

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-DEC-1999 12:20:12.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask Don't Tell

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

TEXT:

pls help Dag here

----- Forwarded by Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP on 12/09/99
12:20 PM -----

James R. Fallin
12/09/99 12:15:57 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Don't Ask Don't Tell

I provided guidance developed yesterday for POTUS to Jason this AM.
----- Forwarded by James R. Fallin/NSC/EOP on 12/09/99
10:24 AM -----

Barry J. Toiv

12/09/99 11:58:35 AM

Record Type: Record

To: David C. Leavy/NSC/EOP@EOP, Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP, James R. Fallin/NSC/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Don't Ask Don't Tell

----- Forwarded by Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP on 12/09/99
11:58 AM -----

Dag Vega
12/09/99 09:54:38 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP, Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Don't Ask Don't Tell

FYI-

----- Forwarded by Dag Vega/WHO/EOP on 12/09/99 09:53 AM

Elizabeth J. Potter
12/09/99 09:06:24 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP, Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: Don't Ask Don't Tell

SLDN told me that 60 minutes is doing a story on this topic this Sunday, December 12th. I understand that they have reached out to DoD for comment. What is the Administration's response to this situation?

"On Tuesday, Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said the Defense Department is designing training programs to ensure understanding of the policy." (full text of article below)

'Don't Ask' Policy Hampered Probe
December 8, 1999
.c The Associated Press
By JAMES PRICHARD

FORT CAMPBELL, Ky. (AP) - Complaints about harassment of a soldier who was rumored to be gay and was later beaten to death in his barracks were not investigated because superiors felt constrained by the Pentagon's ``don't ask, don't tell" policy, a sergeant testified Wednesday.

Staff Sgt. Michael Kleifgen testified during a court-martial for Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, 18, who is charged with premeditated murder.

Glover is accused of using a baseball bat to crush Pfc. Barry Winchell's skull as he slept on a cot at their Fort Campbell barracks on July 5. Prosecutors say Glover was driven by hatred of homosexuals.

Defense attorneys have argued that another soldier, Spec. Justin R. Fisher, 25, who is charged as an accessory, goaded Glover into the attack.

Sometime in March, Fisher started spreading rumors among members of their

unit that Winchell was gay, Kleifgen said. Fisher often harassed Winchell and once, during a scuffle, struck him with a dustpan, Kleifgen said. Winchell needed stitches in his head.

Kleifgen, their section leader at the time, said he regularly spoke with Fisher and Winchell about their differences. The problems continued, however, so the matter was presented to a first sergeant, he said.

“He said, basically, there was nothing we could do because of the ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy,” Kleifgen said.

He said he also got nowhere pursuing the issue with the company commander and filed a complaint with the post’s inspector general. It was not immediately clear what happened to that complaint.

Under the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy, gay members of the military can continue to serve - and their superiors cannot investigate and expel them - as long as they keep their sexual orientation to themselves.

On Tuesday, Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said the Defense Department is designing training programs to ensure understanding of the policy.

Glover, who is from Sulphur, Okla., could get up to life in prison without parole. Fisher, who is from Lincoln, Neb., will be court-martialed on Monday.

Fort Campbell is on the Kentucky-Tennessee state line about 50 miles northwest of Nashville, Tenn.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Fenceberry@aol.com (Fenceberry@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 09:20:59.00

SUBJECT: Articles 12.10.99

TO: "undisclosed-recipients:;"@eop.gov ("undisclosed-recipients:;"@eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. ASSOCIATED PRESS Hawaii Ends Drive for Gay Marriage
2. NEW YORK TIMES Editorial: Hillary got it right by rejecting "don't ask, don't tell"
3. NEW YORK TIMES Letter: "Don't ask, don't tell" not just politically unsound but doesn't work
4. DAYTON DAILY NEWS Dayton City Commissioner proposes ordinance banning discrimination based on sexual orientation
5. SHEWIRE.COM My Two Moms: You have two moms? Shewire's Roseann Marulli chats with women about growing up with gay parents.

Associated Press, December 10, 1999

Hawaii Ends Drive for Gay Marriage

By JEAN CHRISTENSEN

HONOLULU (AP) ? The Hawaii Supreme Court has effectively ended the drive to legalize gay marriage in a state once considered one of the most likely to accept same-sex unions.

In a ruling Thursday, the court said the effort by homosexual couples was rendered moot by a 1998 amendment to the state constitution overwhelmingly approved by voters. The amendment gave lawmakers the authority to limit state-recognized marriages to opposite-sex couples.

"Thank you to the Hawaii Supreme Court for affirming what we've known all along ? that marriage, by God's definition, is between opposite-sex couples," said Mike Gabbard, chairman of the Alliance for Traditional Marriage.

The high court considered an appeal of a lower court ruling that the state could not justify its 1994 ban on same-sex marriages. The judge in the case had ordered the state to grant marriage licenses to gay couples, but delayed the order pending the appeal.

Lawmakers later drafted the amendment giving them the authority to pass the ban. Voters approved the proposal by a 2-to-1 margin last year.

Many in Hawaii's gay community expected the high court to grant equal protections to homosexuals, said Sue Reardon, a Kailua high school teacher who wants to marry her female partner.

"The people's vote was based on fear and a lack of knowledge and understanding," said Reardon, who was not a plaintiff. "But the Supreme

Court is expected to understand, or at least to be knowledgeable of, civil rights.

"This is a sad day for Hawaii."

Vermont's high court is now the only one in the nation currently facing the question of whether same-sex marriage should be legal.

The Hawaii case drew attention after a 1993 state Supreme Court ruling that said the state's failure to recognize gay marriages amounted to gender discrimination.

The ruling set off preemptive legislating around the nation. At least 30 states banned gay marriages, and Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act, which denied federal recognition of homosexual marriage and allowed states to ignore same-sex unions licensed elsewhere.

The ruling also led Hawaii lawmakers to pass the 1994 ban on gay marriage. What the court did this week was find that last year's amendment made the 1994 law valid, meaning the relief sought by the plaintiffs no longer existed and their case was moot.

"It's very difficult to see how they arrived at this decision," plaintiff Joseph Melillo said. "It's really a cop-out."

New York Times, December 10, 1999
229 W. 43rd Street, New York, NY, 10036
(Fax 212-556-3622) (E-MAIL: letters@nytimes.com)
(<http://www.nytimes.com>)
Editorial: Rejecting 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

Hillary Rodham Clinton was exactly right when she told a gay audience at a fund-raiser in SoHo this week that homosexuals ought to be able to serve openly in the United States military. That is the position her husband held when he campaigned for president, promising to issue an executive order to end the Department of Defense's ban on homosexuals in the armed forces. But in 1993 the new president allowed opposition in Congress and the Pentagon to drive him to an ill-conceived compromise, the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

In her remarks on Tuesday, the first lady said her husband's policy had been a failure, and that is an understatement. "Don't ask, don't tell" has led to increased harassment of homosexuals and a doubling in the number of discharges of gay service members. It has also turned barracks life into a grotesque trap for many gay men and lesbians.

Nothing brings that fact into harsher focus than the murder of Army Pfc.

Barry Winchell of the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, Ky., in July.

For weeks, while his company sergeant looked on and did nothing, Private Winchell silently endured daily sexual taunts and harassment from his barracks mates. When he finally beat his chief tormentor in a fistfight, that man, Pvt. Calvin Glover, retaliated by beating him to death with a baseball bat two nights later as he slept in his bunk.

As in other cases when Mrs. Clinton has criticized her husband's policies, the politics here are plain. Her prospective opponent in the 2000

Senate race, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, has been critical of the Pentagon policy. To continue to support the failed policy would have hampered her ability to compete with Mr. Giuliani for New York City's influential gay voters. In an odd campaign twist, Mrs. Clinton may have subsequently damaged

her standing with those same voters by saying yesterday that she would like to march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade. That event is shunned by many Democratic politicians because the parade's organizers exclude the Irish Lesbian and Gay Organization.

Whether or not the parade remark turns into a serious gaffe, the clarity

of Mrs. Clinton's new position on the "don't ask, don't tell" policy is encouraging. So was the verdict of a court-martial jury at Fort Campbell, which on Wednesday found Private Glover guilty of premeditated murder.

New York Times, December 10, 1999

Letter: 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

In describing Hillary Rodham Clinton's opposition to the "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military, your Dec. 9 front-page article notes that her view, and the fact that it is shared by Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, "reflects the extent to which both Mr. Giuliani and Mrs. Clinton view gay men and lesbians in New York as a source of votes and contributions."

While I agree that gay voters are a source of great political power, isn't it possible that the two likely candidates for the Senate oppose the policy because it makes no sense, is immoral and simply doesn't work?
? CHRISTOPHER GOULD, Washington

Dayton Daily News, December 9, 1999

45 S. Ludlow Street, Dayton, OH, 45402

(Fax 937-225-7302) (E-MAIL: edletter@Coxohio.com)

(<http://www.activedayton.com/ddn/>)

Wiseman proposes ban on gay bias

By Jim Bebbington, DAYTON DAILY NEWS

DAYTON ? City commissioner Mary Wiseman has proposed an ordinance prohibiting discrimination in the city based on sexual orientation or source of income.

If passed, the ordinance would add gays, lesbians and the poor to the list of groups given protection under the city's anti-discrimination law.

"I think Dayton will join a long list of other cities in the U.S. and Ohio that declares discrimination against gays and lesbians is wrong and discrimination against poor people just because they are poor is wrong," Wiseman said.

The measure has already produced some opposition among conservatives. This summer, as Wiseman prepared the ordinance, City Hall was flooded at times with callers voicing either support or opposition on the issue.

Similar ordinances are on the books in Cleveland, Columbus, Toledo and Youngstown and other cities.

But a 1992 effort to enact such an ordinance in Cincinnati failed. The city council there approved the measure but it was rescinded by voters the following year.

Critics of the Cincinnati ordinance characterized such ordinances as providing special protection for gays and lesbians.

Wiseman said characterizing the protections afforded by anti-discrimination laws as "special" is inaccurate.

"The argument that by including a group in a non-discrimination ordinance

you are granting them a special privilege implies justice is a zero-sum game," Wiseman said. "That by giving justice to one group you are taking it away from another."

The ordinance will receive a first reading at next Wednesday's commission meeting and is scheduled to be voted upon at the Dec. 22 meeting. It needs support from three of the five members of the commission.

Commissioner Lloyd Lewis said he would consider the proposal and support it if he felt it was needed.

"Does it make sense," Lewis said. "I tend to think there is a need."

Dean Lovelace said he supported the idea.

Commissioners Idotha Bootsie Neal and Mayor Mike Turner couldn't be reached for comment.

The city's anti-discrimination ordinance prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, ancestry, place of birth, age or marital status.

It covers all actions within the city and for employment contracted for in the city but done elsewhere, as when a Dayton-based corporation contracts

for work done in another state. Dayton's ordinance specifically prohibits discrimination in employment, public accommodations and housing.

The changes proposed by Wiseman would also prohibit landlords from refusing to rent to tenants because they receive government subsidies such as

Section 8 housing grants or temporary assistance for needy families.

Bryan Bucklew, vice president of the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce, said the chamber will likely not oppose the ordinance because member businesses have voiced no concerns about it.

Contact Jim Bebbington at 225-2262 or e-mail him at jim_bebbington@coxohio.com

SHEWIRE.COM, December 10, 1999

<http://shewire.chickclick.com/>

My Two Moms

by Roseann Marulli

Carolina Wings could be the girl next door. She's a senior in high school and likes to hang out with her friends. Like most girls her age, she still doesn't know what she wants to study or where she wants to go to college. In fact, Carolina seems like any other 17-year-old at first glance.

But if you turn back the clock a couple years, you'd find hers is a childhood very much unlike most her age. Why?

Carolina's moms are gay.

"I never felt like I was missing anything. Actually, I think I was better off having two moms ? it helped me be more open about life."

When friends Clare and Clem decided to share the responsibility of raising a baby with their friend Jim 17 years ago, the result was Carolina. Growing up, Carolina had three homes, splitting her school year between her biological mom Clare in Oakland, Calif., and mom Clem in Sebastopol, Calif., and spending part of the summer with Jim. Carolina has not two parental role models, but six ? including Clem's and Clare's lesbian partners and Jim's girlfriend.

"I think being raised in a gay family helps kids develop pretty well because it's the quality of the relationships that counts," says Carolina. "And I like the openness, and the events we went to, like [gay] Pride."

But beyond the fact that her mothers were gay women and that she attended gay community activities, Carolina, says, her childhood wasn't much different from that of the other kids she went to school with.

So while many people still view gay families as an aberration, many of the children who grew up in households headed by gay parents say theirs was a childhood much like everyone else's. "Most of my friends [with straight parents] told me I didn't miss much!" Carolina laughs.

Homosexuality may be more prevalent in the movies and on television today, but it's still a hotly debated political issue ? the most obvious evidence of which is probably California's impending Knight initiative, which seeks to ban, within the state, recognition of a marriage that is not solely between a man and a woman.

But despite the challenges that face gay parents ? bans on second-parent adoptions, the inability, for many, to obtain medical benefits for same-sex partners, and, of course, homophobia ? more and more gay men and lesbians are having children, whether by insemination or adoption.

For children of gay parents, the biggest drawback appears to be the heightened consciousness that the difference between their family and other families creates and the subsequent pressure to excel in order to prove to the world that they're just like everybody else.

Take Olivia Smith: If not for her parents' divorce, Olivia's childhood seems uneventful. But when her parents, Joy and Harrison, divorced when she was 5 years old, Harrison began living with his partner Joe.

However, Olivia says her father's sexuality didn't have a negative impact on her; the divorce, she explains, is what most affected her. "If my parents had stayed married it wouldn't have been a good marriage, so there was nothing to be missed there. My dad and Joe were the most stable and

important relationship in my life."

Olivia says her relationship with her father and Joe did cause some friction with her mother ? particularly when Olivia chose to move to California live with them. But, she says, her mother ultimately respected her daughter's decision and her relationship with her ex-husband's partner.

"My mom was hurt because she felt I was rejecting her, and she worried about the effect [living with them] would have on my sexuality and my morals.

But I knew at the time that [my dad] was ill [with AIDS], his time was limited, and I didn't want to live 2,000 miles from him knowing he didn't have forever."

And in Joe, Olivia says she gained another loving parental figure. "I don't remember life before him. He was always part of my life, and he still

is. Having Joe in his life made Dad happier, made him a better father. Something would have been missing otherwise. [The only problem I experienced

as a result was] when I was a sophomore and my dad died of AIDS ? I was in a

small Catholic school, so that wasn't okay."

But Olivia is quick to point out that it wasn't her father's sexuality that made her uncomfortable. "What's hurtful is the social attitudes of people that look at [gays men and lesbians] as wrong," she says.

Felicia Park-Rogers, executive director of Children of Lesbians and Gays

Everywhere (COLAGE) in San Francisco. "The problem is, your family isn't reflected in school," she says.

But Park-Rogers is working through COLAGE to change that. Created in 1989 by a handful of children of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender parents, COLAGE aims to provide children in gay households with education, support, advocacy, and a place to socialize with other kids like themselves.

The program now boasts nearly 30 chapters and offers programs such as online

discussion groups, a newsletter, and activity groups.

The daughter of a gay dad and lesbian mom, Felicia says she feels really

lucky to have grown up with gay parents. "I never lost friends over it.

It never occurred to me to cover up about my family," she says.

Stay tuned for Part II of "My Two Moms," in which the children of gay parents talk about overcoming societal stereotypes of their families.

? Roseann Marulli, a native of New York City, is a freelance journalist and editor, as well as a fiction writer. She has written for LGNY, New York

Living magazine, HBO's Hobnobber, Manhattan Mirror and Lifetime Television Online. Her fiction has appeared in Fetishes.

During the court-martial, a sergeant testified that complaints about harassment of Winchell by other soldiers who suspected he was gay were not investigated because superiors felt constrained by the policy.

According to testimony, Winchell was once hit in the head with a dustpan during a scuffle and needed stitches.

Winchell's parents, Pat and Wally Kutteles, also had harsh words for "don't ask, don't tell."

"We knew Barry could be deployed and come into harm's way for our country. We never dreamed that he would be killed by labeling, prejudice and hatred at home," Mrs. Kutteles said in a statement. "'Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue' did not protect our son. It won't protect anyone else's child. This policy must end."

Glover never addressed the allegation that he despised homosexuals. His attorneys argued that another soldier, Spc. Justin R. Fisher, goaded Glover into the attack. Fisher will be tried in January as an accessory.

While some members of Winchell's unit said they suspected he was homosexual, two soldiers testified at a hearing in August that Winchell had told them he wasn't gay.

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said the Defense Department is working on new training programs for commanders to ensure a fair enforcement of the policy on gays.

"There were certainly very disturbing charges made in the course of this trial about the atmosphere at Fort Campbell, and the commanders at Fort Campbell have said that after the trial is over they will review the compliance with the 'don't ask, don't tell' policy and all the relevant procedures and regulations that flow from that policy," Bacon said.

Bacon said the Clinton administration's policy has succeeded in ending the previous practice of excluding gays from the military.

"I don't think that you can declare the policy a failure based on one gruesome murder at one Army post," he said.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 10:41:16.00

SUBJECT: POTUS Weekly

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

TEXT:

Johnathan this is my first go around so....let me know if I need to edit.
Also, sorry it is late.

"Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue": The trial and sentencing of Private Glover, 18, who was convicted of using a baseball bat to crush Pfc. Barry Winchell's skull as he slept on a cot, has created new energy and focus on this controversial policy. Advocates are furious that six years into the policy, the Department of Defense has still not properly implemented the policy by providing training for law enforcement personnel, commanders, and supervisors about the limits of investigation and appropriate implementation.

It is well documented that servicemembers continue to be interrogated, investigated, harassed and threatened about their sexual orientation. The community has asked that you call on the leadership of the Pentagon to make it crystal clear, throughout the entire chain of command, that anti-gay harassment and hate crimes have no place in the U.S. Military; and that at the end of the trial you will ensure that any military commanders who violated this policy will be held accountable.

HATE CRIMES: The Human Rights Campaign circulated very strong rhetoric that you and the Administration did not do enough to pass this legislation. HRC was very personally invested in attaining justice for the Sheppard family and could not separate our political loss from their emotional experience. I have spoken with several other constituent groups, elected officials and activists who understand and believe that the Republican controlled Congress is to blame. But, they have asked that you make this a top priority for next year and they stand ready to support the administration in this fight for justice.

The court of five officers and enlisted men Wednesday night pronounced him guilty of premeditated murder, solely measuring how calculating Glover had been in the assault. He will be sentenced Thursday and could face life in prison.

Witnesses testified that the victim, fearful that protesting the harassment to superiors meant risking expulsion from the service as a homosexual, had been taunted by Glover into a fistfight. Winchell won the fight handily at the end of a night of barracks drinking. But the humiliated loser, Glover, retaliated with a baseball bat two days later as Winchell slept, bludgeoning him in premeditated revenge, the Army charged.

In pleading guilty to the lesser charge and hoping for leniency, Glover accused a second defendant, 25-year-old Specialist Justin Fisher of Lincoln, Neb., of supplying the baseball bat and goading him into the assault. "I was just so drunk," Glover tearfully told the court Monday. "I had no intent for him to die."

The court-martial, replete with testimony about widespread drunkenness and barracks harassment and routine denunciations of Winchell by fellow soldiers as "a faggot," "a queer" and a "homo," was treated by the prosecution as purely a murder trial. The Army has made no comment on the case's possible implications for its controversial policy toward gays.

But gay-rights organizations contend that the slaying is a classic example of a hate crime rooted in homophobia, and that the Clinton administration's "don't ask" policy, far from making life easier for gays and lesbians in the armed services, has left many to suffer in silence or leave the service.

Since its inception, the policy has seen a doubling of discharges of gay service members, to 312 last year, and a comparable increase in complaints of homosexual harassment, according to pro-gay organizations.

"This murder has shut down any illusions soldiers had," said Michelle Benecke, co-executive director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a gay-rights organization that monitors military justice, in underscoring the Pentagon's failure to circulate guidelines on its gay policy until after the slaying of Winchell. "Every day, service members in every service must endure anti-gay epithets and threats."

In testimony at the trial and in a preliminary inquiry here last summer, witnesses said that Glover, after being struck in the face and thrown to the ground in his challenge to Winchell, seethed with embarrassment, shouted homophobic curses and threatened to kill him, declaring, "It ain't over."

Witnesses said that Winchell, a machine gunner in the 101st Airborne Division, had been called a homosexual by his roommate, Fisher, who is facing a separate court-martial Monday on charges that he was an accomplice in the slaying and lied to investigators. Glover's defense team sought to bring out from witnesses that Fisher was a dominant, manipulative individual while the accused private was subservient and a braggart.

The presiding judge, Col. Gary Holland, told the court that the critical question was whether Glover, amid a long weekend of barracks drinking, partying, and bickering, had opportunity to "cool off" from a point of initial rage and premeditate the assault. Of Fisher, the judge stressed it had been stipulated as fact that "he's the one who handed the accused the bat" and "told him to go out and mess up" Private Winchell.

On the morning of the slaying, a military policeman testified, Fisher, his clothes covered in blood, stood by the ambulance shouting, "Let him die! Let him die!" as Winchell was taken to the hospital. In the earlier hearing, Fisher swore that Glover spewed homophobic epithets before the assault and confessed to the slaying as he hurriedly washed blood from the bat. When the two checked on the stricken Winchell, Fisher said, Glover

lifted his bloodied head and said, "Yes, he is dead."

Witnesses testified that the assault was so severe that Winchell's face was unrecognizable, with his eyes swollen shut and his head cracked open. Glover fled the scene, according to testimony, and threw bloody evidence in a dumpster. He was later arrested in his room by investigators who said they found blood stains on the door and on his clothing.

Last March, Fisher accompanied Winchell to the Connection in Nashville, Tenn., a nightclub favored by gays, according to witnesses, and gossip soon went around the post that the Winchell was homosexual. Testimony established that Winchell had dated a female impersonator at the club, Cal Addams, a former Navy medic known as Calpernia, who eulogized Winchell last July as "a kind, calm gentleman."

"Pretty much everybody in the company called him derogatory names," Winchell's platoon sergeant, Michael Kleifgen, testified at the pre-trial hearing. "They called him a 'faggot' and stuff like that, I would say on a daily basis. A lot of times, he was walking around down in the dumps."

Despite the military's "Don't ask" stricture, Kleifgen testified last summer that he decided to informally investigate after Fisher described the nightclub visit without identifying Winchell. The sergeant said he suspected that Winchell was gay but Winchell denied this. The sergeant dropped the matter, he testified, finally acknowledging to the amazement of some in his audience, that "the military has a policy of 'Don't ask, don't tell.'"

At the same time, the sergeant said he did nothing to enforce Army regulations against the sort of harassment that Winchell was suffering. "Everybody was having fun," the sergeant said in explaining his reasoning.

In the welter of harassment and epithets, several witnesses testified, a few soldiers complained of homophobic denunciations of Winchell by ranking superiors. But nothing came of their complaints, the witnesses said. "We did a formal IG complaint and nothing was done, sir," Kleifgen testified Wednesday, referring to the inspector general's office here. The Fort Campbell public affairs office said it would inquire into the reported complaint to see what might have happened.

Under the policy introduced by the Clinton administration, the military cannot inquire into a soldier's sex life unless there is clear evidence of homosexual conduct. But gays who volunteer this information can be discharged for being homosexual. After the Winchell slaying and reports of white supremacists in the Army, Clinton signed an executive order in October that amends the court martial manual to allow judges to weigh hate-crime factors in meting out sentences.

The last time a service member was killed because of his sexual orientation was beating death of Alan Schindler, a Navy petty officer who was assaulted by two shipmates in October 1992, aboard the USS Belleau Wood.

- att1.htm===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">

<META NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2650.12">

<TITLE>FW: NC11571: NYT on Winchell trial</TITLE>

```
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<BR>
```

<P>This was the piece I refereed to. You should make everybody over there read it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Rex Wockner [mailto:rwockner@netcom.com]

Sent: Thursday, December 09, 1999 5:19 PM

To: Rex Wockner

Subject: NC11571: NYT on Winchell trial

</P>

[illegible]

THE NEW YORK TIMES
December 9, 1999

Killer's Trial Shows Gay Soldier's Anguish
By FRANCIS X. CLINES

<P> FORT CAMPBELL, Ky. -- An 18-year-old Army private was convicted

Wednesday of fatally bludgeoning a fellow soldier whom he had harassed for

being gay but who feared expulsion from the service if he complained.

 Gay-rights proponents have said the court-martial here laid bare the

grave flaws in the military's "don't ask, don't tell" ; policy.

 The 21-year-old victim, Pfc. Barry Winchell of Kansas City, Mo., was

beaten to death with a baseball bat as he slept in his barracks bed early

last July 5 after what fellow soldiers testified was months of vile

name-calling, rumor-mongering and an inquiry into his private life that

was supposed to be forbidden under military policy.

 Winchell's killer, Pvt. Calvin Glover, 18,
of Sulphur, Okla., had

pleaded guilty to a charge of unpremeditated murder. But Wedne
sday he was

convicted of premeditated murder, after details of the final m
onths of

Winchell's life as a soldier subjected to derision and fear we
re heard at

the court-martial.

 The court of five officers and enlisted men
Wednesday night pronounced

him guilty of premeditated murder, solely measuring how calcul
ating Glover

had been in the assault. He will be sentenced Thursday and cou
ld face life

in prison.

 Witnesses testified that the victim, fearfu
l that protesting the

harassment to superiors meant risking expulsion from the servi
ce as a

homosexual, had been taunted by Glover into a fistfight. Winch
ell won the

fight handily at the end of a night of barracks drinking. But
the

humiliated loser, Glover, retaliated with a baseball bat two d
ays later as

Winchell slept, bludgeoning him in premeditated revenge, the A
rmy charged.

 In pleading guilty to the lesser charge and
hoping for leniency,

Glover accused a second defendant, 25-year-old Specialist Just
in Fisher of

Lincoln, Neb., of supplying the baseball bat and goading him i
nto the

assault. "I was just so drunk," Glover tearfully tol
d the court Monday. "I

had no intent for him to die."

 The court-martial, replete with testimony a
bout widespread drunkenness

and barracks harassment and routine denunciations of Winchell
by fellow

soldiers as "a faggot," "a queer" and a &q
uot;homo," was treated by the

prosecution as purely a murder trial. The Army has made no com
ment on the

case's possible implications for its controversial policy towa
rd gays.

 But gay-rights organizations contend that t
he slaying is a classic

example of a hate crime rooted in homophobia, and that the Cli
nton

administration's "don't ask" policy, far from making
life easier for gays

and lesbians in the armed services, has left many to suffer in

silence or

leave the service.

 Since its inception, the policy has seen a
doubling of discharges of

gay service members, to 312 last year, and a comparable increa
se in

complaints of homosexual harassment, according to pro-gay orga
nizations.

 "This murder has shut down any illusio
ns soldiers had," said Michelle

Benecke, co-executive director of the Servicemembers Legal Def
ense

Network, a gay-rights organization that monitors military just
ice, in

underscoring the Pentagon's failure to circulate guidelines on
its gay

policy until after the slaying of Winchell. "Every day, s
ervice members in

every service must endure anti-gay epithets and threats."

 In testimony at the trial and in a prelimin
ary inquiry here last

summer, witnesses said that Glover, after being struck in the
face and

thrown to the ground in his challenge to Winchell, seethed wit
h

embarrassment, shouted homophobic curses and threatened to kil
l him,

declaring, "It ain't over."

 Witnesses said that Winchell, a machine gun
ner in the 101st Airborne

Division, had been called a homosexual by his roommate, Fisher
, who is

facing a separate court-martial Monday on charges that he was
an

accomplice in the slaying and lied to investigators. Glover's
defense team

sought to bring out from witnesses that Fisher was a dominant,

manipulative individual while the accused private was subservi
ent and a

braggart.

 The presiding judge, Col. Gary Holland, tol
d the court that the

critical question was whether Glover, amid a long weekend of b
arracks

drinking, partying, and bickering, had opportunity to "co
ol off" from a

point of initial rage and premeditate the assault. Of Fisher,
the judge

stressed it had been stipulated as fact that "he's the on
e who handed the

accused the bat" and "told him to go out and mess up
" Private Winchell.

 On the morning of the slaying, a military policeman testified, Fisher,

his clothes covered in blood, stood by the ambulance shouting, "Let him

die! Let him die!" as Winchell was taken to the hospital. In the earlier

hearing, Fisher swore that Glover spewed homophobic epithets before the

assault and confessed to the slaying as he hurriedly washed blood from the

bat. When the two checked on the stricken Winchell, Fisher said, Glover

lifted his bloodied head and said, "Yes, he is dead." ;

 Witnesses testified that the assault was so severe that Winchell's

face was unrecognizable, with his eyes swollen shut and his head cracked

open. Glover fled the scene, according to testimony, and threw bloody

evidence in a dumpster. He was later arrested in his room by investigators

who said they found blood stains on the door and on his clothing.

 Last March, Fisher accompanied Winchell to the Connection in

Nashville, Tenn., a nightclub favored by gays, according to witnesses, and

gossip soon went around the post that the Winchell was homosexual.

Testimony established that Winchell had dated a female impersonator at the

club, Cal Addams, a former Navy medic known as Calpernia, who eulogized

Winchell last July as "a kind, calm gentleman."
NT>

 "Pretty much everybody in the company called him derogatory names,"

Winchell's platoon sergeant, Michael Kleifgen, testified at the pre-trial

hearing. "They called him a 'faggot' and stuff like that, I would say on a

daily basis. A lot of times, he was walking around down in the dumps."

 Despite the military's "Don't ask" ; stricture, Kleifgen testified last

summer that he decided to informally investigate after Fisher described

the nightclub visit without identifying Winchell. The sergeant said he

suspected that Winchell was gay but Winchell denied this. The sergeant

dropped the matter, he testified, finally acknowledging to the amazement

of some in his audience, that "the military has a policy
of 'Don't ask,

don't tell.'"

 At the same time, the sergeant said he did
nothing to enforce Army

regulations against the sort of harassment that Winchell was s
uffering.

"Everybody was having fun," the sergeant said in exp
laining his reasoning.

 In the welter of harassment and epithets, s
everal witnesses testified,

a few soldiers complained of homophobic denunciations of Winch
ell by

ranking superiors. But nothing came of their complaints, the w
itnesses

said. "We did a formal IG complaint and nothing was done,
sir," Kleifgen

testified Wednesday, referring to the inspector general's offi
ce here. The

Fort Campbell public affairs office said it would inquire into
the

reported complaint to see what might have happened.

 Under the policy introduced by the Clinton
administration, the

military cannot inquire into a soldier's sex life unless there
is clear

evidence of homosexual conduct. But gays who volunteer this in
formation

can be discharged for being homosexual. After the Winchell sla
ying and

reports of white supremacists in the Army, Clinton signed an e
xecutive

order in October that amends the court martial manual to allow
judges to

weigh hate-crime factors in meting out sentences.

 The last time a service member was killed b
ecause of his sexual

orientation was beating death of Alan Schindler, a Navy petty
officer who

was assaulted by two shipmates in October 1992, aboard the USS
Belleau

Wood.
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: earlybird-alert@njdc.com (earlybird-alert@njdc.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 08:24:58.00

SUBJECT: EARLYBIRDS: McCain And Bradley Shake On Finance Reform

TO: Leslie Bernstein (CN=Leslie Bernstein/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Today's Earlybirds are now available on
National Journal's Cloakroom:
<http://www.cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/>

This morning's headlines at 8:30 a.m.:

Hotline Earlybird: McCain and Bradley shake on campaign finance reform,
firearm fund-raiser in Illinois-17, Yeltsin lashes out at Clinton, Daley
addresses gap in computer access and Guam shipyard prompts clash between
Navy and Congress.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/hotline.htm>

Greenwire Earlybird: Smith outlines Senate enviro agenda, Energy
Department chooses two permanent dump sites, and California air board
orders cuts in sulfur and elimination of MTBE.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/greenwire/>

Pundit Watch: Bradley's flaws, Bush's reading list, and the Declaration of
Independence.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/pundits.htm>

TV Track: Firefighters memorial service, arrest of Russian spy and gays in
the military.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/tvnews.htm>

Today on Cloakroom:

-- Hotline Weekly: The Political Week In Review
<http://cloakroom.com/members/hotlineweekly/>

-- Political Pulse: Trade -- A Sleeper Issue No More
<http://cloakroom.com/members/buzz/njbuzz.htm>

To stop receiving this E-mail Alert:

Reply to this message and include the word "unsubscribe" (without quotes)
in the BODY of the message.

The Earlybirds are published daily by National Journal Group Inc. For more

information about National Journal Group's publications, go to
<http://www.nationaljournal.com>.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 09:13:46.00

SUBJECT: CNN Inside Politics, December 9, 1999

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

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:
CNN Inside Politics
Aired December 9, 1999 - 5:00 p.m. ET

Hillary Clinton Takes Aim at 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'
Policy; A Look at First Lady's and Giuliani's Anger
Management; Bush Campaigns in Granite State

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

HILLARY CLINTON, FIRST LADY OF THE UNITED STATES:
Fitness to serve in the military should be based on

one's conduct, not one's
sexual orientation.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

aim BERNARD SHAW, CNN ANCHOR: Senate candidate Clinton takes
at "don't ask, don't tell," putting her at odds with the
president's policy again.

Also ahead:

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE:
Starring in a new movie called "Silence In Seattle."

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: George W. Bush takes a new shot at Al Gore. But
privately, are his
jitters about John McCain intensifying?

And the West Virginia mountains call a teacher to the
statehouse. Can she
beat the odds and become governor?

Judy ANNOUNCER: From Washington, this is INSIDE POLITICS with
Woodruff and Bernard Shaw.

SHAW: Thanks for joining us. Judy is off today.

New York As Hillary Clinton reaches out to key voting blocks in
state, she
is trying to highlight her differences with likely
Senate rival Rudy Giuliani. But
on one issue today, it wasn't Giuliani's stand the first
lady was disputing; it
was the president's.

CNN's Deborah Feyerick reports on Mrs. Clinton's
position on the
administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays
in the military and other
matters of concern to the first lady.

powerful (BEGIN VIDEOTAPE) DEBORAH FEYERICK, CNN
CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Surrounded by a small but
group of Irish-Americans, Hillary Clinton shared her
views about gays in the
military.

H. CLINTON: Fitness to serve in the military should be based on one's conduct, not one's sexual orientation.

FEYERICK: In the past, Mrs. Clinton's liberal opinions would have made many conservative Irish Catholics shudder, but this is New York City, a tapestry of diversity, as well as an ethnic mine field, which Mrs. Clinton is learning to navigate.

NIAL O'DOWD, PUBLISHER, "IRISH VOICE": Maybe eight years ago, you know, her positions would have been hard for Irish-Americans to accept on a lot of issues, but the Northern Ireland issue has been extremely important for Irish Americans, and there's no question that without her role and her husband's role, we wouldn't have a peace process.

FEYERICK: Mrs. Clinton will be negotiating her own peace next week at a meeting with New York's orthodox Jews. Many are angry at her handling of Suha Arafat, who accused Israelis of poisoning Palestinian women and children. Mrs. Clinton failed to speak up at the time, then embraced Mrs. Arafat following the explosive remarks.

H. CLINTON: I want to clear the air. I'm not going with any particular agenda, but I want people to meet and hear from me firsthand.

FEYERICK: And what of Mrs. Clinton's scheduled meeting with controversial activist and Rudy Giuliani nemesis Al Sharpton? The mayor won't meet with him; Mrs. Clinton will.

H. CLINTON: We're going to be promoting the politics of inclusion in New York, because I think it's to the benefit of New Yorkers that people work together, even if they have differences.

FEYERICK: Mayor Giuliani's campaign spokesman dismissed the idea the mayor can be divisive, saying Mrs. Clinton's remarks were more of the same negative personal rhetoric being imported into New York

from Washington.

(on camera): Though Mrs. Clinton is doing her best to get to know New York politics, she still has a way to go to understand its nuances. When asked whether she would march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade, Mrs. Clinton enthusiastically answered yes. The parade bans gays and lesbians from marching as a group.

Deborah Feyerick, CNN, New York.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: Now let's take a closer look at Mrs. Clinton's stand on gays in the military and put it in political context. For that, we turn to CNN White House correspondent John King.

John, what is her strategy? What's the strategy behind breaking with the president on this?

JOHN KING, CNN WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Well, Bernie, aides say that Mrs. Clinton simply thinks from a policy perspective that this does not work. Think back to early 1993, implementing the so-called "don't ask, don't tell" policy, one of the most controversial things this president did. Even behind the scenes, many of the president's aides will tell you the policy is not working as they had hoped it would. The number of gays and lesbians being kicked out of military actually on the rise. That was not what the president intended. The president, with just one year left, has no interest in revisiting this subject. The first lady, as she campaigns for Senate and campaigns for a very critical gay and lesbian constituency in New York state decided to speak out because, we're told she thinks this policy simply doesn't work.

SHAW: Gay rights, big issue, New York State?

KING: A very big issue, and one in which she has trouble with her opponent. He's a Republican, the mayor Rudy Giuliani,

but he passed the
domestic partnership provision in the city. He has also
been critical in the
past of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

The first lady facing trouble here. Let me run through a
few numbers to
explain this trouble. It's not just gays and lesbians,
Rudy Giuliani does well
with Democratic voters and Democratic constituencies in
particular. The first
lady in the latest Marist Institute poll getting 55
percent support in New
York City. Chuck Schumer a year ago in a very close
race, he got 74
percent support in New York City. The first lady needs
to do better there.
And among Democrats, registered Democrats statewide, the
first lady
supported by 63 percent. That sounds good. Chuck
Schumer, when he won
a tight race against Alfonse D'Amato, got 85 percent of
registered
Democrats. So the first lady has her work cut out for
her. These early
campaign controversies not helping so far -- Bernie.

SHAW: And mindful of the final point that Deborah
Feyerick just made in
her piece, the first lady taking this position on gays
and lesbians, but she's
going to be in the St. Patty's Day Parade next March,
and the parade bans
gays.

KING: It won't be long before some liberals, some gay
rights groups,
criticize what the first lady said today. Her campaign
insisting she was well
aware of the controversy when she said she very much
looks forward to
marching. Mayor Giuliani already poked fun at it. He has
marched in the
campaigns in the past, says he's marched all the way
back do his days in
college, then he paused and added, of course he grew up
in New York --
Bernie.

SHAW: John King at the White House, thank you.

Now let's talk about an area in which Mrs. Clinton
apparently believes she
has an advantage over Giuliani, namely her ability to

control her temper.

Thomas DeFrank, the Washington bureau chief for "The New York Daily News," has an article today about the first lady's anger management as well as that of Mayor Rudy Giuliani.

How short is her fuse?

THOMAS DEFRANK, "NEW YORK DAILY NEWS": Well, she's got a short fuse, Bernie, like a lot of politicians, certainly like her husband, but she's done a very good job of keeping the fuse on private display, not on personal display. I think she comes from a family where she was taught to be disciplined, under control. And I think her temperament is definitely not going to be a problem in the public arena, because I think she's much more disciplined, much more controlled than Mayor Rudy Giuliani has shown to be from time to time.

SHAW: You're anticipating my next question. Who has the shorter fuse?

DEFRANK: Well, I think Rudy has the shorter fuse in the public persona. The mayor, despite his many attributes, he's known to be quick with a quip. He tends to be very tough sometimes. And it's interesting that the Clinton campaign has made a command decision to go after him on this score. They're hoping to goad him into saying something dumb, stupid, incautious, intemperate, all of the above if he can. And so far, she's showing a lot of discipline, too. So it's going to be very interesting.

SHAW: Let's look at the anatomy of Hillary Rodham Clinton's anger -- the face, the body language, the voice?

DEFRANK: Well, if she's only moderately exasperated, she might say -- she might roll her eyes and say "Jeez Louise." If she's really angry, you know it because her voice ducks down an octave, the nostrils flare a little bit, there's a hardening quality to her voice. And those who have survived her

private temper will tell you that when she gets to the point where she starts going in uh-huh, uh-huh in very rapid order time, it's time to look for a seatbelt. And if she gets to the point where she says, I have heard all I want to hear, I don't want to hear about it anymore, you've got to be very secure to keep talking.

SHAW: The candidates' temperament, will that really be a big factor in this race?

DEFRANK: I think it's only going to be a factor if one of the candidates shows either a temper or some lack of judicial temperament in some sort of setting. I mean, their private, you know, how they explode or how they vent in private is -- who cares, but the issue is going to be how they manage and control their public persona. And again, the Clinton camp thinks that they can get Rudy to blow. The Rudy folks are saying, we understand the game, that's what they want us to do, the mayor's going to be very disciplined.

We have got 11 months to watch, Bernie.

SHAW: Tom DeFrank, "New York Daily News," very interesting piece. Thank you.

DEFRANK: Thank you. SHAW: And we have to switch the tone of our reporting right now because we have a breaking news story from the pentagon. A United States Marine helicopter has gone down off the coast of San Diego. Eighteen marines were aboard that chopper. That's all we have to report right now. And we're scrambling to get more details. As we get them, we'll pass them onto you.

Coming up next on INSIDE POLITICS, Bob Novak weighs in on a question being asked of George W. Bush.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

QUESTION: You are contemplating the possibility of

losing this primary?

(LAUGHTER)

BUSH: No.

(LAUGHTER)

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: We'll have the latest on Bush's prospects in New Hampshire and his day on the trail. Plus: In addition to taking on Bush, John McCain is challenging one state's rules for getting on the ballot.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: In New York today, John McCain announced a legal challenge to the state's Republican primary ballot process. The GOP presidential hopeful said he will file a federal lawsuit designed to change the system before the March 7th primary. McCain charges the process involving the collection of signatures in individual Congressional districts is weighted to exclude non-establishment candidates like himself.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: In 49 other states, the people, the voters -- the Republican voters -- have an ability to make a choice without the obviously confusing and Byzantine kind of situation that exists here in New York State. I'm sorry we had to file this lawsuit. I know that Guy and our team have exhausted every other option before we do this, but I'm also sure that we will prevail.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: McCain was referring to the chairman of his New York campaign, Staten Island borough president Guy Molinari.

McCain may face an uphill battle against George W. Bush in New York, but the dynamic is very different in New Hampshire.

CNN's Candy Crowley has the latest on Bush's bid to bounce back in the Granite State.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CANDY CROWLEY, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): George Bush finished off a two-day campaign swing against the backdrop of New Hampshire blues.

BUSH: Thank you for your endorsement. I accept.

CROWLEY: A law enforcement endorsement is welcome to counter blues of a different sort: Seven weeks out from the primary, the Governor of Texas has a race on his hands in the Granite State.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I am a Republican. I am torn between you and John McCain, and in layman's terms, what makes you different from him?

CROWLEY: Every poll shows John McCain near, even with, or ahead of George Bush in New Hampshire.

Where did that 33-point lead go? For one thing, there have been a lot of campaign dropouts, and McCain is largely the beneficiary.

But some critics blame the Bush message.

DICK BENNETT, NEW HAMPSHIRE POLLSTER: The themes that he has been talking about have addressed mainly this compassionate conservative. It doesn't reach into the conservative Republican base as much as it should.

CROWLEY: What do New Hampshire conservatives want to talk about on the eve of the new millennium? Same thing they wanted to talk about in the old millennium.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I find that I am currently in the highest tax bracket, and about a million people like me are in a higher tax bracket than Bill Gates.

BUSH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a real problem with that. Yes, I gather you picked up some of that.

CROWLEY: Then, too, Bush did not come early or often to a state that expects both.

BUSH: Thank you.

People are making up their mind. This is what this is all about. And I have got a lot of work to do, and I am looking forward to doing it.

CROWLEY: Bush will step up his New Hampshire stopovers in January.

He has been to the state nine times, compared to 22 trips for John McCain.

McCain has virtually lived here, running a one-state national strategy.

Bush has been all over the map, running, in essence, a general campaign.

More often than not, his sights set on the Clinton-Gore administration.

Thursday's hit, the failure of the World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle.

BUSH: They weren't forceful as free traders, and Vice President Gore has been amazingly silent on the issue, starring in a new movie called, "Silence in Seattle."

CROWLEY: Bush's intrastate national campaign strategy has made him a formidable front runner everywhere but New Hampshire. Prevailing wisdom is that a loss in this first primary state could loosen Bush's grip elsewhere.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am wondering if you are contemplating the possibility of losing this primary?

BUSH: No.

CROWLEY (on camera): While no candidate likes to publicly entertain the thought of losing before the votes are cast, strategists

both here and in Texas
believe with organizations in place in 50 states, a loss
for Bush in New
Hampshire, while not desirable, is certainly survivable.

Candy Crowley, CNN, Gosstown, New Hampshire.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: For more on the Bush-McCain race in New Hampshire,
and other
campaign 2000 matchups, let's bring in Bob Novak of "The
Chicago
Sun-Times."

Bob, what is the buzz on that Republican primary in New
Hampshire?

ROBERT NOVAK, "CHICAGO SUN-TIMES": Bernie, it is too
early to
say anything definitive, but there are multiple
indications from several polls
that not only is John McCain ahead of George Bush in New
Hampshire, but
he's moving well ahead. And one pollster told me today
there is a chance for
a blowout in New Hampshire where McCain wins big.

Now, it's been always considered at this counting --
proposition, that Bush
-- which is, New Hampshire isn't a good state for Bush,
that he could lose
New Hampshire narrowly and it wouldn't make much
difference with all his
money and his advantage elsewhere. But what if he is
blown out by a big
margin in New Hampshire, would that have an impact
elsewhere? Nobody
knows, but it is one reason why the Bush people I talked
to want the
governor to do a little better in the poll -- in the
coming debates, and to
campaign a little harder in New Hampshire.

SHAW: Very interesting, especially with South Carolina
following New
Hampshire. On to the Democrats -- Gore, Bradley. How's
the tax issue
playing in that race?

NOVAK: This is wonderful. You know, in a "Washington
Post" interview,
Bill Bradley said that he would consider raising taxes
to finance his health

care plan, and the Gore people jumped on it. Well,
yesterday in New
Hampshire, Gore said, when he was pressed, that he would
-- couldn't rule
out a tax increase. So I was talking to...

SHAW: Said he didn't have a crystal ball.

NOVAK: He didn't have a crystal ball. So I said, they
are in the same thing.
He said, no, one is considering it, the other is not
ruling it out.

The truth of the matter, Bernie, is being for higher
taxes is not that bad in a
Democratic primary, and they're just about on the same
level there. I don't
think it's a factor.

SHAW: Finally, New York Senate race, Mayor Giuliani's
crackdown on the
homeless.

NOVAK: Another non-factor, I believe. I think this is an
issue that certainly
gives the people, the liberals, African-Americans, some
feminists who like
Hillary Clinton -- it's going to give them more reason
to be for. But I think
the upstate and suburban voters, who are the swing
voters -- I think it's a
non-factor in this race.

Obviously, the factor that might be important is in the
Jewish vote in New
York where Mayor Giuliani is going to be run very well.
Does this hurt him
with the Jewish vote in New York? I really don't think
so. No matter what
the polls say, I don't think the homeless is a factor
that goes into a broad
base of support in voting in New York, or anywhere else.

SHAW: We're hearing it from Bob Novak's notebook, thanks
very much.

And INSIDE POLITICS will be right back with more.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: And there is much more ahead here on INSIDE
POLITICS.

Coming up, Bill Bradley takes his campaign to
California, but is a meeting

with a GOP hopeful in his future?

Plus...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

JUDY WOODRUFF, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Her stand against a practice called mountaintop mining has become her passion, so much so that it has taken her out of the cloistered world of books and into the rough-and-tumble of West Virginia state politics.

(END VIDEO CLIP) SHAW: Judy Woodruff on a West Virginia scholar turned candidate and the issue driving her unlikely bid for governor.

And later...

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRUCE MORTON, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): It must be hard for this president. The kids grow up and leave, of course. Wives follow careers, but he was the most important man in the world for seven years, and now maybe he isn't.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

SHAW: Bruce Morton on what can be a lonely life, even for a president.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: We'll have more of this day's political news coming up, but now a look at some other top stories.

Thousands came from across the country and across the oceans to pay tribute to six firefighters killed in a warehouse blaze in Worcester, Massachusetts. President Clinton made the pilgrimage as well.

CNN White House correspondent Chris Black now with the sights and sounds of an emotional ceremony that moved many to tears. We'll have that report shortly.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin lashes out over U.S.

criticism of Moscow's
military campaign in Chechnya. Mr. Yeltsin is in China
where he reminded
the United States that his country still controls a vast
nuclear arsenal.
Chinese leaders are supporting Russia's campaign in
Chechnya.

A Russian diplomat has been caught eavesdropping on the
U.S. State
Department building. The embassy attache was arrested
yesterday but
declared diplomatic immunity. He has been ordered to
leave the United
States within ten days. Last week, Russia expelled a
U.S. diplomat on
charges of spying.

NATO's top commander is warning Yugoslav President
Slobodan Milosevic
not to interfere with the independence-minded government
of Montenegro.
Montenegro is one of two republics that make up
Yugoslavia and it is
currently trying to democratize its institutions. NATO
officials say they'll
keep a close eye on Milosevic so he doesn't move against
the Montenegrin
government.

When INSIDE POLITICS returns, Bill Bradley reaching out
to
African-Americans and to a would-be Republican rival.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: Now to Bill Bradley in California, where his focus
today was on
some Americans who have not profited from the economic
boom. CNN's
Jennifer Auther covered Bradley's appearance in Los
Angeles -- Jennifer.

JENNIFER AUTHER, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Bernie, Democratic
presidential hopeful Bill Bradley addressed the National
Congress of Black
Churches, that is an ecumenical coalition of eight
historically
African-American denominations. The former three-term
senator from New
Jersey reiterated his view that race is at the very core
of many domestic
issues, including health care, gun violence, and
economic equality.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BILL BRADLEY (D), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: We can't afford in this new economy not to have everyone with the tools to advance. We can't afford to have a 21st century stained by the same racism that poisoned the 20th century. We cannot be who we can be as a people, unless we realize the ultimate truth that we all advance together, or each of us, in some way, some poisonous way, is diminished. But you and I know that we still have a long way to go.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

AUTHER: Bradley evoked memories of days spent in the Little League during segregation, and then to the inequality he viewed that was race-based when he played for the New York Knicks in the 1960s. He told this group of about 150 that he'd like to be the one to make a difference.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BRADLEY: I don't believe we have to settle in America. I don't think we should settle for lifting a few children here, and a few children there out of poverty. I don't think we should settle for an infant mortality rate among black children in this country that's nearly twice of that white children in America. I don't think we should settle for a Medicaid system that is failing. I don't think we should settle for taking a few guns here and a few guns there off the street. And I don't think we should settle for a certain percentage of people of color in government. I think what we need are people of color deciding what government does.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

AUTHER: Bradley is definitely trying to close the gap that Vice President Al Gore has within support among African-Americans in this country. On

another note, Bradley's aides today confirmed that talks are under way with Republican presidential hopeful John McCain, the senator from Arizona.

Nothing is final, but the two, if they can complete these talks, would be in New Hampshire. They want to reemphasize their support for campaign finance reform -- Bernie.

SHAW; Thank you, Jennifer Auther in Los Angeles. And we have much more in what you just alluded, too.

CNN has learned that Bradley and Republican John McCain will appear

together in Claremont, New Hampshire, next week -- a week from today, in

fact -- to underscore mutual support for campaign finance reform. They are

planning to publicly agree to renounce the use of unregulated soft money if

they become the presidential nominees of their respective parties. And

they're planning to seal their agreement with a handshake, and much the

same way as you see this, in the same town where President Clinton and

then House Speaker Newt Gingrich pledged to change campaign finance laws in 1995.

Postscript: Nothing substantive was accomplished as a result of the

Clinton-Gingrich pledge. So why do Bradley and McCain want to reenact

that moment in political history? Well, let's bring in our Bill Schneider.

Bill, what would a McCain-Bradley handshake mean for campaign finance reform?

WILLIAM SCHNEIDER, CNN SR. POLITICAL ANALYST: Well, Bernie, Bradley and McCain both have a mutual interest to make campaign

finance reform a bigger issue to voters. They both claim the issue is their

own, and they use it to portray opponents as compromised by special

interest money, Bush because he's raised so much of it, and Gore because of

his role in the 1996 fund-raising scandal. The fact that the handshake across

parties is very important. Reform cannot work unless both parties accept it.

McCain and Bradley are saying you want to clean up the political system?

Start by nominating the two of us.

SHAW; But doesn't memory say that the '95 Clinton-Gingrich handshake also was across party lines?

SCHNEIDER: Sure it was. But as you said, nothing really came of it. A year

later, the Clinton administration broke all records in raising and in spending

soft money. And since then, the Republican Senate has let McCain-Feingold

-- that reform bill die. The voters didn't seem to care very much. They've

become pretty cynical. Now, McCain and Bradley are announcing a

compact: That if they become the nominees, they will direct their parties not

to raise or spend any soft money. And in fact, the McCain campaign has

informed CNN that Mr. McCain intends to reject soft money, regardless of

what the Democratic nominee does.

SHAW: Interesting. But in New Hampshire, McCain and Bradley are

competing for the same independent voters.

SCHNEIDER: Well, you might think so, but take a look at the polls. Now,

Bradley does much better among independents than he does among partisan

Democrats. And McCain does better among independents than among

partisan Republicans. But the independents who are voting for Bradley are

liberals who usually vote in the Democratic primary. The independents who

are voting for McCain are conservatives who usually vote in the Republican

primary. All they have in common is that they're not partisan, and they prefer

candidates who challenge the party establishments, like McCain and

Bradley. Bradley and McCain are betting that they will not take votes from

each other. Precisely the opposite: That if they can dramatize the issue of

campaign finance reform, both of them will benefit. And that is their mutual

interest. SHAW; Bill Schneider, thanks very much.

SCHNEIDER: Sure.

SHAW: For the second time in this edition of INSIDE POLITICS, we have to change the tone of our normal reporting. First, we told you about the Marine chopper going down off the coast of San Diego. And now our White House correspondent Chris Black on the story, the memorial service for the six firemen killed in the Worcester, Massachusetts, factory fire. Here now is Chris Black with the sights and sounds of today's very moving memorial service.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CHRIS BLACK, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): It was time to say good-bye.

CLINTON: We hope that by our collective presence, we will speak louder than words in saying that your tragedy is ours.

BLACK: Outside, firefighters from California to Canada marched through the streets of Worcester, paying tribute to six brothers who lost their lives searching for people in a burning warehouse.

UNIDENTIFIED FIREFIGHTER: On my walk from the fire station I seen a sign that said everything. It said, most cities have one hero. The city of Worcester was blessed with six.

BLACK: Massachusetts senior senator remembered the men he called our watchmen on the wall. Senator Kennedy might have been speaking of his own losses.

SEN. EDWARD KENNEDY (D), MASSACHUSETTS: I wish that loved ones did not have to die too young. I wish that none were lost in the high noontime of their lives. I wish that tragedy never haunted a single soul. But I know that sometimes life breaks your heart.

BLACK: And here is the city called the "Heart of

Massachusetts," hearts
were breaking. The mayor canceled school, and thousands
watched and
listened outside the convention center.

(on-camera): Only two of the six bodies have been
recovered. Throughout
the service, Worcester firefighters continued their sad
duty sifting through the
ashes searching for some sign of the last four, who may
never be found.

(voice-over): Vice President Al Gore stopped by the
smoldering warehouse
to offer words of comfort. At the service, Worcester's
Congressman
thanked the president for answering his call to attend,
and then he spoke to
the 17 fatherless children.

UNIDENTIFIED CONGRESSMAN: An entire nation joined
together to
say that your fathers are special.

BLACK: What can be done or said to those who have lost
so much? The
Firefighters Union presented a Medal of Honor to each
family, Senator John
Kerry and Congressman McGovern offered American flags,
and the belief
that untimely lives of Thomas and Timothy, Paul and
Jeremiah, James and
Joseph had meaning.

Chris Black, CNN, Worcester, Massachusetts.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: Next year in West Virginia, voters will have a
chance to re-elect or
unseat their current Republican governor. Several
candidates are already in
the race. But one West Virginia resident, inspired by a
single cause, is
battling for the right just to be listed on the ballot.

Judy Woodruff traveled outside the beltway to meet this
political newcomer
to find out what's driving her uphill campaign.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

WOODRUFF (voice-over): Denise Giardina is at home in a classroom.

DENISE GIARDINA, WEST VIRGINIA GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATE: Well, first of all, let me put this down. The powerful make the decisions.

WOODRUFF: She's a professor of English literature at West Virginia State College.

GIARDINA: If you notice, the top of the quotation's good old J. Alfred Prufrock on there. Do I dare disturb the universe? Do I dare?

WOODRUFF: She's also a successful author, writing late into the evening, or giving readings from one of her award-winning novels.

GIARDINA: So why did they listen this time?

WOODRUFF: "Storming Heaven" deals with the West Virginia she grew up in, a state of striking natural beauty, which she fears is now in peril because of modern mining.

GIARDINA: Soon they will be tearing the whole tops off of mountains, and scooping out the coal like eating a soft-boiled egg.

WOODRUFF: Her stand against a practice called mountaintop mining has become her passion: so much so, that it has taken her out of the cloistered world of books and into the rough and tumble of West Virginia State politics.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want to introduce Denise Giardina for governor.

(APPLAUSE)

GIARDINA: I'm the only candidate running who's against mountaintop removal. WOODRUFF: For 30 years, it has been one of the most efficient ways of getting at the state's most valuable natural resource: coal. Instead of tunneling into the mountainside, mining companies use powerful explosives

literally to blow the top off of the mountain and get at
high-grade coal
underneath.

The blasted rock is then dumped into valleys and over
mountain streams.

So far, about 500 square miles of West Virginia's
mountainscape have been
leveled. Denise Giardina showed me one site near
Charleston.

WOODRUFF (on camera): West Virginia didn't look anything
like this
when you were growing up, did it?

GIARDINA: No. I never would have dreamed that this kind
of thing would
be done to a mountain.

Can you imagine doing this to Colorado's mountains or
Vermont's mountains
or the Alps? Just actually gorgeous mountains, and we're
making them dead
places basically for short-term gain. And nobody will
ever see these
mountains again.

WOODRUFF (voice-over): For someone so opposed to the
influence of
mining, Giardina's background might surprise you. She
was born into a
mining family in southern West Virginia. Her grandfather
emigrated from Italy
to work in the mines. Her uncle died of black lung.

(on camera): What is really driving you to do this?

GIARDINA: I don't think I could live with myself right
now if I weren't
doing this. It just feels like the right thing to do.

WOODRUFF (voice-over): It may feel right, but by taking
on the coal
industry she's challenging a defining way of life in
West Virginia. Coal is one
of the state's biggest employers, it's greatest taxpayer
and a major
contributor to political campaigns.

She's opposing the Republican governor, who used to be a
mining executive
and is against a ban on mountaintop mining.

GOV. CECIL UNDERWOOD (R), WEST VIRGINIA: It would be a financial disaster for the state of West Virginia. If we were to lose 25 percent of our mining, it would cost the state over a \$100 million in taxes.

WOODRUFF: And it's not just the Republicans she's up against. Veteran Democratic senators Robert Byrd and Jay Rockefeller also vigorously support mountaintop mining, along with virtually the state's entire political establishment.

(on camera): But the biggest hurdle Giardina faces in her bid for the governorship comes long before any votes are cast. She is struggling simply to get her name on the ballot, because complex rules in West Virginia make it almost impossible for any third-party candidate to run for office.

(voice-over): Like independent candidates throughout the country, to become an official candidate Giardina needs to gather thousands of signatures. In West Virginia, independent candidates have a tougher time than most.

GIARDINA: I have until May to get these signatures, 14,000 of them.

WOODRUFF: But a 75-year-old law in West Virginia means that she has to warn every potential signer that they can't vote in the primary election if they sign her petition. Because of a recent amendment to the law, Giardina argues it is no longer valid and she is fighting in court to get it changed. In the meantime, collecting signatures is a battle in itself.

GIARDINA: It says here that if you sign this you are giving up your right to vote in the primary election. However, that's no longer the case. The legislature did away with this provision, because it no longer applies, but they didn't take the language off the petition. You can vote now in the primary if you want to. But we're still required by law to tell you you're not supposed

to, which is really goofy.

WOODRUFF: The state's Democratic Party believes the law is valid and is challenging Giardina in court. According to the state party's co-chairman, the Democrats want to keep Giardina out of the race, because they believe she would take votes from their candidates.

While she is surrounded by political opponents, Giardina is getting support from outside the political establishment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, Harry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: First of all, I want to tell you, everything you spoke about so far, I support you 100 percent.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I like just about everything that you have to say.

GIARDINA: I appreciate that.

We just have a history in this state, I think, of supporting the big corporations over the little guy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks for calling.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right.

WOODRUFF: Both the state's main newspapers have defended the outsider's right to run for office. Paul Owens (ph) is the political editor of "The Charlestown Daily Mail."

PAUL OWENS, POLITICAL EDITOR, "THE CHARLESTOWN DAILY MAIL": Well, her candor is so refreshing. It's not the kind of behavior you get from normal politicians who qualify their answers and leave -- do a lot of equivocating when you ask them a simple question.

WOODRUFF: When it comes to mountaintop mining, West Virginia's governor is very straightforward. He says mining companies have an

excellent record of restoring mined sites into land that
can be used for
building projects, like this state prison.

UNDERWOOD: I've been on many of the sites, and properly
done, I think
it's a benefit to West Virginia.

WOODRUFF (on camera): The denuding of the mountain, the
changing of
the contour of the mountain, and the tree removal and
all the rest of that is
not something that you think should be of concern?

UNDERWOOD: You don't understand that we have practically
very few
acres of level land in this state, and that's one of the
problems that we've had
over the years in diversifying our economic base. We
need more acres of flat
land.

GIARDINA: If it's so wonderful to have all that flat
land, why don't we
export that technology to Vermont or someplace, you
know, and say, well
you want to flatten your mountains too? It'll be good
for you, you know, you
can develop your economy even more. You know, I mean,
it's absurd on it's
face.

WOODRUFF (voice-over): Adding more urgency to the
debate, a federal
judge recently agreed with environmentalists that valley
fills from
mountaintop mines violate water quality standards. This
could lead to a
mining ban, but mine workers, mining companies and the
state are all
appealing the ruling. The fear of a ban has already led
to some layoffs.

Terry Vance (ph) has been out of work for four months,
and blames
environmentalists like Denise Giardina.

TERRY VANCE, FMR. MINE WORKER: She's offered no plan
whatsoever, alternative plan for mining the coal or
anything. Apparently, all
she wants is to do away with coal mining, and save the
mountains, for what?

WOODRUFF: What Giardina wants to save those mountains

for the future

West Virginia, one she hopes is without mountaintop mining.

GIARDINA: My point is it's on it's way out. It doesn't have anything to do with local lawsuits or local environmentalists, it's on it's way out. It's going to run out in 30 or so years. Why should we wait 30 years or so for the roof to fall in and let our kids deal with it?

Judy Woodruff, CNN, reporting.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: In California, a political issue has drawn the attention of the cast of the sitcom "Will and Grace." The show's actors are starring in a political ad, voicing their opposition to proposition 22. The referendum would deny legal recognition of same-sex marriages.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, ANTI-PROPOSITION 22 AD)

UNIDENTIFIED ACTOR: Hi, we're the cast of "Will and Grace."

On March 7, Californians will go to the polls to vote either for or against basic civil rights.

UNIDENTIFIED ACTRESS: Proposition 22, known as the 9th initiative, would legalize discrimination against gay and lesbian Americans and their families.

SHAW: The show "Will and Grace" is about a gay man who is best friends with a straight woman. This ad marks the first time the entire cast of a network television show has participated in a political ad.

When we return, President Clinton's newfound solitude. Bruce Morton ponders whether it is indeed lonely at the top.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHAW: Updating for you now a very exhausting and dramatic story

underway as we report these latest details to you on the crash of that Marine chopper off the coast of San Diego. Eleven Marines have been rescued, 11 have been rescued. A total of 18 were aboard the chopper, and now Navy Seals, Navy Seals are in the water searching for the other seven Marines. We're going to have a live update from the Pentagon at the top of the hour at 6:00 p.m. on "WORLDVIEW."

President Clinton is nearing the final year of his presidency, and as our Bruce Morton reports, it may be a lonely 12 months at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

MORTON (voice-over): He's alone a lot now, notice? Walked up to the Christmas tree lighting alone. Not so many vacation threesomes anymore. That recent Middle East trip was ladies only. And she's involved with other men -- mentors, like Daniel Patrick Moynihan; rivals, like his honor, the mayor. She got this house; has referred to it as "my house."

H. CLINTON: I thought about the furniture I have and the furniture I need to get.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: She's going to spend a long time in New York. So she'll be there a lot, she'll be here when she can, I'll go up there when I can, and I'll -- we'll be together as much as we can.

MORTON: His right-hand man's gone a lot, too, running for Mr. Clinton's job, running for president. More reporters following him, sometimes, than following the main man, the former main man. W. CLINTON: Well, obviously he's not around as much. We don't have lunch every week and I miss that terribly.

MORTON: You know what Harry Truman said, Mr. President. If you want a friend in Washington, get a -- well, you have one of

those, of course. It
must be hard for this president. Kids grow up and leave,
of course. Wives
follow careers. But he was the most important man in the
world for seven
years, and now maybe he isn't, and there's that other
thing he can't seem to
shake.

W. CLINTON: Well, the mistake I made was self-inflicted
and the
misconduct of others was not.

MORTON: Presidents have an official song, of course,
"Hail to the Chief."
Mr. Clinton, these days, may be humming another one:
"All By Myself,
Alone."

Bruce Morton, CNN, Washington.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SHAW: That's all for this edition of INSIDE POLITICS.
We'll see you
again tomorrow, when we'll have Bill Schneider's
political play of the week.
And you can go online all the time at CNN's
allpolitics.com.

I'm Bernard Shaw in Washington. "WORLDVIEW" is next, as
we look at
the lighting of the Capitol Tree on the West Plaza here
in Washington.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-tvtrack@po.databack.com@INET@LNGTWY (owner-tvtrack@po.databack.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 01:45:36.00

SUBJECT: TV TRACK 12 09

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

TO: Mark A. Kitchens@eop (Mark A. Kitchens@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dag Vega@eop (Dag Vega@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

TV TRACK -- Network TV Headlines From Thursday, December 9, 1999
To: Television Writer
Contact: U.S. Newswire, 202-347-2770

WASHINGTON, Dec. 9 /U.S. Newswire/ -- The following headline summary of evening network news programs for December 9 was prepared by U.S. Newswire. Headlines are in the order that stories appeared on the broadcast and include the name of the correspondent, dateline, and running time.

<STAB>

NETWORK TELEVISION NEWS HEADLINES

Copyright U.S. Newswire 1999

Thursday, December 9, 1999

ABC World News Tonight

- 1 Russian Diplomat, Caught Bugging State Dept., Is Expelled
John McWethy Washington 2:20
- 2 Bug Found In State Was Technologically Nothing Special
Jack Smith Washington 1:15
- 3 US-Russia Relationship Deteriorating For Several Reasons
John Cochran Washington 1:50
- 4 Another Round Of Public Demonstrations In Cuba For Boy's Return
Peter Jennings New York 0:25
- 5 Thousands, Including Clinton & Gore, Honor Dead Firefighters
Aaron Brown Worcester, MA 3:00
- 6 Many Farmers Spurning Gene-Engineered Food Due To Consumer Fear
Jim Williams Assumption, IL 3:00
- 7 How Gene-Altered Crops Differ From Ancient Practice Of Breeding
Bill Blakemore no location 2:25
- 8 E-Commerce Reportedly Up 44 Percent Over Last Christmas

Peter Jennings	New York	0:15
9 NFL, Other Companies File Lawsuits Over Trademark Names On Web		
Peter Jennings	New York	0:25
10 Linux Computer Company Sets Stock-Rise Record		
Peter Jennings	New York	0:20
11 Jockey Ties Record For Most Career Wins		
Judy Muller	Hollywood Park, CA	2:15

CBS Evening News

12 Thousands Mourn Six Massachusetts Firefighters		
John Roberts	Worcester, MA	2:35
13 Search For 4 Missing Firefighters' Bodies Still Underway		
Randall Pinkston	Worcester, MA	1:40
14 Private Plane Crashes Into Neighborhood In NJ		
Dan Rather	New York	0:10
15 Helicopter Carrying 18 Marines Crashes Near San Diego		
Dan Rather	New York	0:20
16 Russian Diplomat Caught Listening To Bug In State Dept.		
David Martin	Washington	1:45
17 Stung By Chechnya Criticism, Yeltsin Rattles Nuclear Saber		
Barry Petersen	Beijing	1:40
18 Clinton Plays Down Yeltsin Criticism		
Dan Rather	New York	0:10
19 US Asks Cuban Boy's Father To Back Up His Claim To His Son		
Dan Rather	New York	0:30
20 Jury Sentences Army Private To Life For Gay's Killing		
Dan Rather	New York	0:20
21 Army Base Was Rife With Anti-Gay Sentiment Even After Murder		
Dan Rather	New York	0:1:25
22 Hilary Clinton Says "Don't Ask Don't Tell" Doesn't Work		
Diana Olick	Washington	2:05
23 Researchers Grow First Artificial Human Corneas In The Lab		
Dan Rather	New York	0:25
24 Jury Judges King Assassination A Conspiracy; Some Are Critical		
Dan Rather	New York	2:25
25 Many Hyped-Up Year 2000 Events Are Drawing Few Customers		
Jeffrey Kofman	Miami	2:20

NBC Nightly News

26 Memorial Service For 6 Firefighters Attracts Clinton, Firefighters		
Tom Brokaw	New York	3:05
27 Russian Caught Spying At The State Department		
Pete Williams	Washington	2:15
28 Yeltsin Lashes Out Against Clinton Over Chechnya Conflict		
Dana Lewis	Chechnya	2:40
29 Some Tech Stocks Have Banner Day		
Tom Brokaw	New York	0:30
30 A Look At One Of Amazon.com's Distribution Warehouses		
Anne Thompson	Georgia	2:40
31 Amazon.com Has Not Turned A Profit Yet		

Tom Brokaw	New York	0:15
32 Personal Shopper Idea Moves To The Web To Help Consumers		
Jim Avila	Chicago	2:00
33 Marine Helicopter Crashes Into Ocean; 11 Rescued, 7 Missing		
Tom Brokaw	New York	0:15
34 Army Soldier Convicted Of Killing Gay Man Is Sentenced To Life		
Tom Brokaw	New York	0:20
35 Murder Of Gay Soldier Reignites Fury Over "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"		
Lisa Myers	Washington	5
36 Children Discuss Firefighters' Deaths & Discover New Heroes		
Rehema Ellis	Worcester, MA	2:10

PBS Newshour With Jim Lehrer

37 Time Magazine Reporter Discusses Arrest of Russian Spy		
Jim Lehrer	Washington	
38 Report on Murder of Gay Soldier; Killer Sentenced		
Tom Bearden	Washington	
39 Experts Discuss Israeli and Syrian Decision on Peace Talks		
Ray Suarez	Washington	
40 Report on Firefighters Memorial Service in Massachusetts		
Spencer Michels	Washington	

****Summaries are available for 30 days from date of broadcast****

Call U.S. Newswire at 202-347-2770 for information

<ETAB>

Unsubscribe Info

~~~~~

To UNSUBSCRIBE from this list call U.S. Newswire, 202-347-2770  
Monday-Friday during business hours or send the following email  
message:

To: majordomo@ataback.com

Subject: (blank)

Message: UNSUBSCRIBE TVTRACK

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando ( CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 09:12:55.00

SUBJECT: FOX Special Report, December 9, 1999

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

TO: Brian A. Reich ( CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kristina Wolfe ( CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak ( CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Michael A. Hammer ( CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan ( CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Matthew T. Schneider ( CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson ( CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Melissa G. Green ( CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:  
FOX SPECIAL REPORT WITH BRIT HUME  
December 9, 1999

BRIT HUME, HOST, SPECIAL REPORT: Welcome to  
Washington. I'm Brit Hume.

Polls in the New Hampshire Republican presidential  
race have been trending toward John McCain, and the trend has accelerated  
since the debate there last week. Now there's a poll that strongly  
confirms that trend and suggests McCain is now the clear favorite in a  
state where George W. Bush once held a commanding lead. The latest from  
Carl Cameron.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CARL CAMERON, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Kissing Christmas shoppers in New Hampshire...

GEORGE W. BUSH (R), TEXAS GOVERNOR, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Whatever you do, don't stomp the flowers, boys.

CAMERON: ... George W. Bush faced another day and another new poll indicating that he is slipping further behind Arizona Senator John McCain in the state with the first presidential primary. A Franklin Pierce College poll puts McCain at 43 percent, 15 points ahead of Bush at 28 percent. Three hundred and sixty likely voters in the Republican primary were surveyed. A third were independents, who lean heavily toward McCain. It was the second poll in two days to show Bush trailing McCain by more than the margin of error and prompted questions about whether Bush has contemplated losing in New Hampshire.

BUSH: (laughs) No.

CAMERON: But senior advisers in New Hampshire have, in fact, warned Bush that defeat in the first primary is possible. Bush's debate performances, first in New Hampshire, then in Arizona, have done little to dispel critics' doubts about his depth. Aides now hint that Bush has begun preparing for the next debate--in Iowa Monday--in the hopes that his next effort will quell questions before they come to define his candidacy.

BUSH: The question was--they were--they were talking about, you know, do I know enough to be the president. And my answer was, you know, I'd rather be underestimated than overestimated.

CAMERON: As Bush meets and greets his way cross-country, influential backers have begun to fret about the frequency with which his intellect is questioned. For the second time in three weeks, aides acknowledged plans to add more days to Bush's New Hampshire campaign schedule after January 1st in an attempt to head off John McCain.

BUSH: I look forward to the contest. John McCain's a good man. Just think I'll do a better job.

CAMERON: And even if McCain wins the New Hampshire contest, lack of funds and organization guarantee steep uphill battles elsewhere. In New York, for instance, McCain is not even on the ballot yet and announced a lawsuit that he hopes will overturn complicated rules that require candidates to collect tens of thousands of signatures to be listed.

U.S. SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I'm calling on the governor and the Bush campaign to do everything they can to support this effort to make it possible not only for me, but every other viable candidate to get on the ballot.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

CAMERON: In the end, the McCain campaign believes they will get enough signatures to get on the ballot, and they concede that part of what they were doing today was not about setting any legal precedent but, in fact, casting themselves as the outsiders and the underdogs, the implication being that George W. Bush is the establishment Republican in New York, that he holds all the cards that McCain is hoping to grab.

Brit?

HUME: Carl, does anybody think that this 15-point lead at this stage for McCain might be a case of peaking too soon?

CAMERON: Well, he's actually suggested for months

that there's a fear of that, but I talked with a couple of pollsters in New Hampshire today who have suggested that it's not inconceivable that McCain could pull off a huge upset. The question really becomes where will McCain go after New Hampshire. The next major test is South Carolina, 18 days after New Hampshire. He is well behind there. And should McCain be unable to win in his home state of Arizona, for all intents and purposes, his candidacy could end. So a blow-out in New Hampshire is critical for McCain, and he needs to sustain where he's at right now.

HUME: All right, Carl. Thanks very much.

Taxes are usually an issue Republicans like to talk about and Democrats don't. But New Hampshire is famous for its aversion to taxes, and Al Gore and Bill Bradley have been going at it on the issue. But is there really a difference between them on it? Correspondent Julie Kirtz brings us up to date.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JULIE KIRTZ, FOX NEWS (voice-over): Al Gore canceled campaign appearances to attend a memorial service with the president for six firefighters killed in Massachusetts. It was a rare break in a week of aggressive jabs at his Democratic rival over taxes. When Bill Bradley refused to rule out the possibility of raising taxes if he were elected president, Al Gore pounced. He called Bradley "irresponsible." He said Bradley's economic plan boils down to this:

ALBERT GORE (D), VICE PRESIDENT, PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: ... the economy ain't broke, then let's break it. I think that would be a dangerous mistake.

KIRTZ: "Wait a minute," said the Bradley campaign. "Gore is completely distorting what Bill Bradley said." "I do not propose a tax increase. The vice president knows that," Bradley shot back.

All week the Democratic campaigns have traded barbs over tax hikes, a sensitive subject for a presidential candidate of either party. In 1984, Democratic presidential nominee Walter Mondale said a tax increase was nearly inevitable, and he was defeated. Republican president George Bush also lost after violating his pledge not to raise taxes.

GEORGE BUSH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (August 19, 1988): Read my lips! No new taxes!

KIRTZ: Despite Gore's criticism of Bradley on taxes, the vice president refuses to make a "no new tax" pledge himself. And like Bradley, he leaves the door open to a tax increase if the economy takes a nosedive. It's the kind of fight among Democrats that makes the leader of the Republican National Committee very happy.

JIM NICHOLSON, RNC CHAIR: Gore and Bradley are--are two big-time, traditional liberals, Democrats, who believe in big government and big spending. And to do that, you have to have big taxes.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

KIRTZ: Republicans may like to lump Al Gore and Bill Bradley together, but the Democratic candidates are working to do just that, arguing not only about taxes but about health care, Social Security and Medicare. Unlike Bradley, Al Gore seems to be enjoying this political street fight, using Bill Bradley's words to try to define his own campaign.

By the way, there is a new poll out today with some new numbers on Bradley and Al Gore, showing that Al Gore is still trailing Bill Bradley in New Hampshire. Among likely Democratic voters, Bradley 45

percent, Gore 37 percent in this poll taken earlier this month.

Brit?

HUME: Julie, that poll is roughly consistent with earlier polls. No big change, right?

KIRTZ: Right. No big change.

HUME: All right, Julie Kirtz, thanks very much.

Hillary Rodham Clinton has come out against White House policy again in her New York Senate campaign. First it was clemency for suspected Puerto Rican terrorists. Now it's President Clinton's ``Don't ask, don't tell'' plan regarding gays in the military. The first lady says she opposes it, and that's designed to win over gay voters, as FOX's Molly Falconer reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

MOLLY FALCONER, FOX NEWS (voice-over): One of the first things her husband did as president Hillary Clinton says she'd like to undo if she becomes New York's next senator.

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON (D), FIRST LADY, NEW YORK SENATE CANDIDATE: I don't believe ``Don't ask, don't tell'' has worked, and I don't believe it is ultimately the policy that we should have in our military.

FALCONER: Asked what the military's policy on homosexuality should be, Mrs. Clinton suggested we look for a different way, but didn't specify what that way might be. The first lady's efforts to stake out an independent position put the Clinton administration in the uncomfortable position of having to criticize a Clinton, if gently.

KEN BACON, PENTAGON SPOKESMAN: Mrs. Clinton, like every citizen and every political candidate, has a right to comment on Pentagon policies. Many political candidates do. And she is absolutely right. If she is dissatisfied with this policy, the place to go is Congress.

FALCONER: Her probable opponent, New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani, was happy to criticize her. He's long opposed the ``Don't ask, don't tell'' policy and says the Clintons are just lost on the issue.

RUDOLPH GIULIANI (R), NEW YORK CITY MAYOR, POSSIBLE SENATE CANDIDATE: I mean, there's been so many different positions on that in the Clinton administration, I'd have to--I'd have to, like, get a road map of...

FALCONER: Mrs. Clinton may need a road map in the next few weeks as she moves away from the White House and into her New York home, and probably away from more White House policies, looking, as she was in this case, for issues that might work to her advantage.

RANDY JOHNSON, GAY MEN'S HEALTH CRISIS: I think the lesbian and gay vote is very, very important to politics in general, and here in New York state, and certainly the upcoming Senate race.

FALCONER (on-camera): But Mrs. Clinton has perhaps found out the pitfalls of seeking advantages with differing constituencies. Her remarks about ``Don't ask, don't tell'' came before an Irish group, and she told the same group she'd like to march in the city's Saint Patrick's Day parade. Many Democrats here shun that parade because it bans gay organizations. Her spokesman says she may reconsider.

In New York, Molly Falconer, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: And coming up next: The Justice Department weighs in on what is best--or they think is best--for that 6-year-old

Cuban boy. Details when we come right back.

(18:11)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: The legal battle over custody of the little

Cuban boy pulled from the sea has begun. Fidel Castro wants 6-year-old Elian Gonzalez reunited with his father in Cuba, but the boy's other family in Florida wants him to stay in the U.S. Now, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has sent the boy's father a letter asking him to prove paternity. FOX NEWS correspondent Bret Baier reports from Havana.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

BRET BAIER, FOX NEWS (voice-over):

Carefully-orchestrated street demonstrations in Havana grow more massive by the day as Fidel Castro turns up the pressure in an ongoing battle over immigration policy that now focuses on a 6-year-old boy, Elian Gonzalez.

The biggest protest yet, more than 100,000 strong, came on the day Juan Miguel (ph) Gonzalez received a letter from U.S. immigration authorities, the first direct response since he demanded his son be sent back to Cuba. The letter outlines what must be his first step, proving with documents that he is Elian's father and that returning to him would be good for the boy.

VICKIE HUDDLESTON, U.S. INTERESTS SECTION OFFICER:

... so that he could present the documents that would prove that he is, in fact, the father and is exercising parental responsibility, or had exercised, with Elian. So let's see what happens now. Let's see what the Cubans are going to do with this.

ERIC HOLDER, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL: We have to make sure that the parent has not abandoned the child, has not in any way abused the child, that the return of the child to the parent would be in the best interests of the child.

BAIER: Fidel Castro says the boy's father has no interest in meeting with U.S. officials until they can tell him exactly when little Elian will return. The boy's grandparents in Cuba sense a softening stance by the U.S. government.

J. GONZALEZ HERNANDEZ, PATERNAL GRANDFATHER (through translator): When we heard the news, we were very happy. We were content that they had adopted a reasonable and intelligent view.

BAIER: Critics suspect the family in Cuba is reading from a script written by the Castro regime, all part of a cold-war-era political chess game that's been going on for 40 years.

(on camera): Cuban officials tell FOX NEWS that the Castro government has no interest in torpedoing U.S.-Cuba immigration talks scheduled to begin here on Monday. But they warn that the talks will not go far unless the boy is coming home.

In Havana, Cuba, Bret Baier, FOX NEWS.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: Still to come, former Clinton adviser on Cuba Richard Nuccio about the legal aspects of the case surrounding that little boy. Stay tuned.

(18:16)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: It's difficult for 6-year-old Elian Gonzalez to make up his mind about whether to reunite with his father in Cuba or stay in Miami with relatives. His case is unusual but still has to abide

by U.S. immigration laws.

I'm joined now by Richard Nuccio, a former adviser to President Clinton, to explain the immigration law and how the Gonzalez case impacts U.S.-Cuba relations.

Thank you for coming. Hope I've...

RICHARD NUCCIO, GEORGETOWN UNIV., FORMER CLINTON

ADVISED: Thanks for having me.

HUME: ... pronounced your name properly?

NUCCIO: Absolutely.

HUME: Good. We just heard Eric Holder say in a report moments ago that there's all kinds of weighing of whether the father has abused the child or has--and of course, whether he is the father. Does the U.S. government really feel it's in a position--I mean, does it have to, under the law, make such assessments?

NUCCIO: Well, once someone like Elian reaches U.S. shores, they have available to them a set of constitutional protections, not as full as if they were a citizen, but they do insert themselves into a legal framework. And that means there's going to be some sort of court process.

I'm not exactly sure that Mr. Holder is absolutely correct. I think somewhere it says that the INS alone will decide. I'm not sure that that's absolutely the case. There may well be appeals courts and other kinds of things that will get involved if this becomes a fight between different factions of the family--family here and family in Cuba.

HUME: Now, the president has basically indicated--I mean, understandably, the president would rather have--wouldn't go near this with a barge pole, if he could avoid it.

NUCCIO: I'm not so sure the vice president feels that way.

HUME: Well, I suppose he's in a situation where he may have to take a position, but I just wonder whether the president, if he chose to do so--for reasons of national security, foreign policy, whatever--could intervene in this case one way or the other. Is that--am I--what's the--what are the equities there?

NUCCIO: I don't think so. Once someone is physically in the United States and has a family or a group of people that want to represent them within the American legal system, there's really very little that a president could do about it.

HUME: Now, I can't remember any other cases where it was a minor like this. I'm sure they happen, but I just don't recall one. What are the precedents here?

NUCCIO: Well, there have been a whole series of these. We're only talking, really, since 1994. Before that, we wouldn't have been having this discussion at all.

HUME: Because what happened in '94?

NUCCIO: Because in 1994, the August migration crisis, when Castro pushed out tens of thousands of people from Cuba...

HUME: Right.

NUCCIO: ... the United States changed what had been up until then basically an open-door policy...

HUME: Right.

NUCCIO: ... for Cubans, who were, quote, unquote, "fleeing communism," and therefore entitled to refugee status if they ever made it to the United States. We began intercepting people and first

taking them to Guantanamo Naval Base...

HUME: Right. I remember.

NUCCIO: ... and then eventually, in May of '95, reached an accord that was negotiated secretly with the Cubans.

HUME: So if this little boy landed on our shores in 1993, he would automatically...

NUCCIO: No...

HUME: ... stay here and...

NUCCIO: No discussion.

HUME: Even if his father were clamoring for his return?

NUCCIO: The father could come and try to make a case in our court system that the mother had taken him from Cuba illegally or something, and probably he would lose that court decision. The U.S. government wouldn't have been involved at all.

HUME: Now, obviously, in political terms, this is a hugely important issue in south Florida, where the Cuban exile community remains such a big factor. What are the politics here? I mean, is it just a straight situation, they want him to stay and always will and--I mean, is there any--is there any flip--is there any other side of the equation politically here?

NUCCIO: Well, there's a--there's a very sensitive pressure point precisely on this issue that we were just talking about, that President Clinton, although supposedly he doesn't take dramatic decisions about things, did something to the Cuban exile community that no one has ever done, which is turn them from refugees fleeing communism into just economic migrants, somebody just trying to get into the United States to make a better life. That's a dramatic change in the way that Cuban exiles have been treated by the United States.

HUME: Now, that was done by executive policy change, not by any legislation, right?

NUCCIO: That's right. It was just--just a matter of the United States, from one day to the next, deciding that you're no longer welcome in the United States just because you're leaving Cuba.

HUME: And the law--the applicable law on the subject, in part, is what's called--what is it, the Cuban Democracy Act or the...

NUCCIO: No, the thing that affected the status of Cubans is something called the Cuban Adjustment Act, which was passed in 1966, a long time ago. And what that does is allow anyone of Cuban origin who makes it to the United States, no matter how they make it here--legally or illegally--to change their status after a year, to adjust their status to a legal status. What that meant is that no matter how you got to the United States before 1994, once you were here, you could apply to become an alien resident and eventually a citizen.

And so what we did, the president did in 1994, is stop people from getting here by intercepting them at sea, first taking them to Getmo (ph) and now taking them back into Cuba. And so the only people who make it to the United States are exceptions like Elian. That is, they're rescued at sea, there are reason to believe either that they are clear political refugees that had--that they would have a well-founded fear of persecution if they were taken back to Cuba, or there were a medical emergency...

HUME: Right.

NUCCIO: ... that it would be unsafe to try to return them to Cuba, and so they're brought to the United States for treatment.

HUME: Now, parse the politics of this for me. You mentioned moments ago that the vice president may feel differently about it from the president. What are his political equities here?

NUCCIO: Well, I suspect that his people are saying "This could make us look tough. We could look really good."

HUME: "If we"...

NUCCIO: "If we stand up to Fidel Castro and make it clear that we're not sending this boy back, no matter what, or we're not sending him back until our judicial system has full--a full process to review this case." A little bit of a crisis, like a little bit of a war, might not be such a bad thing from the vice president's point of view.

HUME: Well, let's think--obviously, this is--this is an issue that I suppose has some resonance around the country, but it's really hugely sensitive in that one tip of Florida, with a very large--I mean, relatively large single group there...

NUCCIO: Yes.

HUME: ... the Cuban-American community there.

NUCCIO: About three quarters of (INAUDIBLE)

HUME: Most of them are--I mean, they've tended to vote Republican.

NUCCIO: Yes, about 70-percent.

HUME: I'm just thinking--trying to think this through. It's a state with a Republican governor now, but it's been a state where Democrats have been able to carry--the president carried it. So could this--could this thing actually tip this, in your judgment?

NUCCIO: Well, the thing that Democrats have to do in Florida in the Cuban-American community is get above around 25 percent. And President Clinton has made enormous strides. Dukakis got something like 5 percent when--among the Cuban-American community when he ran. Clinton got, I think, 17 percent the first time. And he went over 30 the second time.

So you want--you're never going to get over 50 among the Cuban-American community because, as you say, there's a tradition there of voting Republican. But if you can eat into that nice chunk of Republican base, make sure that your opponent is spending money in Florida that he didn't think he would have to spend working in the Cuban-American community instead of working in African-Americans or others where--where--you know, with scarce resources...

HUME: Right.

NUCCIO: ... you're tying somebody down.

HUME: But so far, the message that's coming out of the administration doesn't quite meet the standard that you suggest Mr. Gore might like, right?

NUCCIO: That's right, and I think that's probably why this debate--we may see a little distancing...

HUME: On this question.

NUCCIO: ... on this question, as well.

HUME: Thank you very much. Very informative.

We got to take a break to do the news here, but stay tuned. The latest on the arrest of a suspected Russian spy coming up next.

(18:27)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: A Russian diplomat allegedly caught spying on the U.S. right in front of the State Department. The FBI says it happened, and it's all part of an intense covert operation on the Kremlin's part. This is days after an American is charged with spying in Moscow. FOX NEWS correspondent Jim Angle has the latest on this recent wave of seeming espionage.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JIM ANGLE, FOX NEWS (voice-over): The Russian diplomat was caught red-handed, parked in front of the State Department Wednesday, monitoring an electronic bug planted inside. FBI agents noticed the man, a known intelligence agent, hanging around outside the State Department some time last summer and had been watching him ever since. After a painstaking search, they found the electronic bug several weeks ago in a key conference room, a reminder, officials say, that Russia continues to have an aggressive intelligence operation inside the U.S.

HOLDER: You know, our relationship is not as adversarial as it was, but yet we can't leave our guard down. I mean, there are nations all around the world that are, for a variety of reasons, trying to gain access to information from us, and we just can't let our guard down.

ANGLE: The man, Stanislav Gusev, was an attache at the Russian embassy here in Washington. He promptly claimed diplomatic immunity and has been given 10 days to leave the country. In the midst of that, President Yeltsin lashed out at the U.S. over President Clinton's latest criticism of Russia's military assault on Chechnya, which has forced more than 200,000 civilians from their homes. During a visit to China, Yeltsin said Mr. Clinton must have forgotten what world he lives in, that he can't tell everyone else what to do.

BORIS YELTSIN, RUSSIAN PRESIDENT (through translator): He must have for a minute forgotten what Russia is. Russia is equipped with a full arsenal of nuclear weapons. He forgot about this, and so he decided to flex his muscles.

ANGLE: The U.S. is accustomed to hearing Yeltsin flex his muscles when confronted with criticism, so President Clinton didn't seem too concerned by Yeltsin's tone.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: You know, I didn't think he'd forgotten America was a great power when he disagreed with what I did in Kosovo. (laughs) I mean, we can't get too serious about all--we--let's not talk about what the leaders are saying and all these words of criticism.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ANGLE: Now, as far as the spy case is concerned, Brit, the expulsion of the Russian diplomat doesn't end the matter. The FBI is trying to figure out what kind of information might have been compromised before the bug was discovered, and most important, how the Russians were actually able to plant a listening device inside the State Department.

Brit?

HUME: Jim, this--this chap was not exactly a master spy, was he?

ANGLE: Well, you know, what officials say is that he would have been difficult to just pick out of the crowd. There are a lot of people wandering around over there in the summer. It's a very nice

area, lots of trees and so forth.

But once they were able to see him, which was quite by chance--they just saw him and said, ``Gee, isn't that guy one of the intelligence people at the embassy? That's kind of odd. He's just hanging around in front of the State Department."

Once they started watching him, it became painfully obvious. He would go over, park his car, sometimes sit on a park bench, sometime in the car, adjust the equipment he had to listen. And sometimes he would leave his parking space, drive around the block in a car with diplomatic plates on it and look for a better parking space so he could get better reception, apparently, from the listening device. It's like having an old TV with the rabbit ears, where you have to get it just right.

(LAUGHTER)

ANGLE: So he's--he's driving around the block and looking for the best spot to listen in on that conference room.

HUME: All right, Jim. Thanks very much.

We're going to take a break here, but coming up next, Juan Williams sits down with Republican presidential candidate Alan Keyes. Stay tuned.

(18:35)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

HUME: Republican presidential candidate Alan Keyes says he's the man to carry the torch for his party, but Keyes says media coverage of his candidacy is racist and is holding him back. He spoke about that and other subjects in this edition of ``Juan Williams's Washington."

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

JUAN WILLIAMS, ``THE WASHINGTON POST", FOX NEWS POLITICAL ANALYST: Alan Keyes, candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, thank you so much for joining us.

ALAN KEYES, (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: Glad to be here.

WILLIAMS: Last weekend, I was watching ``Saturday Night Live," and they had little elements from the debate. When they got to Alan Keyes, they say, ``Oh, don't worry about him. He thinks everybody's racist."

In '87, when you were at the State Department, you had a fuss there with John Whitehead, who was the deputy secretary of state, about some matter, and you said it was--he behaved in a racially offensive manner. In '88, you were--complained that Carl Rowan, the black columnist, had written stuff that you considered to be racially offensive about you.

In '89, you said you thought the ``Washington Times" wasn't paying attention to your Senate race, and you again thought that maybe it had something to do with race. In '96, you said the media--and this is in the midst of the '96 presidential race--"The media has stupid stereotypes about black people." And of course, there was the event in Atlanta, where they wouldn't allow you on the stage in the debate.

So it seems like time and time again, you say racism is a problem for Alan Keyes.

KEYES: Well, I think--two things here. The business

at the State Department was not about race, and I said that quite explicitly. The papers said it was, and I said it wasn't. So I don't know where you're getting that. That was a disagreement over policy.

In other respects, though, I think this is an ongoing problem, particularly with the media. And it's not with the country or with the people. As a matter of fact, quite the contrary. As I've gone around in this election, I have found that Americans, by and large, are listening to what I have to say...

WILLIAMS: But the media...

(CROSSTALK)

WILLIAMS: ... is rejecting you, you're saying.

KEYES: The media's filtering me out because I don't--it's sort of like cognitive dissonance. Since I don't correspond to some category, their computers filter me out of the mix, and they don't want to talk about me.

WILLIAMS: You don't correspond to the category of?

KEYES: Black American. They have a racial stereotype, and I don't...

WILLIAMS: Which is...

KEYES: ... fit that stereotype.

WILLIAMS: You have to be a political liberal...

KEYES: You have to be liberal in order to be black, according to them. As a matter of fact, I've seen others that aren't so wonderful. A guy was writing the other day, talking about the debate. And I think people don't even realize, Juan, sometimes what they're saying. And his response to the debate was, "Oh, well, it was so boring. It was over--but Alan Keyes is entertaining. He's a great entertainer." Do these guys realize what they're doing?

WILLIAMS: Well, what about people who would say, "Gee, the media pays lots of attention to Colin Powell, who's a conservative Republican"...

KEYES: No, he's not. I'm sorry. Colin Powell is not a conservative. That's why he could not run for the Republican nomination.

WILLIAMS: What about the argument that you're a politician who has very low standings in the polls and very low standing in terms of fund-raising?

KEYES: Right now, you look at those very self-same phony polls--this is before the debates and everything, toward the end of October, before the debates had occurred, and I was either tied with or ahead of Steve Forbes.

And that then gets to the money issue. Meaning no particular offense, Steve Forbes has spent 20 million, 30 million bucks. I have spent between 2 and 3 million bucks. If I am basically able to achieve the same result or better than Steve Forbes, maybe money isn't as important as people think it is.

WILLIAMS: Some people say, "Alan Keyes is a zealot." Do you have the ability to really be fair, to listen, to relate, to understand what other Americans who might disagree with you are saying?

KEYES: I always listen to people. I'm always listening for the better argument, listening for somebody who will show me where I've gone wrong. And I did it on my program. I do it all the time. But if you can't show me where I'm going wrong, then don't expect that I'm going to change my position just because it would feel more comfortable to be in some other position.

I think the problem I have with that--it's deeply ingrained precisely because I spent many years of my youth thinking about slavery and why it was that for so long people kept black folks in chains, even though many people acknowledged that it was wrong.

WILLIAMS: A few quick questions. Would you be willing to be somebody's vice president?

KEYES: I have to say that if I thought there was somebody I had that much confidence in in terms of their commitment, particularly to the great moral principles of the nation's life, then I wouldn't be running.

WILLIAMS: And so none of the other candidates on the Republican side have impressed you.

KEYES: That's right. They haven't convinced me on this point at all, no. And I...

WILLIAMS: Well, just generally...

KEYES: And I absolutely...

WILLIAMS: ... to be president of these United States, you wouldn't vote for any of your fellow Republicans.

KEYES: I didn't say I wouldn't vote, but voting for somebody is different than being vice president. As vice president, you have to commit to stand there and defend everything that they do.

WILLIAMS: SO you wouldn't be vice president...

KEYES: You have to have...

WILLIAMS: ... for any of these men.

KEYES: ... confidence that they're not going to make judgments that are inconsistent with what you regard as the fundamental...

WILLIAMS: I understand.

KEYES: ... integrity required for (INAUDIBLE)

WILLIAMS: You wouldn't be vice president for any of these men.

KEYES: Well, I'll say it again. If I had that kind of confidence in any of my colleagues, then I would not be running.

WILLIAMS: What about the idea that when you are on the stage listening to the debate, have any of them impressed you?

KEYES: Oh, all of them have. Well, with one or two exceptions.

WILLIAMS: Well, who hasn't impressed you?

KEYES: Well, I hate to be ad hominem, and it's not...

WILLIAMS: It's not ad hominem. It's a legitimate judgment. The whole country's making the judgment.

KEYES: I'll put it this way. I look at that field, take myself out of it (INAUDIBLE) Forget Alan Keyes and just look at the others. The one person on that stage who to my mind has not impressed me with having real weight and substance is the guy everybody says is the frontrunner. I think he is, in fact, the weakest link up there.

WILLIAMS: George W. Bush.

KEYES: George W. Bush. And as I said in the debate the other day, come on, the presidency, like a lot of executive positions--there come moments when you have to be willing to stand on your own judgment, when nobody can make that judgment but you, when everybody will have put their oar in, but you're the guy who has to give the nod, has to say what the direction's going to be.

If you're relying on other people to put thoughts in

your head, words in your mouth, principles and so forth and so on into your thinking, then at that moment, who are you going to be relying on? Who's going to fill you up with substance that you don't have? We can't afford this, and I think that we cannot afford to have people who don't have that weight and substance in the White House.

WILLIAMS: Alan Keyes, candidate for the Republican nomination for president, thank you so much for joining us.

KEYES: Glad to be here. Thank you.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

HUME: And thanks to you, Juan.

Don't go anywhere, folks. Our panel of journalists is coming up next.

(18:44)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SHEPARD SMITH, FOX NEWS: And welcome back to SPECIAL REPORT with Brit Hume. I'm Shepard Smith in New York.

It's live TV, and things go wrong. At this moment in our Washington-newsroom, though no one fears at all, a bomb threat has been called in there. As a result, we've gotten everybody out of the building. I'll have you know Brit Hume was the last to go, not really wanting to give up the ship, but passing along some information about what we should discuss here.

And to that end, the Beltway Boys are with us from--where are you guys now? Safe I'm hoping? Actually, they're getting set up.

You know about the polls that have come out today. You may not. But I can fill you in to some degree on the fly here. A new poll out of New Hampshire, surveying just about 380 voters, I believe, likely Republican voters. And the gap has become even larger between the two major Republican contenders. And I can tell you that at this hour, that latest poll shows that John McCain is leading by 15 full percentage points over George W. Bush of Texas.

Now, there is another poll on the Democratic side which shows, in fact, that Bill Bradley's lead has increased dramatically, for this poll, at least, over his rival, the vice president of the United States.

So what do all of these polls mean, and are they a sign of things to come? Mara Liasson is with us now from the--from the White House, I believe, right, Mara?

MARA LIASSON, NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO: I'm not hearing...

SMITH: And Mara's not hearing us. It's one of those difficult sort of situations, and Brit wishes he could be here. But the long and short of it is, the polls are not looking good for the vice president or for George W. Bush. And of course, you have to look down the road to find out how much of an effect it's having in other cities.

Mara Liasson's IFB and communications are now up with us.

LIASSON: Hi.

SMITH: Mara, I'm glad you're there, not on North Capitol (ph).

LIASSON: Yeah, me, too.

SMITH: What do you think of this Republican poll out

today?

LIASSON: Well, I think it's quite extraordinary. I mean, there have been a lot of nervous Republicans about George W. Bush's performance, and it looks like the polls are really bearing this out. At least this poll shows he's dropping like a stone.

Now, it doesn't mean that he can't weather a loss in New Hampshire. One of the things you have to say about the Republican primary right now is the establishment is anathema to John McCain. In other words, the Republican Party establishment is not just betting on George Bush, they really like him, and they don't like John McCain.

So I think that if John McCain does win in New Hampshire--first of all, he doesn't have the money or the organization, like Bush does, across the country. But also, I think the Republican--the party establishment is not going to be so quick to throw George W. over the side and run to John McCain. But it means, obviously, George W. Bush has to work a heck of a lot harder in New Hampshire, and he has his work cut out for him now, and he doesn't have a whole lot of time left.

SMITH: Well, this particular poll coming from WNDS in--actually, let me look over here--from WNDS and from Franklin Pierce College. And the numbers are like this: McCain 43 percent, Bush 28 percent. Now...

LIASSON: It's really something.

SMITH: Yeah, that's not even close anymore, Mara. And you know, this particular primary can sometime act like a snowball down a victory slope. Any chance of that?

LIASSON: Well, it can, but you got to remember what comes next. I mean, South Carolina, which is a state that has a lot of military people in it--John McCain has said that's an important state for him. Bush is still way, way ahead there. And Bush has strength all over the country. And don't forget, he has a 50-state organization, and I don't think John McCain can say that.

And John McCain hasn't yet had--have the kind of campaign who can develop issues and proposals and big, meaty speeches on things, the way George W. Bush has. So yes, it could snowball, but boy, he'd have to work really fast. And I think George W. Bush would not only have to lose in New Hampshire, he'd have to lose big.

SMITH: Well, while we're waiting on the Beltway Boys, let's talk a little bit about this situation in Cuba--Elia Gonzalez, 6 years old.

LIASSON: Right.

SMITH: The tug-of-war's been going on. Now the folks down in--he--the folks in the United States have said, "Look, show us some proof. We'll see what we can do." But in Cuba they're saying, "Unless you can give us an absolute date and time, we don't want to even talk about it." Does it sound like to you Fidel Castro is trying to stir up some trouble which could lead to an opening of the floodgates, like 1994?

LIASSON: Well, I don't know if--I don't know about whether the floodgates will be opened, but clearly, this is a very difficult, difficult situation. This boy is not just the subject of an international custody dispute, he's the subject of an international political fight now.

The Cuban-American community wants him to stay here. They say "Why shouldn't the father come and visit him in Florida and then

decide what he wants to do?" Obviously, they believe the father would rather stay in the United States, too. John McCain has said the same thing. He'd like the father to come to Florida and then say where he wants to live with his son, betting, again, that the father would want to stay in the United States.

I don't know if you heard President Clinton yesterday. He was carefully noncommittal in that press conference when he was asked about this. He said, "Well, I can sympathize with the father. Of course, I'd rather want to grow up in the United States. It's a difficult situation, but I'm not going to make this decision. The INS is."

SMITH: Well, let's bring in the rest now, who join us from outside the house that Brit Hume built--Mort Kondracke--oh, my goodness!--Fred Barnes and Jim Angle. As Brit would say, FOX NEWS contributors all.

Hello.

MORT KONDRACKE, "ROLL CALL": Hi.

FRED BARNES, "THE WEEKLY STANDARD": Hi.

SMITH: Hi, there. You know what I'm curious about?

Yesterday, when the tide turned a little bit and Fidel Castro said, "Now, wait a minute. We want an exact time and place." There are those who would argue that he doesn't really want this economic embargo to drop at all, because if it does, in comes the United States influence, and there goes a lot of his power. How do you guys see it?

ANGLE: Well...

KONDRACKE: Well--go ahead, Jim.

ANGLE: Well, there's some truth to that. I mean, obviously, he is playing this for all it's worth. And one of the interesting things here is that the U.S. said, "Look, the father needs to come over and prove that he is, indeed, the father. That's what we need for him to do in order to move this thing forward." And Castro said, "Nope. Nope. He's not coming until you tell him when the boy is coming home." So the one step they could have taken that might have led to a fairly easy end to this thing, Castro has refused to take. He's obviously playing it to the hilt.

SMITH: Yeah, and Mort...

KONDRACKE: Yeah, my suspicion is that this is--this is domestic consumption. I mean, he's rallying his people for some--for some new reason that suits him at home. I don't--I don't think that there's a great international credit to be gained here. I think he's been under criticism internationally, and that's what he's responding to.

SMITH: Well, he's always looking for a reason to give some trouble toward his neighbors to the north. And if nothing else, you look back to 1994, when he let all those people go, and in the middle of it all, caused problems for Bill Clinton and ended up making us change our immigration policy while the sea was full of Cubans on Navy boats. You have to wonder if now, with all of these talks coming up about changing our relations and changing the immigration policies, if the bottom line is he doesn't really want that, because in the end...

BARNES: No, he...

SMITH: ... if in we come, out his power goes.

BARNES: Shep, he does want that because his--he's created an economic basketcase in Cuba. He wants trade with the United States to bail himself out. But he sees this opportunity--look, dictators

do this. When they see an opportunity to rally the people for some pseudo-patriotic reasons, that's what he's doing.

It's not that the people there love him. They know exactly what his regime there, rather than--I mean, Cuba used to be the Switzerland of the Caribbean. Now it's the Bulgaria of the Switzerland--of the Caribbean. And Castro's ruining it, has ruined it for years. Cubans can still--they know what's going on in the rest of the world, where we have this gigantic economic boom.

So he's seized on this thing. This is a loser for him, and it will be a--but I'll tell you who would be a bigger loser. If Clinton--if President Clinton lets this boy go back to Cuba or makes him go back there, it's going to be extraordinarily unpopular in the United States.

SMITH: Mort, let's get back to the polls which came out today--significant, according to some, with Bush down 15 points to McCain. Is there anything G.W. can do, at this point, to turn the tide in New Hampshire?

KONDRACK: Oh, sure. You know, I--15 points seems like an awfully big margin. The other polls, the Zogby poll was--is 3 points, I think, or 8 points, or something like that. Look, Bush is going to start turning it on in New Hampshire. There's going to be massive television. You know, he's going to be there constantly from now through the primary. There'll be other debates and stuff like that. You know, this is an eternity between now and February.

SMITH: You know--you know, Jim, as the debates have moved forward, first ours, then one over on another cable news channel--as they've gone on, George W. Bush's numbers have gone down, and John McCain's numbers have gone up. What's to suggest that that tide'll turn?

ANGLE: Well, most people believe it's because John McCain comes across as so honest, sincere, and as a non-politician. You know, this year personality plays a very big role in this race. McCain comes across as someone who is a maverick. He's sort of against Washington politics, fighting against his own party. That goes over well with the voters in this election.

SMITH: You know, Fred, as long as we're talking about it, there's another poll over on the Democratic side, and it shows Bradley's up on Gore 45 to 37.

BARNES: Now, this is in New Hampshire, though.

SMITH: Yeah.

BARNES: You got to remember, New Hampshire is this maverick state where they love to go against whoever is sort of the anointed party candidate. That's Al Gore on the Democratic side and George W. Bush on the Republican side. I mean, they're--it's sort of a built-in system in New Hampshire to sort of stir up the waters.

The big question is if McCain wins New Hampshire, which the Bush people now concede that he could do, will that give him incredible momentum coming out of there to turn around the polls and voter sentiment in South Carolina and Virginia and Michigan and Arizona and the other states whose primaries follow. The Bush people say there's--give no credence to the momentum theory, but the McCain people really believe it.

SMITH: Well, Mara, from the White House a minute ago, while you guys were getting miked up, said, "You know what? In the long run, it doesn't matter that much because he doesn't have enough money to take him down the home stretch."

BARNES: Well, you can raise a lot of money in a short period of time, actually. McCain believes while Bush can outspend him that he, McCain, has enough money to be competitive through March 7th, when you have New York, California and New Jersey and those. He won't be able to spend like Bush, but if he's the hot candidate and getting enormous attention from the so-called ``free media," which means us, then it's possible. Unlikely, but still possible.

SMITH: Fred, Mort, Jim, thank you all very much. Be careful there.

(CROSSTALK)

SMITH: Mara Liasson at the White House, great to have you.

LIASSON: Thanks.

SMITH: And that's a wrap. Coming up, ``The Fox Report," much more on the Cuba situation and the struggle with the little boy, plus the KKK adopting a highway. Should it be allowed? It's all your news, fair and balanced, coming live from New York.

But first--I've always wanted to say this--that's SPECIAL REPORT for this. We'll see you next time, and in the meantime, our news-is next.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter ( CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 19:02:51.00

SUBJECT: Re: Weekly Report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

that is fine. What about Don't Ask, Don't Tell....did that get dropped?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michael A. Hammer ( CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP [ NSC ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 12:05:29.00

SUBJECT: NSC guidance Dec 10

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri ( CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/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: Jenni R. Engebretsen ( CN=Jenni R. Engebretsen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:  
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

December 10, 1999

RUSSIA/NIS

Russia/Chechnya (new)

Russian Spying

Russia

Latvian Language Law (new)

NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA

Kuwait/Crown Prince Visit

MEPP/Syria (updated)

Iraq/Pope,s Visit (new)

MEPP

## INTER-AMERICAN

Cuban Boy and Migration Incident

## AFRICA

Mandela Visit

## DEFENSE

Don,t Ask Don,t Tell (updated)

## RUSSIA/CHECHNYA

December 10, 1999

**BACKGROUND:** Yeltsin,s comments in Beijing continue to get prominent coverage. German Chancellor Schroeder said Russia should not expect to continue receiving Western aid while involved in Chechnya. EU leaders meeting today in Helsinki are expected to offer tough talk, but no new sanctions in response to Russian behavior.

Does the Administration have any response to President Yeltsin,s angry comments yesterday?

ú Can ,t tell you what provoked President Yeltsin ,s comments.

ú Can tell you that President Clinton and President Yeltsin had a constructive meeting in Istanbul and reviewed the situation in Chechnya and our shared objectives on nuclear security.

ú While we have had differences with Russia on these issues, we have also had a useful dialogue on these matters and we are prepared to continue it. Both presidents agreed to do so.

Gerhard Schroeder has said Russia should not receive aid from the international financial institutions so long as it ,s pursuing a military solution in Chechnya? Does the Administration support blocking IMF loans to Russia because of Chechnya?

ú There is a widely held view among the G-7 that Russia is still completing economic conditions required by its program with the IMF. Disbursement of the next tranche of the program depends on fulfillment of these conditions.

ú Russia has made good progress on macroeconomic issues. Russia is still working on structural measures, central bank operations, transparency, and financial safeguards.

ú We make our decisions on IMF support for Russia based on our national interest, including our interests in a democratic and stable Russia making real progress on economic reform.

Isn't the American Government dragging its heels while the Europeans take a more assertive approach in demanding that Russia halt its scorched-earth offensive against Chechnya?

ú First, we have been very clear about our views of Russian tactics: we deplore indiscriminate use of force against civilians; means Russia is using are undermining ends and aggravating cycle of violence.

ú Second, the US is part of a strong and consistent international stance. Views from the US, EU, OSCE, UN representatives, key European leaders are consistent: Russia must stop indiscriminate attacks and seek a political solution. The OSCE summit produced a strong and unified message calling for OSCE role in the North Caucasus. It's important for all of us to keep a close eye on the humanitarian aspects of what's happening inside Chechnya as well to facilitate prospects for a meaningful political dialogue.

ú U.S. recognizes Russia's territorial integrity and right to protect its citizens. Share Russia's interest in stability and security in the North Caucasus.

ú Given Russia's desire -- which we have long supported -- for continued integration with international community, Russia should heed the strong and unified international response to Chechnya conflict.

Do you support Britain's demand that the G-8 foreign ministers' meeting next week must discuss Russia's actions in Chechnya?

ú Chechnya has been on the agenda at all the international community's meetings with Russia. Of course this dialogue needs to continue.

The European Union is considering sanctions against and cutting assistance to Russia over its behavior in Chechnya -- what is the U.S. reaction, will U.S. follow suit?

ú We have made clear that the means Russia is pursuing in Chechnya are undermining its own stated national security objectives. International community has spoken with one voice that indiscriminate use of force in Chechnya is damaging Russia's standing, integration with the international community and that is not in Russia's national security interest.

ú Believe that cutting off assistance and programs that make us

safer or promote market/democratic change in Russia would be short-sighted, counterproductive.

ú Need to be steady, persistent; must continue our bilateral and multilateral efforts (including OSCE) to make it clear to the Russians that their approach in Chechnya is wrong and counterproductive.

How would you characterize US-Russia relations?

ú The Administration has a policy of engaging Russia to advance our core national interests. Engagement has produced solid results for American people and made the world safer: deactivated 5,000 former Soviet nuclear warheads; destroyed 300 missile launchers in Russia; allowed Russia and NATO to work side-by-side in the Balkans.

ú While we have disagreements with Russia, we continue to have a broad range of shared interests and objectives that are in our national interest to pursue: arms control, nonproliferation, completion of Russia's transformation to a market economy and democratic state.

ú Reason we provide assistance to Russia is because it serves our national interest. Two thirds of our bilateral assistance to Russia is aimed at reducing threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Virtually all of the rest is focused on promoting grassroots economic and democratic reform outside Moscow. These efforts include support for NGOs, regional independent media, exchange programs, small business development.

## RUSSIAN SPYING

December 9, 1999

What are you doing to counter Russian spying in the U.S.?

ú We take seriously any country's intelligence activities conducted against the U.S. The FBI is the primary agency charged with conducting investigations into allegations of spying.

What are you doing to reduce the number of Russian spies in the U.S.?

ú I am not going to comment on the details of intelligence matters, but I can assure you we have raised our concerns at the appropriate level.

Will today's apprehension of a Russian diplomat for espionage affect Russian-American relations? Taken together, are today's incident and the expulsion of a U.S. diplomat from Moscow last week signs of a chill in Russian-American relations?

ú This incident demonstrates how seriously we take counterintelligence and our technical countermeasures program.

ú We must remain vigilant of threat posed by foreign intelligence services regardless of the state of bilateral relations with a particular country.

ú That said, our policy of engagement with Russia has not changed. We have a broad range of shared interests at stake in the U.S.-Russia relationship and we intend to continue to pursue them.

Has there been an upsurge in Russian spy activities in the United States?  
Has the Russian intelligence presence in the U.S. increased?

ú As you know, we do not comment on intelligence matters.

RUSSIA  
December 9, 1999

**BACKGROUND:** Following a meeting with Chinese President Jiang Zemin, Russia President Yeltsin lashed out at President Clinton's tough remarks on Russia's action in Chechnya with a blunt reminder that Russia is a nuclear power. Yeltsin stated about Clinton, "He must have forgotten for a moment what Russia is. It has a full arsenal of nuclear weapons. & This has not happened in the past and it won't happen that [Clinton] will dictate to people how to live. & Prime Minister Putin downplayed the impact of Yeltsin's words, stating that there is no cooling in US-Russian relations. Britain demanded today that the G-8 foreign ministers talks next week must focus on Russia's actions in Chechnya as a top priority.

Does the Administration have any response to President Yeltsin's comments?

ú Can't tell you what provoked President Yeltsin's comments.

ú Can tell you that President Clinton and President Yeltsin had a constructive meeting in Istanbul and reviewed the situation in Chechnya and our shared objectives on nuclear security.

ú While we have had differences with Russia on these issues, we have also had a useful dialogue on these matters and we are prepared to continue it. Both presidents agreed to do so.

ú Prime Minister Putin stated today that the impression that there is a cooling of America-Russian relations is incorrect.

Isn't the American Government dragging its heels while the Europeans take a more assertive approach in demanding that Russia halt its scorched-earth offensive against Chechnya?

ú First, we have been very clear about our views of Russian

tactics: we deplore indiscriminate use of force against civilians; means Russia is using are undermining ends and aggravating cycle of violence.

ú Second, the US is part of a strong and consistent international stance. Views from the US, EU, OSCE, UN representatives, key European leaders are consistent: Russia must stop indiscriminate attacks and seek a political solution. The OSCE summit produced a strong and unified message calling for OSCE role in the North Caucasus. It's important for all of us to keep a close eye on the humanitarian aspects of what's happening inside Chechnya as well to facilitate prospects for a meaningful political dialogue.

ú U.S. recognizes Russia's territorial integrity and right to protect its citizens. Share Russia's interest in stability and security in the North Caucasus.

ú Given Russia's desire -- which we have long supported -- for continued integration with international community, Russia should heed the strong and unified international response to Chechnya conflict.

Do you support Britain's demand that the G-8 foreign ministers's meeting next week must discuss Russia's actions in Chechnya?

ú Chechnya has been on the agenda at all the international community's meetings with Russia. Of course this dialogue needs to continue.

The European Union is considering sanctions on Russia over its behavior in Chechnya -- what is the U.S. reaction, will U.S. follow suit?

ú Russia will determine its actions in Chechnya based on its own assessment of its national security interests. Key challenge for the international community is to convey that indiscriminate use of force in Chechnya will damage Russia's integration with the international community and that this is not in Russia's national security interest.

ú We have seen no evidence that the threat of sanctions would influence Russia's behavior in Chechnya.

ú We are continuing our efforts in bilateral and multilateral channels (including OSCE) to make it clear to the Russians that their approach in Chechnya is wrong and counterproductive.

ú

LATVIAN LANGUAGE LAW  
December 10, 1999

PENDING PROPOSED STATEMENT

CONTEXT: The Latvian Parliament has passed a new language law on December 9. That law conforms to essential international standards and is supported by the OSCE. The original bill would have required Latvian for all public gatherings; the new law limits this to government-sponsored events, so that private groups and commercial enterprises have the freedom to use Russian or other languages. The United States believes this law will promote and preserve the Latvian language, while respecting the rights of private individuals. The integration of all Latvia's residents into Latvian society is key to our common U.S.-Baltic Charter of Partnership goal of bringing Latvia fully into European and transatlantic institutions. The United States looks forward to continuing to work with Latvia to advance this goal, and applauds the important step now taken by the Parliament.

Why is the new Latvian language law attracting White House level attention?

ú In order to provide support to President Vike-Freiberga, who is trying to do the right thing in terms of integrating Russian-speakers in Latvia by ~~enticement rather than~~ pressure, and who met with FLOTUS here in September. Vike-Freiberga sent the original bill back to parliament to make it more acceptable, partly at our urging and at no small political risk to herself.

ú Signal WH interest in moderate solutions to this issue -- supports OSCE, will resonate with moderate Latvians and Russians.

ú At the same time, will signal to hard line Russians that we are following this matter at a high level and think the Latvians are entitled to set their own rules regarding language.

## KUWAIT: VISIT CROWN PRINCE AND OIL MINISTER December 8, 1999

What is the purpose of Kuwait's Oil Minister's visit to the U.S. this week? Is it a private visit or will he meet with State Department and other USG officials?

ú Kuwait's Prime Minister and Crown Prince Sheikh Saad Al Abdulla Al-Sabah arrived in the United States on Tuesday for a private visit. He is scheduled for a medical examination at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

ú Kuwaiti Oil Minister Sheikh Saud Naser Al-Sabah and Minister of Health Dr. Mohammed Al-Jarallah are accompanying him.

ú The Oil Minister will meet with Energy Secretary Richardson while he is in the United States. There are no other scheduled meetings with U.S. officials.

ú

## MEPP-ISRAELI SYRIAN TALKS

December 10, 1999

CONTEXT: Planning for the Shara , -Barak meeting in Washington next week has begun, but no decisions have been made. The Israelis have suggested Tuesday morning to Wednesday afternoon as the time for the meetings. The Syrians have not come in with a time, and S/S is still trying to figure out what Secretary Albright can drop from her schedule next week. So, no times have been decided. For now, they ,re looking at the White House as the venue for the meetings, but again, this is still in flux.

What can you tell us about the Shara , -Barak meetings next week in Washington? Where will they take place? When? And has anything been decided about where and when talks in the region will resume?

ú We ,re still working out the details of these meetings. No times and places have yet been decided on, either for the events in Washington or for those in-the-region. We will let you know as soon as they have.

What was it that broke the impasse and allowed Syria and Israel to resume talks? Did Syria compromise on its demand that Israeli return all of the Golan?

ú We ,re not going to get into the details of these negotiations.

ú As President Clinton announced yesterday, Prime Minister Barak and President Asad have agreed to resume negotiations from the point where they left off.

ú This is a significant breakthrough, which we welcome. Difficult negotiations lie ahead,

ú however, and tough decisions will be required of both sides.

Who will participate in the negotiation? Where will they take place?

ú Israel and Syria have agreed to the resumption of direct, high-level negotiations. They will be launched here in Washington next week between Prime Minister Barak and Foreign Minister Shara. We will be working out the details in the near future.

Will the U.S. participate in these negotiations?

ú Clearly, we are prepared to assist the parties in any way they deem appropriate.

ú But this is their decision and we will be talking to them about it as the process unfolds.

The Syrians have long claimed they would not resume negotiations unless Barak reaffirmed Rabin's commitment. Did he in fact do that? Did Barak agree to withdraw to the line of June 4?

ú I don't think it would be useful for me to get into the details.

ú But based on all the previous negotiations between Israel and Syria and the US the negotiations are resuming.

ú But I think it is clear that both sides now have sufficient confidence their needs can be met through negotiations.

When you say that negotiations will begin from the point at which they started, what does that mean? Doesn't that mean June 4, 1967?

ú Again, I do not think it useful to get into the details.

ú But based on all the previous talks between the two parties and with the US the negotiations between Israel and Syria are resuming.

ú Clearly both sides now have a level of confidence that their needs can be met through negotiations.

What is your position on the Rabin deposit? Was a commitment in fact made?

ú Really don't think it helps to get into details of the past.

ú Both parties have agreed to resume negotiations. Our focus should be on the future and making sure negotiations succeed.

Have there been any direct, secret contacts between Syrians and Israelis already?

ú For the past five months, Secretary Albright and I have been involved in intensive and frequent contact with the two sides and I believe we were able to convey their concerns and needs to one another.

How long do you think it will take to reach an agreement?

ú First things first: they have agreed to resume negotiations, and it is a long and bumpy road to an agreement.

ú That said, I believe both leaders are committed to seeking to reach an agreement as soon as possible.

Do you plan to convene a Summit between you and the two leaders?

ú There are no plans for a Summit at this time.

ú If the two leaders request it, and assuming a proper basis had been laid, of course I would be prepared to convene such a Summit.

Are you planning to meet with President Asad anytime soon?

ú I have always said that I was prepared to meet with him if it would be useful to the peace process.

ú There are no plans for such a meeting at this time.

How about the Palestinian track? Do you think that PM Barak and the Israeli people can absorb both tracks at once?

ú I think it is very important for Israelis and Palestinians to stick to their agreed timetable and to reach a Framework Agreement by February and a permanent status agreement by September.

ú I am convinced that that remains Prime Minister Barak's and Chairman Craft's intention, and I will do everything in my power to help them.

ú I believe both tracks have their own dynamic, and one should not detract from the other.

But isn't the Palestinian track stuck?

ú No, Israelis and Palestinians began permanent status discussions some time ago, and they are conducting them with an eye toward reaching a Framework Agreement by Friday.

ú That there should be obstacles is to be expected. The issues they face are extraordinarily difficult, even existential.

ú But I remain convinced that the bold objectives the two leaders set for themselves are achievable. Both leaders are serious and they know that difficult issues will not get any easier as time goes by.

ú I remain confident that they can meet their objectives and plan to do everything in my power to help them.

Do you still plan to hold a Summit in February?

ú As I have said, I am prepared to convene a Summit provided a proper basis has been laid out.

The Palestinians have called for a settlement freeze as a pre-condition for continuing the negotiations. Do you agree that settlement activity should be frozen during the course of the negotiations?

ú Clearly, settlements are an issue of deep concern to the Palestinians. As we have said repeatedly, we consider settlement activity to be damaging to the peace process because it prejudices and predetermines the outcome of negotiations.

ú This one of the permanent status issues, and it needs to be discussed in that context.

ú [I think the statements made this week by the Prime Minister on this issue were a good step] [TO BE CHECKED]

You mentioned the Lebanese track. Do you believe it will soon be restarted?

ú We have not yet spoken to the Lebanese authorities.

ú But they have told us in the past on several occasions that they could not resume the talks until the Syrians and Israelis did.

ú Now that that is about to happen, I would expect this track to resume as well.

#### MEPP: SETTLEMENTS AND PERMANENT STATUS TALKS December 6, 1999

Chairman Arafat has criticized the Israelis for foot-dragging on the issue of settlements. Meanwhile, Palestinian negotiator Abd Rabo said that continued Israeli settlement activity could lead the Palestinians to walk out of permanent status talks. Do you see this as a real problem, or are the Palestinians just manufacturing a crisis in order to get the U.S. more involved in final status discussions?

ú We ,ve made our views on settlement activity clear. We believe that it prejudices and predetermines the outcome of negotiations, and that , s why we have spoken out against settlement activity.

ú The parties have agreed that this is one of the issues to be addressed in permanent status negotiations.

ú Both side committed themselves in the Sharm agreement to make every effort to negotiate a framework agreement by mid February and a comprehensive agreement by September. The way to resolve their differences is through these negotiations.

## IRAQ: POPE JOSEPH VISIT December 10, 1999

What is your reaction to Iraq's decision that the no-fly zones and UN sanctions make it impossible for the Pope to visit? Are you pleased that he won't be going?

ú Our view is well-known. Whether the Pope visits Iraq is between the Iraqi Government and the Vatican.

ú Our concern has always been that Iraq would exploit the visit for propaganda purposes. The Iraqi government seems to have re-considered, perhaps out of concern that the Pope would highlight Saddam's human rights abuses and other negative aspects of this authoritarian regime.

ú UN sanctions and the no-fly zones were never an impediment to the Pope's travel to Iraq. Had the Pope requested assistance, we would have done what we could to facilitate his visit and ensure his safety.

## CUBAN BOY AND MIGRATION INCIDENT December 9, 1999

CONTEXT: On Saturday night, Fidel Castro demanded that the U.S. return to Cuba within 72 hours the 5-year-old Cuban boy, Elian Hernandez, who was rescued at sea last week or else the Cuban people would take to the streets to insist on his return. Castro has also beefed up Cuban security outside the U.S. Interests Section in Havana. The boy currently resides in Miami with his great uncle and aunt. It appears that the boy's biological father is in Cuba.

There have been ongoing demonstrations outside the U.S. Interests Section relating to this case.

Separately, the U.S. Coast Guard on Monday interdicted a private Cuban vessel holding 8 Cuban nationals as it entered U.S. waters. The U.S. Coast Guard was notified of the incident by the Cuban border guard. Two of the Cubans aboard the vessel are members of the Cuban navy. It appears that six of the individuals took the two Cuban officials hostage and took control of the boat. The Cuban individuals are currently aboard a Coast Guard cutter and the vessel is in tow. The Department of Justice has evaluated the case and determined that all 8 migrants should be returned to Cuba. Consistent with standard operating procedures, Coast Guard will effect that return today.

How does the USG intend to resolve the case of Elian Gonzalez?

ú As in the case of any unaccompanied minor who arrives on U.S. shores, our primary concern is for the child.

ú As the President indicated yesterday, we will not act on the basis of ultimatums or politics. A decision on the child's case will be made consistent with our laws and procedures.

ú INS is attempting to contact by letter the putative father of the boy to explain the process by which it will evaluate his rights in this case.

ú A key issue will be determining the right of the father to speak on behalf child. INS will consider all relevant evidence in deciding this matter.

ú We expect the Government of Cuba to fulfill its obligation to protect international diplomatic missions and their personnel. We would hold the Cuban government responsible for any harm to U.S. citizens or damages to our Interests Section that may come from the public protests called for by the Cuban government.

Is it true that U.S. has decided to send the boy back to Cuba?

ú No. There is a legal process here. The INS is in the throes of collecting the necessary information to make a decision in this case consistent with our laws and procedures. No decision has been made.

Can you confirm that an asylum claim has been filed on the child's behalf as reported in today's New York Times?

ú No. Refer you to INS.

Did the U.S. violate the migration accords with Cuba by bringing the child into the U.S.?

ú No. This boy was in serious physical distress when he was turned over to the U.S. Coast Guard just off the Florida coast. The Coast Guard determined that he was in need of urgent medical treatment. As in similar cases, he was brought into the U.S. for that purpose.

What does the U.S. intend to do with the hijacked vessel and the eight migrants aboard it currently in the custody of the Coast Guard?

ú The Department of Justice has investigated the matter and a decision was made that the individuals and the vessel should be returned to Cuba. The Coast Guard effected that return this morning.

ú This incident shows the virtue of our cooperation with Cuba in the context of the migration accords.

ú We continue to be committed to the migration accords and the goal of facilitating migration from Cuba that is safe, legal and orderly.

## DISNEYWORLD SUMMIT WITH MANDELA December 9, 1999

Why is the President meeting with former President Mandela in Orlando on Saturday?

ú President Clinton and former President Mandela have developed a strong friendship over the years, and have remained in touch since President Mandela stepped down, including during his private visits to the United States.

ú We expect that they will discuss a number of issues, including the President's strong support for Mandela's recent decision to take over the leadership of the Burundi peace process.

[IF ASKED]:

ú They will also discuss the latest developments in the Middle East Peace Process.

## DON ,T ASK, DON ,T TELL December 9, 1999

A soldier at Fort Campbell has pled guilty to murdering another soldier who was believed to be gay. Was this murder a result of a failed &don ,t ask, don ,t tell 8 policy?

ú I was shocked and saddened by this senseless act of brutality at Fort Campbell.

ú I have confidence in the military system of justice under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It would not be appropriate to comment further on the proceedings.

ú The &don ,t ask, don ,t tell 8 policy is not what the President had hoped for but was the best compromise that could be attained at the time.

ú There certainly has been problems with the implementation of the policy.

ú DOD recently completed a review of the policy ,s implementation and found that certain elements of the policy is being properly applied

and enforced. But more remains to be done.

ú Secretary Cohen has asked for additional steps to be taken to strengthen implementation. When properly implemented, the policy helps ensure that gay military personnel are not the target of discrimination or harassment. It also supports the maintenance of unit cohesion, morale and readiness.

ú The President looks forward to seeing the policy strengthened and individual rights more protected during the coming year.

Do you have any plans to strengthen the "don't ask, don't tell" policy?

ú DOD recently issued additional policy guidance designed to promote consistent and fair application of this policy. For example, Commanders must now receive approval from the Military Department secretarial level before initiating an investigation into whether a service member made a statement regarding his or her homosexuality for the purpose of seeking separation from the service.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter ( CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 19:01:45.00

SUBJECT: 60 Minutes this Sunday night

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

60 MINUTES will air a show on Sunday, December 12, 1999, on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue." The correspondent will be Ed Bradley. 60

MINUTES

has interviewed (1) the family of Barry Winchell, the soldier murdered at Ft.

Campbell because he was perceived as gay; (2) another soldier and SLDN client

from Ft. Campbell who faced severe anti-gay harassment; (3) SLDN client Steve

May, the openly gay Arizona State Representative whom the Army called back to

the active reserves in February only to seek his discharge based on comments

made in carrying out his public duties; and (4) SLDN Co-Executive Director,

Dixon Osburn.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Joseph D. Ratner ( CN=Joseph D. Ratner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 13:44:34.00

SUBJECT: Re: updated weekly

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Don't ask Don't tell paragraph has some spelling mistakes.

jdr

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: earlybird-alert-owner@mail2.cloakroom.com@INET@LNGTWY ( earlybird-alert-owner@mail2.cloakroom.com@INET@LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 08:26:21.00

SUBJECT: EARLYBIRDS: McCain And Bradley Shake On Finance Reform

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

TO: Deborah B. Mohile@eop ( Deborah B. Mohile@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Today's Earlybirds are now available on  
National Journal's Cloakroom:

<http://www.cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/>

This morning's headlines at 8:30 a.m.:

Hotline Earlybird: McCain and Bradley shake on campaign finance reform,  
firearm fund-raiser in Illinois-17, Yeltsin lashes out at Clinton, Daley  
addresses gap in computer access and Guam shipyard prompts clash between  
Navy and Congress.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/hotline.htm>

Greenwire Earlybird: Smith outlines Senate enviro agenda, Energy  
Department chooses two permanent dump sites, and California air board  
orders cuts in sulfur and elimination of MTBE.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/greenwire/>

Pundit Watch: Bradley's flaws, Bush's reading list, and the Declaration of  
Independence.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/pundits.htm>

TV Track: Firefighters memorial service, arrest of Russian spy and gays in  
the military.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/tvnews.htm>

Today on Cloakroom:

-- Hotline Weekly: The Political Week In Review  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/hotlineweekly/>

-- Political Pulse: Trade -- A Sleeper Issue No More  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/buzz/njbuzz.htm>

-----  
To stop receiving this E-mail Alert:

Reply to this message and include the word "unsubscribe" (without quotes) in the BODY of the message.

-----

The Earlybirds are published daily by National Journal Group Inc. For more information about National Journal Group's publications, go to <http://www.nationaljournal.com>.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 12:02:04.00

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

By the way, the Q&A's I sent you earlier were from the Pentagon. New guidance is in the works, as you probably know.

Elizabeth J. Potter  
12/09/99 09:06:24 AM  
Record Type: Record

To: Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP, Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc: Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP  
Subject: Don't Ask Don't Tell

SLDN told me that 60 minutes is doing a story on this topic this Sunday, December 12th. I understand that they have reached out to DoD for comment. What is the Administration's response to this situation?

"On Tuesday, Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said the Defense Department is designing training programs to ensure understanding of the policy." (full text of article below)

'Don't Ask' Policy Hampered Probe  
December 8, 1999  
.c The Associated Press  
By JAMES PRICHARD

FORT CAMPBELL, Ky. (AP) - Complaints about harassment of a soldier who was rumored to be gay and was later beaten to death in his barracks were not investigated because superiors felt constrained by the Pentagon's ``don't

ask, don't tell" policy, a sergeant testified Wednesday.

Staff Sgt. Michael Kleifgen testified during a court-martial for Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, 18, who is charged with premeditated murder.

Glover is accused of using a baseball bat to crush Pfc. Barry Winchell's skull as he slept on a cot at their Fort Campbell barracks on July 5. Prosecutors say Glover was driven by hatred of homosexuals.

Defense attorneys have argued that another soldier, Spec. Justin R. Fisher, 25, who is charged as an accessory, goaded Glover into the attack.

Sometime in March, Fisher started spreading rumors among members of their unit that Winchell was gay, Kleifgen said. Fisher often harassed Winchell and once, during a scuffle, struck him with a dustpan, Kleifgen said. Winchell needed stitches in his head.

Kleifgen, their section leader at the time, said he regularly spoke with Fisher and Winchell about their differences. The problems continued, however, so the matter was presented to a first sergeant, he said.

"He said, basically, there was nothing we could do because of the 'don't ask, don't tell' policy," Kleifgen said.

He said he also got nowhere pursuing the issue with the company commander and filed a complaint with the post's inspector general. It was not immediately clear what happened to that complaint.

Under the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, gay members of the military can continue to serve - and their superiors cannot investigate and expel them - as long as they keep their sexual orientation to themselves.

On Tuesday, Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said the Defense Department is designing training programs to ensure understanding of the policy.

Glover, who is from Sulphur, Okla., could get up to life in prison without parole. Fisher, who is from Lincoln, Neb., will be court-martialed on Monday.

Fort Campbell is on the Kentucky-Tennessee state line about 50 miles northwest of Nashville, Tenn.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter ( CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 11:13:25.00

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

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

CC: mary e. cahill ( CN=mary e. cahill/OU=who/O=eop@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

I understand the President had great remarks on Hate Crimes, ENDA and Don't Ask, Don't Tell at the DNC dinner last night. How can I get a copy of the remarks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christine A. Stanek ( CN=Christine A. Stanek/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 13:37:53.00

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

White House Web page.

Elizabeth J. Potter

12/10/99 11:13:13 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP, mary e. cahill/who/eop@eop

Subject: Re: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

I understand the President had great remarks on Hate Crimes, ENDA and Don't Ask, Don't Tell at the DNC dinner last night. How can I get a copy of the remarks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: earlybird-alert-owner@mail2.cloakroom.com@INET@LNGTWY ( earlybird-alert-owner@mail2.cloakroom.com@INET@LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 08:28:01.00

SUBJECT: EARLYBIRDS: McCain And Bradley Shake On Finance Reform

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

TO: Deborah B. Mohile@eop ( Deborah B. Mohile@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Today's Earlybirds are now available on  
National Journal's Cloakroom:  
<http://www.cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/>

This morning's headlines at 8:30 a.m.:

Hotline Earlybird: McCain and Bradley shake on campaign finance reform,  
firearm fund-raiser in Illinois-17, Yeltsin lashes out at Clinton, Daley  
addresses gap in computer access and Guam shipyard prompts clash between  
Navy and Congress.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/hotline.htm>

Greenwire Earlybird: Smith outlines Senate enviro agenda, Energy  
Department chooses two permanent dump sites, and California air board  
orders cuts in sulfur and elimination of MTBE.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/greenwire/>

Pundit Watch: Bradley's flaws, Bush's reading list, and the Declaration of  
Independence.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/pundits.htm>

TV Track: Firefighters memorial service, arrest of Russian spy and gays in  
the military.  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/tvnews.htm>

Today on Cloakroom:

-- Hotline Weekly: The Political Week In Review  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/hotlineweekly/>

-- Political Pulse: Trade -- A Sleeper Issue No More  
<http://cloakroom.com/members/buzz/njbuzz.htm>

-----  
To stop receiving this E-mail Alert:

Reply to this message and include the word "unsubscribe" (without quotes) in the BODY of the message.

-----

The Earlybirds are published daily by National Journal Group Inc. For more information about National Journal Group's publications, go to <http://www.nationaljournal.com>.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michael A. Hammer ( CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP [ NSC ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 19:09:33.00

SUBJECT: Q and A Package for CBS Radio Interview

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

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

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

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

CC: David C. Leavy ( CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:  
For whomever is handling the prep for CBS Radio interview.

POTUS Q and A for CBS Radio

GENERAL

Isn,t true that you didn,t accomplish much in foreign policy this year and that your foreign policy agenda is dead in your last year in office?

ú Absolutely not. Great deal to be thankful for and a great deal left to do.

ú Middle East peace process back on track, thanks to commitment of new Israeli government and our steady engagement. Will build progress in the new year to achieve a comprehensive peace.

ú In Kosovo, defeated ethnic cleansing in a way that held NATO together, preserved relationship with Russia, put southeast Europe on road to stability. Challenge next year: rebuilding, elections, diminished violence in Kosovo; integration of region into Europe; democracy in Serbia.

ú In Russia, made progress in helping stabilize the economy, return it to growth. Challenge now will be to help Russia see its interest in avoiding a violent morass in Chechnya and in seeing its future as part of the west, as it conducts its first ever democratic transfer of power. Push for progress on START III.

ú With China, reached WTO agreement that will boost American exports. It will also strengthen the hand of those in China trying to

move their country toward deeper economic reform and respect for the rule of law. Will work hard to convince the Congress and American people that agreement is in our interest.

ú Worked with UN and partners in Asia to end bloodletting on East Timor and help it achieve independence. UN mission doing well; will need our continued support next year.

ú In Northern Ireland, the promise of the Good Friday agreement is once again being realized, giving the people there the chance to shape their destiny. In coming year, we will continue to lend our support to those working to implement it.

ú Worked with the UN to begin new talks on future of Cyprus. Need to build on that progress, ease tensions between Greece and Turkey, encourage Turkey's integration with Europe.

ú Caspian pipeline: reached agreement that will strengthen our energy security for the coming century; will work next year to implement it.

ú This year, celebrated fall of Berlin Wall. But in fact, in 1999, with democratic transitions in Nigeria and Indonesia, more people won the right to elect their leaders than in 1989, the year the Wall fell. Need to follow through with strong support in year 2000.

ú Must continue struggle against proliferation, terrorism, nexus between them. Continue to work with Russia and others to keep weapons from spreading. Contain Iraq. Restrain N. Korea's missile program. Move toward decision on NMD while preserving principles of ABM treaty.

ú South Asia: eased tensions over Kashmir; now hope to see more progress between India and Pakistan, return to civilian rule in Pakistan.

ú Must also continue to wage battle against global poverty and for shared prosperity. Historic G-7 agreement on debt relief. Working with Congress to implement it.

ú Finally, in the past year, the agreement with perhaps greatest positive impact on our global interests was our budget agreement with Congress. Funds not only our national defense, but key international priorities, pays UN arrears, proves bipartisan consensus for American leadership still strong. Must sustain that consensus to make progress on all the other issues.

DOE Labs

Understand Win Ho Lee will be indicted by the DOJ. Do you think this is fair or is he being scapegoated?

ú Since this is an ongoing legal matter it is not appropriate for me not to comment.

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

A soldier at Fort Campbell has pled guilty to murdering another soldier who was believed to be gay. Was this murder a result of a failed "don't ask, don't tell" policy?

ú I was shocked and saddened by this senseless act of brutality at Fort Campbell.

ú I have confidence in the military system of justice under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It would not be appropriate to comment further on the proceedings.

ú The &don ,t ask, don ,t tell 8 policy is not what I had hoped for but was the best compromise that could be attained at the time.

ú There certainly have been problems with the implementation of the policy.

ú DOD recently completed a review of the policy ,s implementation and found that certain elements of the policy is being properly applied and enforced. But more remains to be done.

ú Secretary Cohen has asked for additional steps to be taken to strengthen implementation. When properly implemented, the policy helps ensure that gay military personnel are not the target of discrimination or harassment. It also supports the maintenance of unit cohesion, morale and readiness.

ú I look forward to seeing the policy strengthened and individual rights more protected during the coming year.

## MEPP

What are expectations for the talks that will begin next week?

ú First, need to put things in perspective. Highest-level Israeli-Syrian meeting ever that will resume negotiations interrupted since 1996.

ú Very significant development that puts us on the road to a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. This is historic opportunity we and parties must seize.

ú This first session (which will take place at Blair House) will be very short, roughly two days. Mainly a get-acquainted session and an opportunity for Prime Minister Barak, Foreign Minister Shara and their respective delegations to discuss agenda and procedures for next steps.

ú Don ,t expect substantive breakthrough. This is essentially laying the grounds for the intensive talks that will follow after the two delegations take a break and return to their respective countries.

The U.S. has said in the past that you did not want negotiations to resume for the sake of resuming ) but in order to rapidly reach an agreement. Is this now the case?

ú Can ,t underestimate significance of gaps that remain. Both sides have very strong feelings about their needs.

ú But fact that they have agreed to resume negotiations demonstrate that they have reached level of confidence that their needs can be met through this process.

What does it mean to say they are resuming talks from where they left off? Has Israel agreed to full withdrawal?

ú As I made clear, I think it would be harmful for me to get into details. The less said, the better.

ú Bottom line is that, based on all the talks that have been held between the two parties and with the U.S., Israel and Syria have agreed to resume negotiations from where they left off.

ú And the fact that they have agreed shows that they have confidence that their needs can be met through negotiations.

What issues will the two parties discuss?

ú Two parties held extensive negotiations in the past, most importantly at Wye in 1995-1996.

ú At that point, the issues fell into four categories: withdrawal, security, character of peace, and timetable.

ú Expect these will continue to be main issues they will face.

ú But too early to get into specifics. Discussing an agenda is one of objectives of this first round of talks.

Will you be meeting with the two parties?

ú I plan to welcome Prime Minister Barak and Foreign Minister Shara to the White House next Wednesday.

ú And, of course, I will make myself available to the extent I can be helpful.

ú As I've often said, I will spare neither time nor effort in the pursuit of Arab-Israeli peace.

How do you think this will affect the Palestinian track?

ú Think it is vital that one track not detract from the other. Prime Minister Barak has made clear he intends to push forward on both; we strongly support him.

ú Fact is that Israeli-Palestinian dispute is at core of Arab-Israeli conflict. There can be no meaningful peace without resolution of the Palestinian question.

ú I intend to be fully engaged on the Palestinian track and believe strongly that we all need to move toward a Framework Agreement by mid-February. I will meet with Chairman Arafat after the new year and, assuming the proper bases exist, will convene a Summit in February to give final push for Framework Agreement.

In the context of a peace agreement are you willing to put U.S. troops on the Golan Heights?

ú Neither party has asked us for such a commitment.

ú But as we've said in the past, I would be prepared to consult with the Congress were such a request to be made.

## CUBA

What are you going to do about Castro's rhetoric concerning returning the 6-year-old Cuban boy to his father?

ú The outcome of this case will be dictated by the fact and the law, not politics.

ú Not a decision for me to make.

ú The key issue is determining who speaks for the child. INS is making every effort to collect the necessary information from Elian's father and will consider all other information relevant to this issue.

ú Reject ultimatum and threats. This is not conducive to resolving case in the appropriate way.

ú ~~We have made~~ clear to the Cuban government what this process entails and hope they will help us facilitate the gathering of the necessary information.

ú Expect Cuba to fulfill its obligation to protect international diplomatic missions and their personnel.

ú Will hold Cuban government responsible for any harm to U.S. citizens or to our personnel.

Last week, the State Department said that the USG would defer to the courts on this case. Now, you are saying that INS must make a decision of its own. Are you caving into the pressure applied by the Castro government?

ú No. This case is a complex one, involving issues of both children's law and immigration law.

ú INS is in the process of gathering the facts, based on the appropriate governing laws. The process should proceed as appropriate and not be politicized.

It appears that an asylum claim will/has been filed on Elian's behalf. Will this change your view of the case?

ú No. The central issue remains the same: who should speak for this child. That is the decision INS must make. And that is a decision that INS will make without involvement of the White House or any other political actor.

How can you be sure that the father is speaking of his own free will, and not responding to pressure from the Castro regime? Why don't you grant the father a visa to come to the U.S.?

ú INS is doing everything possible to ensure that the father can represent his wishes freely.

ú We are also prepared to consider any request the father may make to come to the United States to pursue his case.

Will the outcome of this case affect the U.S. relationship with Cuba on other matters?

ú This is certainly not our intention or hope.

ú This is a difficult legal matter that should be resolved in the appropriate legal way; it should not be a political issue between our two governments.

ú We intend to continue our cooperation with the Government of Cuba on migration and other law enforcement issues.

What can you tell us about the pro-democracy flotilla and the USG preparation for it?

ú I understand that the Democracy Movement, a Cuban exile group, intends to conduct a pro-democracy demonstration in international waters off the Cuban coast on Saturday.

ú We support their right to hold peaceful demonstrations as well as the goal they promote -- the peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba.

ú As on past occasions, the USG will monitor the event to ensure to the extent possible the safety of all participants.

Will the USG intervene to protect the participants from possible Cuban Government against them?

ú We have urged the event organizer to avoid unnecessary risks and warned them of the danger of entering Cuban territory without Cuban government authorization. They have assured us that they have no intention of violating Cuban territorial sea or airspace.

ú Coast Guard ships will be positioned in international waters and will be prepared to perform search and rescues and other emergency operations.

Isn't it time to lift the embargo against Cuba?

ú Our relationship with Cuba is governed by the Cuban Democracy Act and Helms-Burton. Our policy is to keep pressure on the Cuban government to change -- through the embargo and diplomatic efforts -- while reaching out to the Cuban people through exchanges including direct mail, travel and phone links and building bridges to NGOs, and the Catholic Church. Believe best way to effect change in Cuba.

## RUSSIA

Do you believe that the Russians are committing war crimes in Chechnya and that the international community should begin investigating? If the Russians follow through on their ultimatum to destroy anyone left in Grozny after Saturday, is that a crime against humanity?

ú First, we could not have been clearer about our views of Russian

tactics: we deplore indiscriminate use of force against civilians; means Russia is using are undermining ends and aggravating cycle of violence.

ú Second, one of the reasons why the international community has pressed for OSCE role in the North Caucasus is because it's important to all of us to keep a close eye on the humanitarian aspects of what's happening inside Chechnya as well to facilitate prospects for a meaningful political dialogue.

ú Given Russia's desire -- which we have long supported -- for continued integration with international community, Russia should heed the strong and unified international response to Chechnya conflict.

Any comment on allegations that Russians have used chemical weapons or fuel-air explosives in Chechnya?

ú Concerned by Russian indiscriminate use of force in Chechnya. Have seen reports suggesting that fuel-air explosives may have been used in recent attacks as well as Russian official denials. Our people have not been able to confirm these reports.

ú Aware of press reports that Russia has used chemical weapons in conflict. Again, no confirmation that has occurred, and Russians have denied these reports. Believe that Russians are well aware of international outcry that such tactics would cause.

The war in Chechnya is extremely popular with the Russian people, and Putin has shrugged off Western criticism. Isn't the West impotent to stop Russia in Chechnya? What price will they pay for their continued disregard of our concerns?

ú Have said repeatedly in private with the Russian leadership and in public that a purely military solution is not possible. The longer this conflict drags on, the more Russia will undermine its objectives of fighting terrorism and upholding its territorial integrity.

ú Russia is sinking more deeply into a morass that will intensify extremism and diminish its standing in the world.

ú Key issue is that we maintain strong and consistent international stance. Views from EU, OSCE, UN representatives, key European leaders are consistent: Russia must stop indiscriminate attacks and seek a political solution.

ú Russia is already starting to bear the cost in terms of the damage this has done to it internationally. Russia's actions in Chechnya raise questions about its commitment to the standards of the G-8, OSCE and other international structures and thus puts its continued integration at risk.

ú Russia's isolation from the international community and its neighbors will deepen. And it will contribute to a humanitarian crisis in the region, with hundreds of thousands of people driven from their homes.

Why aren't you considering a cutoff of aid to Russia? Aren't you indirectly subsidizing Russia's military campaign?

ú U.S. assistance to Russia advances core United States national security interests. Two thirds of our bilateral assistance to Russia is aimed at reducing threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

ú Virtually all of the rest is focused on promoting grassroots

economic and democratic reform outside Moscow. These efforts include support for NGOs, regional independent media, exchange programs, small business development. These programs advance our national interests, and that is why we continue them.

Why haven't you done anything to alleviate the suffering of Chechens who are being displaced because of the conflict?

ú We have been pressing the Russians to provide for well-being of nearly 200,000 IDPs in neighboring regions, and urging them to allow full freedom of movement for people trying to escape the conflict.

ú The international community will do its part, with UNHCR and International Red Cross taking the lead. My administration is contributing generously to these organizations, appeals for international support.

ú I have authorized the State Department to spend up to \$10 million on behalf of humanitarian relief efforts in North Caucasus. We have also sent several direct humanitarian relief flights to the region.

Gerhard Schroeder has said Russia should not receive aid from the international financial institutions so long as it is pursuing a military solution in Chechnya? Does the Administration support blocking IMF loans to Russia because of Chechnya?

ú There is a widely held view among the G-7 that Russia is still completing economic conditions required by its program with the IMF. Disbursement of the next tranche of the program depends on fulfillment of these conditions.

ú Russia has made good progress on macroeconomic issues. Russia is still working on structural measures, central bank operations, transparency, and financial safeguards.

ú We make our decisions on IMF support for Russia based on our national interest, including our interests in a democratic and stable Russia making real progress on economic reform.

Isn't the American Government dragging its heels while the Europeans take a more assertive approach in demanding that Russia halt its scorched-earth offensive against Chechnya?

ú First, we have been very clear about our views of Russian tactics: we deplore indiscriminate use of force against civilians; means Russia is using are undermining ends and aggravating cycle of violence.

ú Second, we are part of a strong and consistent international stance. Views from key European leaders are consistent: Russia must stop indiscriminate attacks and seek a political solution. The OSCE summit produced a strong and unified message calling for OSCE role in the North Caucasus. It's important for all of us to keep a close eye on the humanitarian aspects of what's happening inside Chechnya as well to facilitate prospects for a meaningful political dialogue.

ú We recognize Russia's territorial integrity and right to protect its citizens. Share Russia's interest in stability and security in the

North Caucasus.

ú Given Russia's desire -- which we have long supported -- for continued integration with international community, Russia should heed the strong and unified international response to Chechnya conflict.

Do you support Britain's demand that the G-8 foreign ministers, meeting next week must discuss Russia's actions in Chechnya?

ú Chechnya has been on the agenda at all the international community's meetings with Russia. Of course this dialogue needs to continue.

Does the Administration intend to cut off assistance and impose trade sanctions just like the EU?

ú EU has not cut off assistance or imposed trade sanctions.

ú EU will redirect some technical assistance to humanitarian and to rule of law programs. We made such changes in our assistance programs to Russia some time ago.

ú EU has said it will strictly enforce the provisions of its trade agreements with Russia, but these are not trade sanctions.

ú Believe that cutting off assistance and programs that make us safer or promote market/democratic change in Russia would be short-sighted, counterproductive.

ú Need to be steady, persistent; must continue our bilateral and multilateral efforts (including OSCE) to make it clear to the Russians that their approach in Chechnya is wrong and counterproductive.

MEPP

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

A soldier at Fort Campbell has pled guilty to murdering another soldier who was believed to be gay. Was this murder a result of a failed 'don't ask, don't tell' policy?

ú I was shocked and saddened by this senseless act of brutality at Fort Campbell.

ú I have confidence in the military system of justice under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It would not be appropriate to comment further on the proceedings.

ú The 'don't ask, don't tell' policy is not what I had hoped for but was the best compromise that could be attained at the time.

ú There certainly have been problems with the implementation of the

policy.

ú DOD recently completed a review of the policy's implementation and found that certain elements of the policy is being properly applied and enforced. But more remains to be done.

ú Secretary Cohen has asked for additional steps to be taken to strengthen implementation. When properly implemented, the policy helps ensure that gay military personnel are not the target of discrimination or harassment. It also supports the maintenance of unit cohesion, morale and readiness.

ú I look forward to seeing the policy strengthened and individual rights more protected during the coming year.

Do you have any plans to strengthen the "don't ask, don't tell" policy?

ú Yes. DOD recently issued additional policy guidance designed to promote consistent and fair application of this policy. For example, Commanders must now receive approval from the Military Department secretarial level before initiating an investigation into whether a service member made a statement regarding his or her homosexuality for the purpose of seeking separation from the service.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides <RSocarides@rlmnet.com> ( Richard Socarides <RSocarides@rlmnet.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 15:04:24.00

SUBJECT: FW: NC11583: Chicago Tribune calls for end to DADT

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

TEXT:

-----Original Message-----

From: Rex Wockner [mailto:rwockner@netcom.com]

Sent: Friday, December 10, 1999 1:19 PM

To: Rex Wockner

Subject: NC11583: Chicago Tribune calls for end to DADT

Chicago Tribune

EDITORIAL

December 10, 1999

[www.chicagotribune.com](http://www.chicagotribune.com)

TIME TO DITCH "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"

The chilling story of 21-year-old Army private Barry Winchell illustrates, as if any additional evidence were needed, why the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military is unworkable--and why it ought to be eliminated.

Winchell enlisted in 1997, filled with dreams of becoming a helicopter pilot. But because he was gay, he soon was subjected to months of harassment and was ultimately bludgeoned to death with a baseball bat by fellow private Calvin Glover.

On Wednesday, Glover was found guilty of premeditated murder, but testimony during the trial also indicted the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Indeed, five years after it was instituted, "don't ask" has clearly proven unworkable and counterproductive: Gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve openly, subject only to the same limitations and conditions imposed on their heterosexual counterparts.

In Winchell's case, early rumors about his homosexuality were followed by taunting and vicious name-calling, and even an informal investigation by his superior.

Winchell at first tried to deny the rumors, to no avail. And complaining to his superiors--much less confirming the rumors--only would have

prompted more inquiries, inevitably leading to discharge.

Because of such contradictions, "don't ask" in fact has made life worse for gays and lesbians in uniform. Between 1994 and 1998, the number of gays discharged from the military increased to 1149 from 597, while the number of complaints filed with the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a gay and lesbian organization, doubled between 1997 and 1998.

The cornerstone premise of "don't ask" is that homophobia in the military is so widespread and ingrained that openly admitting gays would undermine morale and create friction.

But just as the services learned to integrate women and blacks into their ranks, they must learn to integrate homosexuals.

The answer to bigotry cannot be to arbitrarily exclude its victims or condemn them to life in a limbo of fear and lying or, as in Winchell's tragic case, to beatings and death.

It is time for the armed forces to face squarely up to this challenge. "Don't ask, don't tell" has had its chance and has been a failure. It's time to declare that gays and lesbians may serve openly in the armed forces, and that discrimination and persecution will not be tolerated.

- att1.htm===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
<META NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2650.12">
<TITLE>FW: NC11583: Chicago Tribune calls for end to DADT</TITLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<BR>
<BR>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>-----Original Message-----</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>From: Rex Wockner [<A HREF="mailto:rwockner@netcom.com">mailto:
:rwockner@netcom.com</A>] </FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Sent: Friday, December 10, 1999 1:19 PM</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>To: Rex Wockner</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Subject: NC11583: Chicago Tribune calls for end to DADT</FONT>

</P>
<BR>
<BR>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Chicago Tribune </FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>EDITORIAL</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>December 10, 1999</FONT>
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>www.chicagotribune.com</FONT>
</P>
```

<P><FONT SIZE=2>TIME TO DITCH "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL" </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2> The chilling story of 21-year-old Army private Barry Winchell</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>illustrates, as if any additional evidence were needed, why the Pentagon's</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>"don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military is unworkable--and</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>why it ought to be eliminated. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Winchell enlisted in 1997, filled with dreams of becoming a helicopter</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>pilot. But because he was gay, he soon was subjected to months of</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>harassment and was ultimately bludgeoned to death with a baseball bat by</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>fellow private Calvin Glover. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>On Wednesday, Glover was found guilty of premeditated murder, but</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>testimony during the trial also indicted the "don't ask, don't tell"</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>policy. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Indeed, five years after it was instituted, "don't ask&quot; t; has clearly proven</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>unworkable and counterproductive: Gays and lesbians should be allowed to</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>serve openly, subject only to the same limitations and conditions imposed</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>on their heterosexual counterparts. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>In Winchell's case, early rumors about his homosexuality were followed by</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>taunting and vicious name-calling, and even an informal investigation by</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>his superior. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Winchell at first tried to deny the rumors, to no avail. And complaining</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>to his superiors--much less confirming the rumors--only would have</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>prompted more inquiries, inevitably leading to discharge. </FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>NT</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Because of such contradictions, "don't ask" in fact h

as made life worse</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>for gays and lesbians in uniform. Between 1994 and 1998, the number of</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>gays discharged from the military increased to 1149 from 597, while the</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>number of complaints filed with the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network,</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>a gay and lesbian organization, doubled between 1997 and 1998.  
</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>The cornerstone premise of "don't ask" is that homophobia in the military</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>is so widespread and ingrained that openly admitting gays would undermine</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>morale and create friction. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>But just as the services learned to integrate women and blacks into their</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>ranks, they must learn to integrate homosexuals. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>The answer to bigotry cannot be to arbitrarily exclude its victims or</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>condemn them to life in a limbo of fear and lying or, as in Winchell's</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>tragic case, to beatings and death. </FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>It is time for the armed forces to face squarely up to this challenge.</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>"Don't ask, don't tell" has had its chance and has been a failure. It's</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>time to declare that gays and lesbians may serve openly in the armed</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>forces, and that discrimination and persecution will not be tolerated. </FONT>  
</P>

</BODY>  
</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-DEC-1999 09:24:42.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

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

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

TEXT:

Here are some suggestions for talking points. I particularly think that we should call attention to the Ft. Campbell press release, which no one has noticed.

-- The Department of Defense in August issued guidelines for improving the effectiveness of the Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy. These included a requirement that significant investigations of service members for violations be approved at the service secretarial level and that there be training for all persons involved in the implementation of the policy. This training includes dissemination of guidelines prohibiting harassment of service members based on sexual orientation.

-- In October, the President signed an executive order that protected the confidentiality of communications between service members and psychotherapists in court martial proceedings. The executive order also provided that authorized additional penalties for violent crimes in the military motivated by race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability or sexual orientation.

-- In November, the Army announced that at the conclusion of the court martial proceedings arising out of the murder of Pvt. Barry Winchell, the Ft. Campbell command will undertake a review of overall compliance with the Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy, including prohibitions on commanding officers inquiring about sexual orientation and prohibition of harassment of service members based sexual orientation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-DEC-1999 11:22:38.00

SUBJECT: 60 Minutes this Sunday night

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak@eop ( Natalie S. Wozniak@eop [ NSC ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 11-DEC-1999 11:19:00

FYI-

----- Forwarded by Dag Vega/WHO/EOP on 12/11/99 11:19 AM

-----

Elizabeth J. Potter

12/10/99 07:01:35 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP, Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP, Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: 60 Minutes this Sunday night

60 MINUTES will air a show on Sunday, December 12, 1999, on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue." The correspondent will be Ed Bradley. 60

MINUTES

has interviewed (1) the family of Barry Winchell, the soldier murdered at Ft.

Campbell because he was perceived as gay; (2) another soldier and SLDN client

from Ft. Campbell who faced severe anti-gay harassment; (3) SLDN client Steve

May, the openly gay Arizona State Representative whom the Army called back to

the active reserves in February only to seek his discharge based on comments

made in carrying out his public duties; and (4) SLDN Co-Executive Director,

Dixon Osburn.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Nanda Chitre@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY ( Nanda Chitre@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 11-DEC-1999 22:08:33.00

SUBJECT: Internal Transcript: Radio Interview of the President By CBS Ne

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak@eop ( Natalie S. Wozniak@eop [ NSC ] )  
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David C. Leavy@eop ( David C. Leavy@eop [ NSC ] )  
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
Message Creation Date was at 11-DEC-1999 22:05:00

This will be released on Sunday at 5pm, December 12 as  
"Embargoed until 12:01 am EST Monday, December 13, 1999"

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(Miami,  
Florida)

---

Internal Transcript

RADIO INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT  
BY CBS NEWS

December 11, 1999

Wyndham Palace Resort  
Orlando, Florida

11:25 A.M. EST

Q President Clinton, thank you very much for joining us for this special interview with CBS News. Heading into the next century, beyond your immediate goals for the rest of your term, what do you think are the one or two top domestic challenges facing the country?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the aging of America and the children of the country.  
It's ironic that we seem to be growing at both ends. We're going to double the number of people over 65, and yet, we have the largest group of schoolchildren

in our country's history in our schools, the first group bigger than the baby boomers and they're much, much more diverse. They come from more different ethnic and racial and religious backgrounds. And I think that dealing with them are the two biggest things that ought to be on the front burner.

I also believe that, related to that, obviously, as you've heard me say many times, is the challenge of continuing to grow the economy while reaching out into poor areas, continuing to improve the environment and paying the debt off. I think those are the big, big challenges.

Q Mr. President, one of the things I've noticed about these celebrations that the White House, you and the First Lady are planning is that it's propagating the myth that January 1st is the start of the new millennium and the new century. Are you guilty of creating that erroneous impression?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I mean, I think basically, by common consent, everybody decided that we ought to celebrate the millennium on January the 1st, 2000, even though most of the strict correctionists say that it's January 1st, 2001.

Q Well, they're right, aren't they?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, apparently, that was the prevailing view among the experts, but the people have expressed a different wish, so we're going with the folks. We've got a democracy here, and that's the way we're going. It will be nice for me, maybe I can do it twice and I'll be a President of two millennial changes.

Q Well, looking ahead into the next century, whenever it begins, where do you see the power of the presidency itself evolving? Is it going to change?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, yes, it's always changing. But I think it will always -- at least for the future that I can foresee -- will continue to be an extremely important office. I think that a lot of the executive actions will be important, along with getting along with Congress. I think that building partnerships with the private sector will become more important. It will become more important to mobilize the American people and to organize them to meet the challenges in the future the way we've done.

For example, maybe a good example would be the way we've worked on wiring the schools, where we did -- the main government thing we did was to change the law so that we have this e-rate now in poorer schools and hospitals.

Q You mean wiring for the Internet?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, wiring for the Internet -- poorer schools and hospitals can get a discount rate. Then we go out and try to hustle up all the equipment and the Internet connections and get everybody to do that. So I think you'll see a lot more of that.

The other thing I think you will see is, I believe the world is growing ever more interdependent, so I think the President, in order to effectively lead the world, will have to be an increasingly effective negotiator, conciliator, bringing people together, working people together. And I think it will be just as important 30 years from now for America to be involved in the rest of the world as it is now. But I think it will be an increasingly interdependent world that will require powers of persuasion and not just unilateral power.

Q Next year is also, as you well know, the final year of your presidency. Do you find that in any way liberating to try and do things that you weren't able to do in the first years of your presidency?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know if I find it liberating. I find it -- it's concentrated my attention and my energies. And obviously, since I'm not running, I could do things in an election year that might be difficult to do otherwise. But if you go back, I mean, we've taken a lot of controversial decisions. That's one of the reasons we lost the Congress in '94 -- we took on the gun lobby and the health care lobby and the deficit issue at the same time, and it was more than the system could bear, I think.

But I do think that I am acutely mindful of the fact that I have 14 months left, and that I need to be out there squeezing the most out of every day. And I need to get as much done as I can for the American people, to try to leave our country in the best-possible shape so that the next president and the

next

Congress will be even freer than they are to basically look with a visionary eye to the future and take on the big issues. That's the theme that I had today in Florida; that's the theme that I try to echo everywhere.

I believe that this really is the only time in my lifetime we've had so much prosperity, social cohesion and national self-confidence, with the absence of internal crisis or external threat. I will get as much done on these big challenges as I can. But after I'm out of office and there is a new team in, I still think it's very important that they keep the American people focused on these big issues in the 21st century, because a society rarely has the luxury of having the tools and the space to deal with these long-term challenges that we now have. And I think it's very important that we seize it.

Q Let me ask you one specific, if I may, on the question of gays in the military. As you no doubt know, the First Lady this past week was critical of the don't ask, don't tell policy. She said it just doesn't work. You weren't going to institute that at the beginning of your presidency, anyway. Why not use the last year of your presidency to institute an end to discriminatory discharges against gays in the military? And what do you think of what the First Lady said this week?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I'm quite sympathetic with what she said. I think -- that was the position that both of us brought to the White House. But I think -- there's one thing that may be not clearly understood. The reason that I went for don't ask, don't tell is that it's all I could do because I had a clear signal from the Congress that if I implemented my policy, they would reverse it by overwhelming majorities.

I didn't implement don't ask, don't tell until the Senate voted 68-32 against the policy that I wanted. So I think it's very important -- for me, what's important is that the policy, as implemented, does not work as I announced it and as the leaders of our military at that time in '93 pledged to implement it.

I can only hope this last brutal beating death of a gay soldier will give some sobering impetus to a reexamination about how this policy is implemented and whether we can do a better job of fulfilling its original intent.

Let me remind you that the original intent was that people would not be rooted out, that they would not be questioned out, that this would be focused on people's conduct, and if they didn't violate the code of conduct, and they didn't tell, that their comings and goings, the mail they got, the associates they had, that those things would not be sufficient to kick them out of the military, or certainly subject them to harassment.

So what I would like to do is to focus on trying to make the policy that we announced back in '93 work the way it was intended to, because it's way -- it's out of whack now, and I don't think any serious person can say it's not.

Q How are you going to do that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're working with the Pentagon now to do it. I mean, I think there's a greater awareness now that it's just not -- it's not being implemented as it was announced and as it was intended.

Now, as for -- but I don't have any problem with what she says, because that's -- after all, that's what I said back in '93, and if anybody -- you know, if there's a sense in the Congress or in the next White House that that ought to be done, then maybe together they'll have enough votes to do it.

Q You mentioned earlier the importance of future presidents becoming even more mediators and conciliators on the world scene. This coming week, of course, Syria and Israel are going to be at the White House. And I know you told us at the news conference you've taken a blood oath to avoid discussing details of those long-stalled talks, the renewal of them, but how do you plan -- just in general, since you don't want to go into details -- how do you plan to get this process moving and keep it moving when you get these gentlemen sitting down again?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I want to get them together, let them talk, and get

them  
to try to agree on an agenda and a timetable. They know what the issues  
are,  
and they know what the options are for resolving the issues. And my  
experience  
has been that competent people -- and you're dealing with two highly  
competent  
people here -- I mean, these people are good in what they do and  
representing  
the interests of their countries -- and that when -- they don't go into  
these  
negotiations without some idea about where they want to finish and some  
idea  
about where they'll have to give, and whether the other person will give,  
and  
how it will all play out.

So on the other hand, it is difficult, but not as complex, in my view, as  
the  
Palestinian negotiations with Israel. So I would like to see them get  
together, talk together, get to know each other a little better, and agree  
on  
an agenda and a timetable, and then take a couple of days off and go back  
and  
meet with their respective teams to decide where they're going to start  
and  
where they're going to stop, and come back here and just look to burn  
through  
it, just keep going until we get the thing done.

Q Why is the time right now?

THE PRESIDENT: I think because both leaders, for different reasons,  
finally  
have this sense of urgency, and I think they should have a sense of  
urgency.  
And I think they know that the enemies of the peace process are gearing  
up,  
they want to try to derail it, and not just for the Palestinians. I think  
that  
they know that there is a sense of hope and possibility now, and I think  
they  
believe that Prime Minister Barak is committed to trying to resolve all  
this,  
just like he said he was.

Q Mr. President, is there any doubt in your mind, sir, that Russia is  
responsible for the listening device that was discovered at the State  
Department? And to what extent are you disturbed by it? Don't we all do  
the  
same things -- spy on each other?

THE PRESIDENT: I think when -- we have always taken spying seriously and  
taken appropriate action, and I think they will take appropriate action in

this  
regard. And I have no reason to believe that the press accounts on this  
are  
not accurate.

Q You must be concerned, though, about this big security breach in the  
State  
Department.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I certainly wish it hadn't happened, but I think  
they  
learned something about this. I think now they'll figure out how to deal  
with  
this technology and it won't happen again. And I think we just have to --  
look, the consequences of all this, while certainly not good, are not as  
dire  
as they were in the dark days of the Cold War when both of us were spying  
on  
each other in a much more sweeping way. And we had ways of dealing with  
it.  
And there's sort of an established protocol for dealing with this kind of  
thing  
and I think we ought to do it. And the main thing we ought to do is learn  
whatever we can from the incident -- how did they do this, how did they  
get  
away with it, how can we prevent it from happening again.

Q What effect will it have on American relations with Russia?

THE PRESIDENT: Based on what I now know, I think we should proceed where  
it's  
in our interest to do so in our relations with Russia, and where we have  
differences of opinion, we ought to proceed to articulate them. You can't  
let  
every spy case affect the larger national interests in the country.

Q Mr. President, a couple more reflective questions. Based on your own  
experiences over the years, going back to your first campaign, to what  
extent  
do you think a politician's private life should become part of the public  
record?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, I don't know. I think I'll let the press and the  
people  
decide that. I think -- let me say it in a different way -- I think that  
what  
I have seen too often is that the politics of personal destruction become  
the  
preferred option only when people think they can't win the old-fashioned  
way,  
they can't win on the issues or whatever.

Now, a person -- I'm not talking about whether somebody's robbed a bank  
or

something like that, but I think that the pendulum swung pretty far over in the last three or four elections, and I think it's swinging back now. And I think that's what the voters are saying, and they'll try to get it right. But something ought to be genuinely relevant, and we ought not just target people for no good reason and just pound on them, and use that because they couldn't win the old-fashioned way. I think that both the politicians and the press should be mindful of that.

But it will get sorted out. These things come and go. You know, early in the 1800s, we had several years where this sort of thing was all the rage, completely dominated the political debate. And then it sort of faded away again. And these things come and go, and the underlying health of our democracy and the common sense of our people have always been enough to see us through, and I think they will be here.

Q What do you make of the recent statement by Ken Starr that he thinks you ought to get right with the law by admitting in a public way that you were not truthful in your statements under oath?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that I know what to make of Mr. Starr.

Q You know, he's giving interviews, he's doing talk shows?

THE PRESIDENT: No, but it's a free country.

Q Why do you think he's still pursuing this after he's resigned his office?

THE PRESIDENT: I just don't think I can serve any useful purpose by commenting on it now. Maybe I should follow his lead; when I don't have a job, I can comment on it more.

Q Speaking of that as we wind up here, besides getting your presidential library off the ground, what is Bill Clinton going to do with the rest of his life?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I hope I'll be a member of the Senate Spouses Club.

That's one of the things I really hope I'll be. And I say that -- we're laughing, but I'm dead serious about that. I want to do what I can to help Hillary. And getting this library and public policy center up and going and

having it continue the best missions of my presidency I think will be quite time-consuming.

I hope I'll have a little more time for my family and my friends, but I still want to be a good citizen. I really admire what Jimmy Carter's done with his life. I wouldn't necessarily choose the same endeavors, although I've supported Habitat for Humanity and I certainly believe that if someone needed me in the future to monitor an election or something like that, I ought to be willing to do it.

But the main thing I want to say is that he has said -- the life he has lived has been a life of service. And he said -- he's also had a very interesting life. I mean, he's had time to go climb up to the base camp of Mount Everest, he goes fishing and does the things that he loves to do -- he goes skiing. But he has lived a life of service. And he has recognized that it is an incredible gift to have the chance to be President, and that when you have this gift for four or eight years, you learn things, you know things, you have a perspective that no one else has the chance to develop. And you can't just walk away from it and not at least make yourself available. If people don't want you to do anything, that's one thing. But at least you ought to be available for public service. And Jimmy Carter has lived a life of public service.

I admire that and I hope that when I leave here, I will be able to do a lot of the personal things I'm interested in, but, fundamentally, help in a way -- I don't want to be under foot for the next president, I don't want to get in anybody's way, but I do think there's a lot of good things I can do for the world and for our country, and I intend to try to do what I can.

Q Finally, sir, I know it's 14 months away, but what advice do you have for your successor and your successors as the last President of this century? What thoughts do you have to pass on to them?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it's very important for a President to have a sense of

history and a sense of the future. You have to know where your country is at this moment in our journey. You have to know what the lives of the American people are like. Then you have to have a vision of what you think it ought to be. And once you do that, once you're grounded in the facts and the history and you have a vision of what you think you ought to be, then you need to have a lot of ideas and a lot of energy and a lot of interpersonal skills. And you just need to go to work every day and never forget your mission.

Because all the pressures in political life on the Chief Executive is at the center of the vortex of all of these things are designed to make you forget your mission. And those who remember their mission and stay on it tend to do very well, even under the most adverse circumstances.

You know, Lincoln once said in the Civil War, he said, my policy is to have no policy, I am controlled by events. And to some extent that was true. He was being very flexible and the government was a much more rudimentary enterprise than it is today. But to some extent, he was being disingenuous, because his policy was: I am going to save the Union; if I have to burn every wheat field in this country and if I have to give up my own life to do it, we will not be split.

Okay, so he knew where he was in history -- you know, if you listened to him, he talked about George Washington a lot, he had this sense of -- he knew about the future. He signed the Moral Land Grant Act. He was all for the railroads and the public improvements. He had a lot of imagination about the future, Lincoln did, and he said, there won't be any future unless we hold together, no that's my policy, and I'm willing to try anything or anybody or any general to get it done.

The thing that made him great was, he never forgot what his mission was. He was grounded in history, he had the vision of the future. He used to say he

kept regular office hours -- my office in the White House on the second floor is in Lincoln's waiting room, which was later the Office of the President through Theodore Roosevelt. But Lincoln used to keep regular office hours with people that wanted a job in a post office or something, because he said he wanted to be reminded on a regular basis of what the daily concerns of people were, and he wanted the war to be over so everybody could be restored to pursuing those daily concerns.

So, anyway, that's one specific, very big example of what I think the general rule is. You've got to understand your country's history, have some idea of your country's future, have a vision of where you want it to go, come up with a set of ideas and a good team, and just pursue it with all the energy and focus you can and have a good time doing it. That's my advice. Don't forget the mission, don't forget who you work for.

Q We're honor bound to break this off, sir, but we're very grateful for your time.

Q Thank you very much for doing this.

THE PRESIDENT: I've enjoyed it. Thank you.

END 11:47 A.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-DEC-1999 11:19:37.00

SUBJECT: 60 Minutes this Sunday night

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Michael A. Hammer ( CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: James R. Fallin ( CN=James R. Fallin/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:  
FYI-

----- Forwarded by Dag Vega/WHO/EOP on 12/11/99 11:19 AM  
-----

Elizabeth J. Potter  
12/10/99 07:01:35 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP, Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP, Mary E.  
Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc:  
Subject: 60 Minutes this Sunday night

60 MINUTES will air a show on Sunday, December 12, 1999, on "Don't Ask,  
Don't Tell, Don't Pursue." The correspondent will be Ed Bradley. 60

## MINUTES

has interviewed (1) the family of Barry Winchell, the soldier murdered at Ft.

Campbell because he was perceived as gay; (2) another soldier and SLDN client

from Ft. Campbell who faced severe anti-gay harassment; (3) SLDN client Steve

May, the openly gay Arizona State Representative whom the Army called back to

the active reserves in February only to seek his discharge based on comments

made in carrying out his public duties; and (4) SLDN Co-Executive Director,

Dixon Osburn.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Slate Magazine <delivery\_morning@slate.com> ( Slate Magazine <delivery\_morning@slate.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-DEC-1999 07:07:44.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Sun., Dec. 12, 1999

TO: Joshua S. Gottheimer ( CN=Joshua S. Gottheimer/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
SLATE NEWS: Sun., Dec. 12, 1999

--today's papers: "Don't Ask" Don't Work

---

today's papers

"Don't Ask" Don't Work

By Andrew Nieland

The New York Times leads with President Clinton's announcement (or admission) that the administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding homosexuals in the military isn't working. Rather than implement a new policy, Clinton is expected to push military officials to better enforce the current one. The statement was prompted by his wife's remarks earlier this week that gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve openly. The Los Angeles Times reeffers Clinton's remarks, and leads with an expose on failings of the state's education system. California's director of special education maintains that as many as 250,000 children have been incorrectly assessed as "learning disabled" and funneled into California's special education programs simply because they were not taught to read. The Washington Post leads with the State Department's warning that Americans abroad should take extra security precautions in the next month; the department has "credible information" that terrorist groups are planning attacks that target American citizens. The LAT, whose sources are quoted by the Post, reefers the announcement.

Despite the WP headline, Americans abroad needn't run for the hills just yet. Such announcements are relatively common, although they usually accompany military actions, economic sanctions, or other foreign policy initiatives (yesterday's warning was the fifth since October). The Post suggests that the warnings are a reference to Osama bin Laden's terrorist organization, but the link is dubious: officials wouldn't name a group, they only "indicated that [bin Laden's group] is the most important organization seeking to

undermine U.S. interests." The Post also points out that attacks could occur any time from now until the first week in January, when the Muslim holy month of Ramadan ends. Does the State Department's announcement mention Ramadan, or did the WP add it? Either way, someone seems to be equating Islam and terrorism without explaining why. And wouldn't a Muslim terrorist be less likely, not more likely, to take terrorist action during a holy month?

The WP and the LAT front stories highlighting different facets of the AIDS epidemic. The Post examines Africa, where the disease kills 5000 people each day, and could kill as many as 13000 per day in 2005. The article stresses the economic ramifications of these statistics: in Kenya and Zimbabwe, projected GDP in 2005 may be as much as 20% lower than it would have been without the disease's effect on young workers. The LAT article on AIDS in the US emphasizes a more encouraging trend--hospices once filled with patients dying from AIDS are emptying and closing because their patients are getting better and leaving, a phenomenon dubbed "the Lazarus syndrome."

The LAT points to today's to-close-to-call presidential race in Chile as a sign that the country's democratization has progressed since dictator Augusto Pinochet stepped down over ten years ago. The contest, which includes candidates from Chile's main right and left parties as well as four independent candidates, is expected to end in a run-off, the first in the country's history.

A NYT special report examines Clinton fundraiser Terry McAuliffe. McAuliffe is seen as part of a new breed of entrepreneurial fundraisers who leverages their services not to obtain cushy ambassadorial posts or lobbyist clout, but to help fuel telecommunications, banking, and real-estate business deals. They've also help fuel some lawsuits: "I've signed thousands of documents, but never read them," McAuliffe remarks. Unlike Vernon Jordan, who plans to relocate to a New York City investment bank when his friend Bill steps down, McAuliffe plans to stay active in politics, and is already raising money for Hillary Clinton's senate bid.

Now That's Synergy: Used to be that only movie studios could use high-profile glossy magazines to flog their product. Now, the NYT reports, tobacco companies are paying publishers like Time, Inc. millions of dollars to generate magazines similar in look and feel to popular twentysomething mags like Maxim and Mademoiselle. The new magazines, packed with tobacco ads, are an attempt to plug the "communication gap" (as an RJ Reynolds memo puts it) created by independent magazines, which generally limit tobacco ads to only two or three percent of total ads. But persistent rumors that Joe Camel has signed on to star opposite Gwyneth Paltrow in an upcoming Miramax police drama are just that.

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

---

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

In Other Magazines: Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/99-12-06/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

Al Gore, Harasser

<http://www.slate.com/code/BallotBox/BallotBox.asp?Show=12/8/99&idMessage=4143>

Fall Legal Fashions

<http://www.slate.com/dispatches/99-11-09/dispatches.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>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Slate Magazine <delivery\_morning@slate.com> ( Slate Magazine <delivery\_morning@slate.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-DEC-1999 07:10:48.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Sun., Dec. 12, 1999

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

TEXT:  
SLATE NEWS: Sun., Dec. 12, 1999

--today's papers: "Don't Ask" Don't Work

---

today's papers

"Don't Ask" Don't Work

By Andrew Nieland

The New York Times leads with President Clinton's announcement (or admission) that the administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding homosexuals in the military isn't working. Rather than implement a new policy, Clinton is expected to push military officials to better enforce the current one. The statement was prompted by his wife's remarks earlier this week that gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve openly. The Los Angeles Times reefer Clinton's remarks, and leads with an expose on failings of the state's education system. California's director of special education maintains that as many as 250,000 children have been incorrectly assessed as "learning disabled" and funneled into California's special education programs simply because they were not taught to read. The Washington Post leads with the State Department's warning that Americans abroad should take extra security precautions in the next month; the department has "credible information" that terrorist groups are planning attacks that target American citizens. The LAT, whose sources are quoted by the Post, reefer the announcement.

Despite the WP headline, Americans abroad needn't run for the hills just yet. Such announcements are relatively common, although they usually accompany military actions, economic sanctions, or other foreign policy initiatives (yesterday's warning was the fifth since October). The Post suggests that the warnings are a reference to Osama bin Laden's terrorist organization, but the link is dubious: officials wouldn't name a group, they only "indicated that [bin Laden's group] is the most important organization seeking to

undermine U.S. interests." The Post also points out that attacks could occur any time from now until the first week in January, when the Muslim holy month of Ramadan ends. Does the State Department's announcement mention Ramadan, or did the WP add it? Either way, someone seems to be equating Islam and terrorism without explaining why. And wouldn't a Muslim terrorist be less likely, not more likely, to take terrorist action during a holy month?

The WP and the LAT front stories highlighting different facets of the AIDS epidemic. The Post examines Africa, where the disease kills 5000 people each day, and could kill as many as 13000 per day in 2005. The article stresses the economic ramifications of these statistics: in Kenya and Zimbabwe, projected GDP in 2005 may be as much as 20% lower than it would have been without the disease's effect on young workers. The LAT article on AIDS in the US emphasizes a more encouraging trend--hospices once filled with patients dying from AIDS are emptying and closing because their patients are getting better and leaving, a phenomenon dubbed "the Lazarus syndrome."

The LAT points to today's to-close-to-call presidential race in Chile as a sign that the country's democratization has progressed since dictator Augusto Pinochet stepped down over ten years ago. The contest, which includes candidates from Chile's main right and left parties as well as four independent candidates, is expected to end in a run-off, the first in the country's history.

A NYT special report examines Clinton fundraiser Terry McAuliffe. McAuliffe is seen as part of a new breed of entrepreneurial fundraisers who leverages their services not to obtain cushy ambassadorial posts or lobbyist clout, but to help fuel telecommunications, banking, and real-estate business deals. They've also help fuel some lawsuits: "I've signed thousands of documents, but never read them," McAuliffe remarks. Unlike Vernon Jordan, who plans to relocate to a New York City investment bank when his friend Bill steps down, McAuliffe plans to stay active in politics, and is already raising money for Hillary Clinton's senate bid.

Now That's Synergy: Used to be that only movie studios could use high-profile glossy magazines to flog their product. Now, the NYT reports, tobacco companies are paying publishers like Time, Inc. millions of dollars to generate magazines similar in look and feel to popular twentysomething mags like Maxim and Mademoiselle. The new magazines, packed with tobacco ads, are an attempt to plug the "communication gap" (as an RJ Reynolds memo puts it) created by independent magazines, which generally limit tobacco ads to only two or three percent of total ads. But persistent rumors that Joe Camel has signed on to star opposite Gwyneth Paltrow in an upcoming Miramax police drama are just that.

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

4

---

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

In Other Magazines: Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/99-12-06/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

Al Gore, Harasser

<http://www.slate.com/code/BallotBox/BallotBox.asp?Show=12/8/99&idMessage=4143>

43

Fall Legal Fashions

<http://www.slate.com/dispatches/99-11-09/dispatches.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>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: POSTMASTER@lmgate4.eop.gov ( POSTMASTER@lmgate4.eop.gov [ OA ] ) (SYS)

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-DEC-1999 22:14:25.00

SUBJECT: Undeliverable message

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri ( CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
----- Failure Reasons -----

User not listed in public Name & Address Book  
"Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov

----- Returned Message -----

Received: from mhub2.eop.gov ([165.119.1.24]) by lmgate4.eop.gov (Lotus  
SMTP MTA v4.6.4 (830.2 3-23-1999)) with SMTP id 85256846.00119989; Sun,  
12 Dec 1999 22:12:14 -0500

Received: from lmgate3.eop.gov ([165.119.3.232])  
by mhub.eop.gov (PMDF V5.2-32 #34437)  
with SMTP id <01JJFHK8KWUO8ZDX20@mhub.eop.gov>; Sun, 12 Dec 1999 22:11:43  
EST

Received: by lmgate3.eop.gov (Lotus SMTP MTA SMTP v4.6 (462.2 9-3-1997))  
id 85256846.0011A7C1 ; Sun, 12 Dec 1999 22:12:50 -0500

Date: Sun, 12 Dec 1999 22:11:02 -0500

From: Jennifer\_M.\_Palmieri@who.eop.gov

Subject: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

To: Brian\_S.\_Mason@who.eop.gov, Brooke\_B.\_Livingston@who.eop.gov,  
GlynnME@state.gov, SUNTUM\_M@a1.eop.gov, backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu,  
wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov, Kathleen\_K.\_Ahn@who.eop.gov,  
Deborah\_Akel@who.eop.gov, Jeannetta\_P.\_Allen@oa.eop.gov,  
Ralph\_Alswang@who.eop.gov, "Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov,  
Karen\_L.\_Barbuschak@oa.eop.gov, Mark\_H.\_Bartholomew@oa.eop.gov,  
BARTHOLLOW\_T@a1.eop.gov, Leslie\_Bernstein@who.eop.gov,  
Mark\_J.\_Bernstein@who.eop.gov, Marsha\_E.\_Berry@who.eop.gov,  
Todd\_A.\_Bledsoe@who.eop.gov, Antony\_J.\_Blinken@nsc.eop.gov,  
Patrick\_E.\_Briggs@who.eop.gov, Karen\_C.\_Burchard@who.eop.gov,  
Katharine\_Button@who.eop.gov, Barbara\_D.\_Woolley@who.eop.gov,  
Bradley\_M.\_Campbell@ceq.eop.gov, "Brian A. Reich"@OVP.eop.gov,  
"Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov, Mary\_E.\_Cahill@who.eop.gov,  
pcaplan@fbr.com, George\_G.\_Caudill@who.eop.gov, Nanda\_Chitre@who.eop.gov,  
Delia\_A.\_Cohen@who.eop.gov, Justin\_L.\_Coleman@who.eop.gov,  
CUTLER\_L@a1.eop.gov, DICKKEY\_L@a1.eop.gov, Elliot\_J.\_Diringer@ceq.eop.gov,  
Jackson\_T.\_Dunn@who.eop.gov, Daniel\_W.\_Burkhardt@who.eop.gov,  
Dawn\_M.\_Chirwa@who.eop.gov, Debra\_D.\_Bird@who.eop.gov,  
Dorinda\_A.\_Salcido@who.eop.gov, Anne\_M.\_Edwards@who.eop.gov,  
Sharon\_Farmer@who.eop.gov, Jennifer\_Ferguson@omb.eop.gov,  
Martha\_Foley@who.eop.gov, FORDE\_R@a1.eop.gov,  
Carmen\_B.\_Fowler@who.eop.gov,

Paul\_D.\_Glastris@who.eop.gov, Dario\_J.\_Gomez@who.eop.gov,  
Joshua\_S.\_Gottheimer@who.eop.gov, Toby\_C.\_Graff@who.eop.gov,  
GRAY\_W@a1.eop.gov, John\_A.\_Gribben@who.eop.gov, William\_Hadley@oa.eop.gov,  
Michael\_A.\_Hammer@nsc.eop.gov, William\_C.\_Haymes@oa.eop.gov,  
Ann\_C.\_Hertelendy@who.eop.gov, Marty\_J.\_Hoffmann@who.eop.gov,  
Maureen\_A.\_Hudson@who.eop.gov, Sheyda\_Jahanbani@nsc.eop.gov,  
Thomas\_D.\_Janenda@who.eop.gov, David\_T.\_Johnson@nsc.eop.gov,  
Wayne\_C.\_Johnson@oa.eop.gov, Joel\_Johnson@who.eop.gov, John\_See@ed.gov,  
David\_E.\_Kalbaugh@who.eop.gov, Mark\_A.\_Kitchens@who.eop.gov,  
Catherine\_T.\_Kitchen@who.eop.gov, Sarah\_S.\_Knight@who.eop.gov,  
"Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov, KTORPEY@AOL.COM,  
Kris\_M\_Balderston@who.eop.gov, Sara\_M.\_Latham@who.eop.gov,  
"Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov, Ann\_F.\_Lewis@who.eop.gov,  
Joseph\_P.\_Lockhart@who.eop.gov, Laura\_D.\_Schwartz@who.eop.gov,  
Laura\_S.\_Marcus@who.eop.gov, Irma\_L.\_Martinez@who.eop.gov,  
Andrew\_J.\_Mayock@who.eop.gov, MOFFETT\_J@a1.eop.gov,  
Megan\_C.\_Moloney@who.eop.gov, Melissa\_M.\_Murray@who.eop.gov,  
rmusgrav@ostp.eop.gov, Sean\_P.\_Maloney@who.eop.gov,  
Minyon\_Moore@who.eop.gov,  
Steven\_J.\_Naplan@nsc.eop.gov, Elizabeth\_R.\_Newman@who.eop.gov,  
"Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov, Ellen\_E.\_Olcott@who.eop.gov,  
Sean\_P.\_O'Shea@who.eop.gov, Julia\_M.\_Payne@who.eop.gov,  
Denver\_R.\_Peacock@who.eop.gov, Jonathan\_M.\_Prince@who.eop.gov,  
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov,  
Nicole\_R.\_Rabner@who.eop.gov, Linda\_Ricci@omb.eop.gov,  
Heather\_M.\_Riley@who.eop.gov, Robin\_M.\_Roland@who.eop.gov,  
Peter\_Rundlet@who.eop.gov, Evan\_Ryan@who.eop.gov,  
Robert\_B.\_Johnson@who.eop.gov, G.\_Timothy\_Saunders@who.eop.gov,  
Jason\_H.\_Schechter@who.eop.gov, NAPLAN\_S@a1.eop.gov,  
Brooks\_E.\_Scoville@who.eop.gov, Christopher\_K.\_Scully@who.eop.gov,  
Ruby\_Shamir@opd.eop.gov, Mark\_C.\_Sheppard@who.eop.gov,  
Jeffrey\_A.\_Shesol@who.eop.gov, June\_Shih@who.eop.gov,  
Leanne\_A.\_Shimabukuro@opd.eop.gov, Richard\_L.\_Siewert@who.eop.gov,  
SMITH\_BD@a1.eop.gov, Jennifer\_H.\_Smith@who.eop.gov,  
Mary\_L.\_Smith@opd.eop.gov,  
Douglas\_B.\_Sosnik@who.eop.gov, Maria\_E.\_Soto@who.eop.gov,  
Dana\_C.\_Strand@who.eop.gov, Michael\_J.\_Sullivan@who.eop.gov,  
Sarah\_E.\_Gegenheimer@who.eop.gov, Tracy\_F.\_Sisser@who.eop.gov,  
Sylvia\_M.\_Mathews@omb.eop.gov, Barry\_J.\_Toiv@who.eop.gov,  
Serena\_C.\_Torrey@who.eop.gov, Karen\_Tramontano@who.eop.gov,  
June\_G.\_Turner@who.eop.gov, "Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov,  
Thurgood\_Marshall\_Jr@who.eop.gov, Loretta\_M.\_Ucelli@who.eop.gov,  
Victoria\_L.\_Valentine@who.eop.gov, Dag\_Vega@who.eop.gov,  
Janice\_H.\_Vranich@who.eop.gov, Setti\_D.\_Warren@who.eop.gov,  
Essence\_P.\_Washington@opd.eop.gov, Robert\_S.\_Weiner@ondcp.eop.gov,  
Lowell\_A.\_Weiss@who.eop.gov, Woyneab\_M.\_Wondwossen@who.eop.gov,  
Debra\_S.\_Wood@who.eop.gov, WOZNIAK\_N@a1.eop.gov, carolmast@aol.com,  
dmilbank@tnr.com, john\_see@ed.gov, klasky\_helaine@ustr.gov,  
Margaret\_M.\_Suntum@who.eop.gov, skgmd@umich.edu, tingen-terri@dol.gov,  
usia01@access.digex.com, 62955104@eln.attmail.com, INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov,  
newsdesk@usnewswire.com, pubs\_backup@oa.eop.gov,  
Jennifer\_M.\_Palmieri@who.eop.gov, Jason\_H.\_Schechter@who.eop.gov,  
Aprill\_N.\_Springfield@who.eop.gov, Gina\_N.\_Dennis@who.eop.gov,  
Alberto\_O.\_Feraren@oa.eop.gov, Pub\_Arch@oa.eop.gov,

Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov, Hildy\_Kuryk@who.eop.gov,  
Pub\_Arch@oa.eop.gov,  
Michael\_K.\_Gehrke@who.eop.gov, Sally\_Katzen@omb.eop.gov,  
David\_Vandivier@omb.eop.gov, Carolyn\_T.\_Wu@who.eop.gov,  
John\_H.\_Corcoran\_III@who.eop.gov, Lindsey\_E.\_Huff@nsc.eop.gov,  
Patrick\_M.\_Dorton@opd.eop.gov, MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us,  
Rachel\_A.\_Redington@who.eop.gov, Irma\_L.\_Martinez@who.eop.gov,  
Sharon\_H.\_Yuan@opd.eop.gov, Anne\_W.\_Bovaird@who.eop.gov,  
Charles\_J.\_Payson@who.eop.gov, Fern\_Mechlowitz@who.eop.gov,  
Michele\_Ballantyne@who.eop.gov, Melissa\_G.\_Green@opd.eop.gov,  
Nicole\_L.\_Davison@opd.eop.gov, Stephanie\_A.\_Cutter@who.eop.gov,  
Francisco\_J.\_Sanchez@who.eop.gov, Fern\_Mechlowitz@who.eop.gov,  
Anne\_W.\_Bovaird@who.eop.gov, Eric\_P.\_Liu@opd.eop.gov,  
Anna\_Richter@opd.eop.gov, Matthew\_T.\_Schneider@who.eop.gov,  
David\_Vandivier@omb.eop.gov, Lisa\_Ferdinando@who.eop.gov,  
Beth\_Nolan@who.eop.gov, Lindsey\_E.\_Huff@nsc.eop.gov,  
Bridget\_T.\_Leininger@who.eop.gov, Abigail\_L.\_McDermott@who.eop.gov,  
Laurie\_P.\_Kelleher@who.eop.gov, Samir\_Afridi@who.eop.gov,  
Terry\_Edmonds@who.eop.gov, Kymberly\_M.\_Escobar@ceq.eop.gov,  
Justin\_G.\_Cooper@who.eop.gov, sean.carr@cnn.com,  
Julia\_G.\_Bataille%OVP@oa.eop.gov, Lisa\_Ferdinando@who.eop.gov,  
masonjulie@aol.com, Jason\_E.\_Hartke@who.eop.gov,  
Debra\_D.\_Alexander@who.eop.gov, Adrienne\_K.\_Elrod@who.eop.gov,  
Lisel\_Loy@who.eop.gov, releases@wwwO.whitehouse.gov,  
jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com, Rebecca\_J.\_Salay@who.eop.gov,  
kit.judge@mail.house.gov, Abigail\_C.\_Smith@who.eop.gov,  
Jordanindc@aol.com,  
Deanne\_E.\_Benos@opd.eop.gov, Jenni\_R.\_Engebretsen@who.eop.gov,  
Gilbert\_S.\_Gonzalez@who.eop.gov, Sonya\_N.\_Hebert@who.eop.gov,  
Stephen\_N.\_Boyd@who.eop.gov, Emily\_Karcher@who.eop.gov,  
Maureen\_A.\_Hudson@who.eop.gov, Sonya\_N.\_Hebert@who.eop.gov,  
Lindsay\_R.\_Drewel@who.eop.gov, Christine\_L.\_Anderson@who.eop.gov,  
Erica\_Lepping@ed.gov, Mark\_D.\_Magana@who.eop.gov,  
Brian\_A.\_Barreto@who.eop.gov, Christine\_L.\_Anderson@who.eop.gov,  
Victoria\_L.\_Valentine@who.eop.gov, Lauren\_M.\_Supina@who.eop.gov,  
Adrian\_E.\_Miller@who.eop.gov, Justin\_G.\_Cooper@who.eop.gov,  
Renee\_Sagiv@who.eop.gov, Heather\_F.\_Hurlburt@who.eop.gov,  
Sean\_R.\_Dobson@opd.eop.gov, deborah.charles@reuters.com,  
Elizabeth\_J.\_Potter@who.eop.gov  
Message-id: <85256846.00114103.00@lmgate3.eop.gov>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(Miami, Florida)

---

Embargoed until 12:01 am EST Monday, December 13, 1999

RADIO INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT

BY CBS NEWS

December 11, 1999

Wyndham Palace Resort  
Orlando, Florida

11:25 A.M. EST

Q President Clinton, thank you very much for joining us for this special interview with CBS News. Heading into the next century, beyond your immediate goals for the rest of your term, what do you think are the one or two top domestic challenges facing the country?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the aging of America and the children of the country. It's ironic that we seem to be growing at both ends. We're going to double the number of people over 65, and yet, we have the largest group of schoolchildren in our country's history in our schools, the first group bigger than the baby boomers and they're much, much more diverse. They come from more different ethnic and racial and religious backgrounds. And I think that dealing with them are the two biggest things that ought to be on the front burner.

I also believe that, related to that, obviously, as you've heard me say many times, is the challenge of continuing to grow the economy while reaching out into poor areas, continuing to improve the environment and paying the debt off. I think those are the big, big challenges.

Q Mr. President, one of the things I've noticed about these celebrations that the White House, you and the First Lady are planning is that it's propagating the myth that January 1st is the start of the new millennium and the new century. Are you guilty of creating that erroneous impression?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I mean, I think basically, by common consent, everybody decided that we ought to celebrate the millennium on January the 1st, 2000, even though most of the strict correctionists say that it's January 1st, 2001.

Q Well, they're right, aren't they?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, apparently, that was the prevailing view among the experts, but the people have expressed a different wish, so we're going with the folks. We've got a democracy here, and that's the way we're going. It will be nice for me, maybe I can do it twice and I'll be a President of two millennial changes.

Q Well, looking ahead into the next century, whenever it begins, where do you see the power of the presidency itself evolving? Is it going to change?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, yes, it's always changing. But I think it will

always -- at least for the future that I can foresee -- will continue to be an extremely important office. I think that a lot of the executive actions will be important, along with getting along with Congress. I think that building partnerships with the private sector will become more important. It will become more important to mobilize the American people and to organize them to meet the challenges in the future the way we've done.

For example, maybe a good example would be the way we've worked on wiring the schools, where we did -- the main government thing we did was to change the law so that we have this e-rate now in poorer schools and hospitals.

Q You mean wiring for the Internet?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, wiring for the Internet -- poorer schools and hospitals can get a discount rate. Then we go out and try to hustle up all the equipment and the Internet connections and get everybody to do that. So I think you'll see a lot more of that.

The other thing I think you will see is, I believe the world is growing ever more interdependent, so I think the President, in order to effectively lead the world, will have to be an increasingly effective negotiator, conciliator, bringing people together, working people together. And I think it will be just as important 30 years from now for America to be involved in the rest of the world as it is now. But I think it will be an increasingly interdependent world that will require powers of persuasion and not just unilateral power.

Q Next year is also, as you well know, the final year of your presidency. Do you find that in any way liberating to try and do things that you weren't able to do in the first years of your presidency?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know if I find it liberating. I find it -- it's concentrated my attention and my energies. And obviously, since I'm not running, I could do things in an election year that might be difficult to do otherwise. But if you go back, I mean, we've taken a lot of controversial decisions. That's one of the reasons we lost the Congress in '94 -- we took on the gun lobby and the health care lobby and the deficit issue at the same time, and it was more than the system could bear, I think.

But I do think that I am acutely mindful of the fact that I have 14 months left, and that I need to be out there squeezing the most out of every day. And I need to get as much done as I can for the American people, to try to leave our country in the best-possible shape so that the next president and the next Congress will be even freer than they are to basically look with a visionary eye to the future and take on the big issues. That's the theme that I had today in Florida; that's the theme that I try to echo everywhere.

I believe that this really is the only time in my lifetime we've had so much prosperity, social cohesion and national self-confidence, with the absence of internal crisis or external threat. I will get as much done on these big challenges as I can. But after I'm out of office and there is a

new team in, I still think it's very important that they keep the American people focused on these big issues in the 21st century, because a society rarely has the luxury of having the tools and the space to deal with these long-term challenges that we now have. And I think it's very important that we seize it.

Q Let me ask you one specific, if I may, on the question of gays in the military. As you no doubt know, the First Lady this past week was critical of the don't ask, don't tell policy. She said it just doesn't work. You weren't going to institute that at the beginning of your presidency, anyway. Why not use the last year of your presidency to institute an end to discriminatory discharges against gays in the military? And what do you think of what the First Lady said this week?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I'm quite sympathetic with what she said. I think -- that was the position that both of us brought to the White House. But I think -- there's one thing that may be not clearly understood. The reason that I went for don't ask, don't tell is that it's all I could do because I had a clear signal from the Congress that if I implemented my policy, they would reverse it by overwhelming majorities.

I didn't implement don't ask, don't tell until the Senate voted 68-32 against the policy that I wanted. So I think it's very important -- for me, what's important is that the policy, as implemented, does not work as I announced it and as the leaders of our military at that time in '93 pledged to implement it.

I can only hope this last brutal beating death of a gay soldier will give some sobering impetus to a reexamination about how this policy is implemented and whether we can do a better job of fulfilling its original intent.

Let me remind you that the original intent was that people would not be rooted out, that they would not be questioned out, that this would be focused on people's conduct, and if they didn't violate the code of conduct, and they didn't tell, that their comings and goings, the mail they got, the associates they had, that those things would not be sufficient to kick them out of the military, or certainly subject them to harassment.

So what I would like to do is to focus on trying to make the policy that we announced back in '93 work the way it was intended to, because it's way -- it's out of whack now, and I don't think any serious person can say it's not.

Q How are you going to do that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're working with the Pentagon now to do it. I mean, I think there's a greater awareness now that it's just not -- it's not being implemented as it was announced and as it was intended.

Now, as for -- but I don't have any problem with what she says, because that's -- after all, that's what I said back in '93, and if anybody -- you know, if there's a sense in the Congress or in the next White House that that ought to be done, then maybe together they'll have enough votes

to do it.

Q You mentioned earlier the importance of future presidents becoming even more mediators and conciliators on the world scene. This coming week, of course, Syria and Israel are going to be at the White House. And I know you told us at the news conference you've taken a blood oath to avoid discussing details of those long-stalled talks, the renewal of them, but how do you plan -- just in general, since you don't want to go into details -- how do you plan to get this process moving and keep it moving when you get these gentlemen sitting down again?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I want to get them together, let them talk, and get them to try to agree on an agenda and a timetable. They know what the issues are, and they know what the options are for resolving the issues. And my experience has been that competent people -- and you're dealing with two highly competent people here -- I mean, these people are good in what they do and representing the interests of their countries -- and that when -- they don't go into these negotiations without some idea about where they want to finish and some idea about where they'll have to give, and whether the other person will give, and how it will all play out.

So on the other hand, it is difficult, but not as complex, in my view, as the Palestinian negotiations with Israel. So I would like to see them get together, talk together, get to know each other a little better, and agree on an agenda and a timetable, and then take a couple of days off and go back and meet with their respective teams to decide where they're going to start and where they're going to stop, and come back here and just look to burn through it, just keep going until we get the thing done.

Q Why is the time right now?

THE PRESIDENT: I think because both leaders, for different reasons, finally have this sense of urgency, and I think they should have a sense of urgency. And I think they know that the enemies of the peace process are gearing up, they want to try to derail it, and not just for the Palestinians. I think that they know that there is a sense of hope and possibility now, and I think they believe that Prime Minister Barak is committed to trying to resolve all this, just like he said he was.

Q Mr. President, is there any doubt in your mind, sir, that Russia is responsible for the listening device that was discovered at the State Department? And to what extent are you disturbed by it? Don't we all do the same things -- spy on each other?

THE PRESIDENT: I think when -- we have always taken spying seriously and taken appropriate action, and I think they will take appropriate action in this regard. And I have no reason to believe that the press accounts on this are not accurate.

Q You must be concerned, though, about this big security breach in the State Department.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I certainly wish it hadn't happened, but I think they learned something about this. I think now they'll figure out how to

deal with this technology and it won't happen again. And I think we just have to -- look, the consequences of all this, while certainly not good, are not as dire as they were in the dark days of the Cold War when both of us were spying on each other in a much more sweeping way. And we had ways of dealing with it. And there's sort of an established protocol for dealing with this kind of thing and I think we ought to do it. And the main thing we ought to do is learn whatever we can from the incident -- how did they do this, how did they get away with it, how can we prevent it from happening again.

Q What effect will it have on American relations with Russia?

THE PRESIDENT: Based on what I now know, I think we should proceed where it's in our interest to do so in our relations with Russia, and where we have differences of opinion, we ought to proceed to articulate them. You can't let every spy case affect the larger national interests in the country.

Q Mr. President, a couple more reflective questions. Based on your own experiences over the years, going back to your first campaign, to what extent do you think a politician's private life should become part of the public record?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, I don't know. I think I'll let the press and the people decide that. I think -- let me say it in a different way -- I think that what I have seen too often is that the politics of personal destruction become the preferred option only when people think they can't win the old-fashioned way, they can't win on the issues or whatever.

Now, a person -- I'm not talking about whether somebody's robbed a bank or something like that, but I think that the pendulum swung pretty far over in the last three or four elections, and I think it's swinging back now. And I think that's what the voters are saying, and they'll try to get it right. But something ought to be genuinely relevant, and we ought not just target people for no good reason and just pound on them, and use that because they couldn't win the old-fashioned way. I think that both the politicians and the press should be mindful of that.

But it will get sorted out. These things come and go. You know, early in the 1800s, we had several years where this sort of thing was all the rage, completely dominated the political debate. And then it sort of faded away again. And these things come and go, and the underlying health of our democracy and the common sense of our people have always been enough to see us through, and I think they will be here.

Q What do you make of the recent statement by Ken Starr that he thinks you ought to get right with the law by admitting in a public way that you were not truthful in your statements under oath?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that I know what to make of Mr. Starr.

Q You know, he's giving interviews, he's doing talk shows?

THE PRESIDENT: No, but it's a free country.

Q Why do you think he's still pursuing this after he's resigned his office?

THE PRESIDENT: I just don't think I can serve any useful purpose by commenting on it now. Maybe I should follow his lead; when I don't have a job, I can comment on it more.

Q Speaking of that as we wind up here, besides getting your presidential library off the ground, what is Bill Clinton going to do with the rest of his life?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I hope I'll be a member of the Senate Spouses Club. That's one of the things I really hope I'll be. And I say that -- we're laughing, but I'm dead serious about that. I want to do what I can to help Hillary. And getting this library and public policy center up and going and having it continue the best missions of my presidency I think will be quite time-consuming.

I hope I'll have a little more time for my family and my friends, but I still want to be a good citizen. I really admire what Jimmy Carter's done with his life. I wouldn't necessarily choose the same endeavors, although I've supported Habitat for Humanity and I certainly believe that if someone needed me in the future to monitor an election or something like that, I ought to be willing to do it.

But the main thing I want to say is that he has said -- the life he has lived has been a life of service. And he said -- he's also had a very interesting life. I mean, he's had time to go climb up to the base camp of Mount Everest, he goes fishing and does the things that he loves to do -- he goes skiing. But he has lived a life of service. And he has recognized that it is an incredible gift to have the chance to be President, and that when you have this gift for four or eight years, you learn things, you know things, you have a perspective that no one else has the chance to develop. And you can't just walk away from it and not at least make yourself available. If people don't want you to do anything, that's one thing. But at least you ought to be available for public service. And Jimmy Carter has lived a life of public service.

I admire that and I hope that when I leave here, I will be able to do a lot of the personal things I'm interested in, but, fundamentally, help in a way -- I don't want to be under foot for the next president, I don't want to get in anybody's way, but I do think there's a lot of good things I can do for the world and for our country, and I intend to try to do what I can.

Q Finally, sir, I know it's 14 months away, but what advice do you have for your successor and your successors as the last President of this century? What thoughts do you have to pass on to them?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it's very important for a President to have a sense of history and a sense of the future. You have to know where your country is at this moment in our journey. You have to know what the lives of the American people are like. Then you have to have a vision of what

you think it ought to be. And once you do that, once you're grounded in the facts and the history and you have a vision of what you think you ought to be, then you need to have a lot of ideas and a lot of energy and a lot of interpersonal skills. And you just need to go to work every day and never forget your mission.

Because all the pressures in political life on the Chief Executive is at the center of the vortex of all of these things are designed to make you forget your mission. And those who remember their mission and stay on it tend to do very well, even under the most adverse circumstances.

You know, Lincoln once said in the Civil War, he said, my policy is to have no policy, I am controlled by events. And to some extent that was true. He was being very flexible and the government was a much more rudimentary enterprise than it is today. But to some extent, he was being disingenuous, because his policy was: I am going to save the Union; if I have to burn every wheat field in this country and if I have to give up my own life to do it, we will not be split.

~~Okay, so he knew where he was in history --~~ you know, if you listened to him, he talked about George Washington a lot, he had this sense of -- he knew about the future. He signed the Moral Land Grant Act. He was all for the railroads and the public improvements. He had a lot of imagination about the future, Lincoln did, and he said, there won't be any future unless we hold together, no that's my policy, and I'm willing to try anything or anybody or any general to get it done.

The thing that made him great was, he never forgot what his mission was. He was grounded in history, he had the vision of the future. He used to say he kept regular office hours -- my office in the White House on the second floor is in Lincoln's waiting room, which was later the Office of the President through Theodore Roosevelt. But Lincoln used to keep regular office hours with people that wanted a job in a post office or something, because he said he wanted to be reminded on a regular basis of what the daily concerns of people were, and he wanted the war to be over so everybody could be restored to pursuing those daily concerns.

So, anyway, that's one specific, very big example of what I think the general rule is. You've got to understand your country's history, have some idea of your country's future, have a vision of where you want it to go, come up with a set of ideas and a good team, and just pursue it with all the energy and focus you can and have a good time doing it. That's my advice. Don't forget the mission, don't forget who you work for.

Q We're honor bound to break this off, sir, but we're very grateful for your time.

Q Thank you very much for doing this.

THE PRESIDENT: I've enjoyed it. Thank you.

END 11:47 A.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-DEC-1999 22:11:16.00

SUBJECT: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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

TO: Sean R. Dobson ( CN=Sean R. Dobson/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Erica\_Lepping@ed.gov ( Erica\_Lepping@ed.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: releases@wwwO.whitehouse.gov ( releases@wwwO.whitehouse.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Adrienne K. Elrod ( CN=Adrienne K. Elrod/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: sean.carr@cnn.com ( sean.carr@cnn.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kymberly M. Escobar ( CN=Kymberly M. Escobar/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Matthew T. Schneider ( CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eric P. Liu ( CN=Eric P. Liu/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Melissa G. Green ( CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us ( MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Pub\_Arch@EOP ( Pub\_Arch@EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@inet ( Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alberto O. Feraren ( CN=Alberto O. Feraren/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: newsdesk@usnewswire.com ( newsdesk@usnewswire.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: 62955104@eln.attmail.com ( 62955104@eln.attmail.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tingen-terri@dol.gov ( tingen-terri@dol.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: john\_see@ed.gov ( john\_see@ed.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Essence P. Washington ( CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: June G. Turner ( CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Christopher K. Scully ( CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: NAPLAN\_S@a1.eop.gov ( NAPLAN\_S@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (NSC)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G. Timothy Saunders ( CN=G. Timothy Saunders/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: " ( "/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEOP/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: "Nathan B. Naylor"@lngate4.eop.gov ( "Nathan B. Naylor"@lngate4.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: MOFFETT\_J@a1.eop.gov ( MOFFETT\_J@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: KTORPEY@AOL.COM ( KTORPEY@AOL.COM @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: John\_See@ed.gov ( John\_See@ed.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne C. Johnson ( CN=Wayne C. Johnson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Michael A. Hammer ( CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jackson T. Dunn ( CN=Jackson T. Dunn/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DICKEY\_L@al.eop.gov ( DICKEY\_L@al.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: pcaplan@fbr.com ( pcaplan@fbr.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bradley M. Campbell ( CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: BARTHOLOW\_T@al.eop.gov ( BARTHOLOW\_T@al.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (OA)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Barbuschak ( CN=Karen L. Barbuschak/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov ( wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SUNTUM\_M@a1.eop.gov ( SUNTUM\_M@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: deborah.charles@reuters.com ( deborah.charles@reuters.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Justin G. Cooper ( CN=Justin G. Cooper/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: kit.judge@mail.house.gov ( kit.judge@mail.house.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com ( jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Julia G. Bataille@OVP ( Julia G. Bataille@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Bridget T. Leininger ( CN=Bridget T. Leininger/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Sharon H. Yuan ( CN=Sharon H. Yuan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: John H. Corcoran III ( CN=John H. Corcoran III/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Pub\_Arch@oa.eop.gov@inet ( Pub\_Arch@oa.eop.gov@inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: pubs\_backup@oa.eop.gov ( pubs\_backup@oa.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov ( INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (SYS)  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: usia01@access.digex.com ( usia01@access.digex.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: skgmd@umich.edu ( skgmd@umich.edu @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: klasky\_helaine@ustr.gov ( klasky\_helaine@ustr.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dmilbank@tnr.com ( dmilbank@tnr.com @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WOZNIAK\_N@a1.eop.gov ( WOZNIAK\_N@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (NSC)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: "Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Maria E. Soto ( CN=Maria E. Soto/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: SMITH\_BD@a1.eop.gov ( SMITH\_BD@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (OMB)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Reuben L. Musgrave Jr ( CN=Reuben L. Musgrave Jr/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [ OSTP ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: "Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kris M Balderston ( CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Catherine T. Kitchen ( CN=Catherine T. Kitchen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: David T. Johnson ( CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheyda Jahanbani ( CN=Sheyda Jahanbani/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: William C. Haymes ( CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William Hadley ( CN=William Hadley/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GRAY\_W@a1.eop.gov ( GRAY\_W@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (NSC)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: FORDE\_R@a1.eop.gov ( FORDE\_R@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) ()  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Elliot J. Diringer ( CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [ CEQ ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CUTLER\_L@a1.eop.gov ( CUTLER\_L@a1.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] ) (WHO)  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: George G. Caudill ( CN=George G. Caudill/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: "Brian A. Reich"@OVP.eop.gov ( "Brian A. Reich"@OVP.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew ( CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov ( "Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeannetta P. Allen ( CN=Jeannetta P. Allen/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen K. Ahn ( CN=Kathleen K. Ahn/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu ( backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GlynnME@state.gove ( GlynnME@state.gove @ inet [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:  
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(Miami, Florida)

---

Embargoed until 12:01 am EST Monday, December 13, 1999

RADIO INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT  
BY CBS NEWS

December 11, 1999

Wyndham Palace Resort  
Orlando, Florida

11:25 A.M. EST

Q President Clinton, thank you very much for joining us for this special interview with CBS News. Heading into the next century, beyond your immediate goals for the rest of your term, what do you think are the one or two top domestic challenges facing the country?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the aging of America and the children of the country. It's ironic that we seem to be growing at both ends. We're going to double the number of people over 65, and yet, we have the largest group of schoolchildren in our country's history in our schools, the first group bigger than the baby boomers and they're much, much more diverse.

They come from more different ethnic and racial and religious backgrounds. And I think that dealing with them are the two biggest things that ought to be on the front burner.

I also believe that, related to that, obviously, as you've heard me say many times, is the challenge of continuing to grow the economy while reaching out into poor areas, continuing to improve the environment and paying the debt off. I think those are the big, big challenges.

Q Mr. President, one of the things I've noticed about these celebrations that the White House, you and the First Lady are planning is that it's propagating the myth that January 1st is the start of the new millennium and the new century. Are you guilty of creating that erroneous impression?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I mean, I think basically, by common consent, everybody decided that we ought to celebrate the millennium on January the 1st, 2000, even though most of the strict correctionists say that it's January 1st, 2001.

Q Well, they're right, aren't they?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, apparently, that was the prevailing view among the experts, but the people have expressed a different wish, so we're going with the folks. We've got a democracy here, and that's the way we're going. It will be nice for me, maybe I can do it twice and I'll be a President of two millennial changes.

Q Well, looking ahead into the next century, whenever it begins, where do you see the power of the presidency itself evolving? Is it going to change?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, yes, it's always changing. But I think it will always -- at least for the future that I can foresee -- will continue to be an extremely important office. I think that a lot of the executive actions will be important, along with getting along with Congress. I think that building partnerships with the private sector will become more important. It will become more important to mobilize the American people and to organize them to meet the challenges in the future the way we've done.

For example, maybe a good example would be the way we've worked on wiring the schools, where we did -- the main government thing we did was to change the law so that we have this e-rate now in poorer schools and hospitals.

Q You mean wiring for the Internet?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, wiring for the Internet -- poorer schools and hospitals can get a discount rate. Then we go out and try to hustle up all the equipment and the Internet connections and get everybody to do that. So I think you'll see a lot more of that.

The other thing I think you will see is, I believe the world is

growing ever more interdependent, so I think the President, in order to effectively lead the world, will have to be an increasingly effective negotiator, conciliator, bringing people together, working people together. And I think it will be just as important 30 years from now for America to be involved in the rest of the world as it is now. But I think it will be an increasingly interdependent world that will require powers of persuasion and not just unilateral power.

Q Next year is also, as you well know, the final year of your presidency. Do you find that in any way liberating to try and do things that you weren't able to do in the first years of your presidency?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know if I find it liberating. I find it -- it's concentrated my attention and my energies. And obviously, since I'm not running, I could do things in an election year that might be difficult to do otherwise. But if you go back, I mean, we've taken a lot of controversial decisions. That's one of the reasons we lost the Congress in '94 -- we took on the gun lobby and the health care lobby and the deficit issue at the same time, and it was more than the system could bear, I think.

But I do think that I am acutely mindful of the fact that I have ~~14 months left, and that I need to be out there squeezing the most out of every day.~~ And I need to get as much done as I can for the American people, to try to leave our country in the best-possible shape so that the next president and the next Congress will be even freer than they are to basically look with a visionary eye to the future and take on the big issues. That's the theme that I had today in Florida; that's the theme that I try to echo everywhere.

I believe that this really is the only time in my lifetime we've had so much prosperity, social cohesion and national self-confidence, with the absence of internal crisis or external threat. I will get as much done on these big challenges as I can. But after I'm out of office and there is a new team in, I still think it's very important that they keep the American people focused on these big issues in the 21st century, because a society rarely has the luxury of having the tools and the space to deal with these long-term challenges that we now have. And I think it's very important that we seize it.

Q Let me ask you one specific, if I may, on the question of gays in the military. As you no doubt know, the First Lady this past week was critical of the don't ask, don't tell policy. She said it just doesn't work. You weren't going to institute that at the beginning of your presidency, anyway. Why not use the last year of your presidency to institute an end to discriminatory discharges against gays in the military? And what do you think of what the First Lady said this week?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I'm quite sympathetic with what she said. I think -- that was the position that both of us brought to the White House. But I think -- there's one thing that may be not clearly understood. The reason that I went for don't ask, don't tell is that it's all I could do because I had a clear signal from the Congress that if I implemented my policy, they would reverse it by overwhelming majorities.

I didn't implement don't ask, don't tell until the Senate voted 68-32 against the policy that I wanted. So I think it's very important -- for me, what's important is that the policy, as implemented, does not work as I announced it and as the leaders of our military at that time in '93 pledged to implement it.

I can only hope this last brutal beating death of a gay soldier will give some sobering impetus to a reexamination about how this policy is implemented and whether we can do a better job of fulfilling its original intent.

Let me remind you that the original intent was that people would not be rooted out, that they would not be questioned out, that this would be focused on people's conduct, and if they didn't violate the code of conduct, and they didn't tell, that their comings and goings, the mail they got, the associates they had, that those things would not be sufficient to kick them out of the military, or certainly subject them to harassment.

So what I would like to do is to focus on trying to make the policy that we announced back in '93 work the way it was intended to, because it's way -- it's out of whack now, and I don't think any serious person can say it's not.

Q How are you going to do that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're working with the Pentagon now to do it. I mean, I think there's a greater awareness now that it's just not -- it's not being implemented as it was announced and as it was intended.

Now, as for -- but I don't have any problem with what she says, because that's -- after all, that's what I said back in '93, and if anybody -- you know, if there's a sense in the Congress or in the next White House that that ought to be done, then maybe together they'll have enough votes to do it.

Q You mentioned earlier the importance of future presidents becoming even more mediators and conciliators on the world scene. This coming week, of course, Syria and Israel are going to be at the White House. And I know you told us at the news conference you've taken a blood oath to avoid discussing details of those long-stalled talks, the renewal of them, but how do you plan -- just in general, since you don't want to go into details -- how do you plan to get this process moving and keep it moving when you get these gentlemen sitting down again?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I want to get them together, let them talk, and get them to try to agree on an agenda and a timetable. They know what the issues are, and they know what the options are for resolving the issues. And my experience has been that competent people -- and you're dealing with two highly competent people here -- I mean, these people are good in what they do and representing the interests of their countries -- and that when -- they don't go into these negotiations without some idea about where they want to finish and some idea about where they'll have to

give, and whether the other person will give, and how it will all play out.

So on the other hand, it is difficult, but not as complex, in my view, as the Palestinian negotiations with Israel. So I would like to see them get together, talk together, get to know each other a little better, and agree on an agenda and a timetable, and then take a couple of days off and go back and meet with their respective teams to decide where they're going to start and where they're going to stop, and come back here and just look to burn through it, just keep going until we get the thing done.

Q Why is the time right now?

THE PRESIDENT: I think because both leaders, for different reasons, finally have this sense of urgency, and I think they should have a sense of urgency. And I think they know that the enemies of the peace process are gearing up, they want to try to derail it, and not just for the Palestinians. I think that they know that there is a sense of hope and possibility now, and I think they believe that Prime Minister Barak is committed to trying to resolve all this, just like he said he was.

Q Mr. President, is there any doubt in your mind, sir, that Russia is responsible for the listening device that was discovered at the State Department? And to what extent are you disturbed by it? Don't we all do the same things -- spy on each other?

THE PRESIDENT: I think when -- we have always taken spying seriously and taken appropriate action, and I think they will take appropriate action in this regard. And I have no reason to believe that the press accounts on this are not accurate.

Q You must be concerned, though, about this big security breach in the State Department.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I certainly wish it hadn't happened, but I think they learned something about this. I think now they'll figure out how to deal with this technology and it won't happen again. And I think we just have to -- look, the consequences of all this, while certainly not good, are not as dire as they were in the dark days of the Cold War when both of us were spying on each other in a much more sweeping way. And we had ways of dealing with it. And there's sort of an established protocol for dealing with this kind of thing and I think we ought to do it. And the main thing we ought to do is learn whatever we can from the incident -- how did they do this, how did they get away with it, how can we prevent it from happening again.

Q What effect will it have on American relations with Russia?

THE PRESIDENT: Based on what I now know, I think we should proceed where it's in our interest to do so in our relations with Russia, and where we have differences of opinion, we ought to proceed to articulate them. You can't let every spy case affect the larger national interests in the country.

Q Mr. President, a couple more reflective questions. Based on your own experiences over the years, going back to your first campaign, to what extent do you think a politician's private life should become part of the public record?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, I don't know. I think I'll let the press and the people decide that. I think -- let me say it in a different way -- I think that what I have seen too often is that the politics of personal destruction become the preferred option only when people think they can't win the old-fashioned way, they can't win on the issues or whatever.

Now, a person -- I'm not talking about whether somebody's robbed a bank or something like that, but I think that the pendulum swung pretty far over in the last three or four elections, and I think it's swinging back now. And I think that's what the voters are saying, and they'll try to get it right. But something ought to be genuinely relevant, and we ought not just target people for no good reason and just pound on them, and use that because they couldn't win the old-fashioned way. I think that both the politicians and the press should be mindful of that.

But it will get sorted out. These things come and go. You know, early in the 1800s, we had several years where this sort of thing was all the rage, completely dominated the political debate. And then it sort of faded away again. And these things come and go, and the underlying health of our democracy and the common sense of our people have always been enough to see us through, and I think they will be here.

Q What do you make of the recent statement by Ken Starr that he thinks you ought to get right with the law by admitting in a public way that you were not truthful in your statements under oath?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that I know what to make of Mr. Starr.

Q You know, he's giving interviews, he's doing talk shows?

THE PRESIDENT: No, but it's a free country.

Q Why do you think he's still pursuing this after he's resigned his office?

THE PRESIDENT: I just don't think I can serve any useful purpose by commenting on it now. Maybe I should follow his lead; when I don't have a job, I can comment on it more.

Q Speaking of that as we wind up here, besides getting your presidential library off the ground, what is Bill Clinton going to do with the rest of his life?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I hope I'll be a member of the Senate Spouses Club. That's one of the things I really hope I'll be. And I say that -- we're laughing, but I'm dead serious about that. I want to do what I can to help Hillary. And getting this library and public policy

center up and going and having it continue the best missions of my presidency I think will be quite time-consuming.

I hope I'll have a little more time for my family and my friends, but I still want to be a good citizen. I really admire what Jimmy Carter's done with his life. I wouldn't necessarily choose the same endeavors, although I've supported Habitat for Humanity and I certainly believe that if someone needed me in the future to monitor an election or something like that, I ought to be willing to do it.

But the main thing I want to say is that he has said -- the life he has lived has been a life of service. And he said -- he's also had a very interesting life. I mean, he's had time to go climb up to the base camp of Mount Everest, he goes fishing and does the things that he loves to do -- he goes skiing. But he has lived a life of service. And he has recognized that it is an incredible gift to have the chance to be President, and that when you have this gift for four or eight years, you learn things, you know things, you have a perspective that no one else has the chance to develop. And you can't just walk away from it and not at least make yourself available. If people don't want you to do anything, that's one thing. But at least you ought to be available for public service. And Jimmy Carter has lived a life of public service.

I admire that and I hope that when I leave here, I will be able to do a lot of the personal things I'm interested in, but, fundamentally, help in a way -- I don't want to be under foot for the next president, I don't want to get in anybody's way, but I do think there's a lot of good things I can do for the world and for our country, and I intend to try to do what I can.

Q Finally, sir, I know it's 14 months away, but what advice do you have for your successor and your successors as the last President of this century? What thoughts do you have to pass on to them?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it's very important for a President to have a sense of history and a sense of the future. You have to know where your country is at this moment in our journey. You have to know what the lives of the American people are like. Then you have to have a vision of what you think it ought to be. And once you do that, once you're grounded in the facts and the history and you have a vision of what you think you ought to be, then you need to have a lot of ideas and a lot of energy and a lot of interpersonal skills. And you just need to go to work every day and never forget your mission.

Because all the pressures in political life on the Chief Executive is at the center of the vortex of all of these things are designed to make you forget your mission. And those who remember their mission and stay on it tend to do very well, even under the most adverse circumstances.

You know, Lincoln once said in the Civil War, he said, my policy is to have no policy, I am controlled by events. And to some extent that was true. He was being very flexible and the government was a much more rudimentary enterprise than it is today. But to some extent, he was being disingenuous, because his policy was: I am going to save the Union; if I

have to burn every wheat field in this country and if I have to give up my own life to do it, we will not be split.

Okay, so he knew where he was in history -- you know, if you listened to him, he talked about George Washington a lot, he had this sense of -- he knew about the future. He signed the Moral Land Grant Act. He was all for the railroads and the public improvements. He had a lot of imagination about the future, Lincoln did, and he said, there won't be any future unless we hold together, no that's my policy, and I'm willing to try anything or anybody or any general to get it done.

The thing that made him great was, he never forgot what his mission was. He was grounded in history, he had the vision of the future. He used to say he kept regular office hours -- my office in the White House on the second floor is in Lincoln's waiting room, which was later the Office of the President through Theodore Roosevelt. But Lincoln used to keep regular office hours with people that wanted a job in a post office or something, because he said he wanted to be reminded on a regular basis of what the daily concerns of people were, and he wanted the war to be over so everybody could be restored to pursuing those daily concerns.

So, anyway, that's one specific, very big example of what I think the general rule is. You've got to understand your country's history, have some idea of your country's future, have a vision of where you want it to go, come up with a set of ideas and a good team, and just pursue it with all the energy and focus you can and have a good time doing it. That's my advice. Don't forget the mission, don't forget who you work for.

Q We're honor bound to break this off, sir, but we're very grateful for your time.

Q Thank you very much for doing this.

THE PRESIDENT: I've enjoyed it. Thank you.

END 11:47 A.M. EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando ( CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-DEC-1999 16:00:17.00

SUBJECT: CBS Face the Nation, December 12, 1999

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

TO: Brian A. Reich ( CN=Brian A. Reich/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kristina Wolfe ( CN=Kristina Wolfe/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak ( CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Michael A. Hammer ( CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan ( CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP@OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Matthew T. Schneider ( CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson ( CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Melissa G. Green ( CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:  
CBS FACE THE NATION  
DECEMBER 12, 1999

SPEAKERS: BOB SCHIEFFER, HOST, CBS FACE THE NATION  
GLORIA BORGER, U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT  
CORRESPONDENT  
MADELEINE ALBRIGHT, U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE  
HAROLD ICKES, HILLARY CLINTON CAMPAIGN ADVISER

SCHIEFFER: Today on FACE THE NATION, Secretary of State  
Madeleine Albright and Hillary Clinton's top adviser, Harold Ickes.

No one's busier than Secretary of State Albright these days. On the agenda, this week's Middle East talks between Israel and Syria, the case of the Cuban boy, the discovery of a sophisticated listening device at the State Department, and troubles with Yeltsin. We'll ask her about all those issues this morning.

Then we'll turn to the New York Senate race and talk with Hillary Clinton's top adviser, Harold Ickes.

Gloria Borger will be here, and I'll have a final word about old time invective.

But first, Secretary of State Madeline Albright on FACE THE NATION.

ANNOUNCER: FACE THE NATION, with chief Washington correspondent, Bob Schieffer. And now, from CBS NEWS in Washington, Bob Schieffer.

SCHIEFFER: Good morning again. And Madam Secretary, welcome. You're here in our studio this morning.

A very troubling thing, it seems to me. The State Department has now warned all Americans traveling abroad to take extra security precautions between now and the first week in January. It says there's a possibility or you have information that there may be attacks planned where large gatherings of people are taking place--celebrations and so on. What can you tell us about it?

ALBRIGHT: Well, basically we believe we have an obligation to let the American people know when there are potential terrorists threats, and we are concerned about Americans traveling abroad and being in large groups, and we are suggesting that if they do travel abroad, that they be in touch with the American embassy and the consulate and take care.

SCHIEFFER: Well, now, there will be some large gatherings in this country, of course, on New Year's Eve--Times Square, down on the mall here in Washington. Do you have any security concerns about those gatherings?

ALBRIGHT: Well, I think we always have to be vigilant. But the warning that we put out was for Americans abroad, and it is not something that is--that we--as we see it as targeted against Americans here.

SCHIEFFER: You know, you do this, the State Department does this from time to time, but this one seems a bit more ominous in some way.

ALBRIGHT: Well, I think we are concerned, obviously because there are a lot of activities going on, and I think that there are more specific indications.

But we don't want to discourage people. We want people to be very vigilant, and we want people to contact their--our embassies.

If people want more information, I'd suggest that they get in touch with our web site, which is [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov).

SCHIEFFER: Let me ask you, this is obviously aimed at--you're worried about some sort of a terrorist attack. Could it be Osama bin Laden? Is it anything to do with him?

ALBRIGHT: Well, let me say, we are--there are number of groups that we are watching obviously for some time. We have been concerned about Osama bin Laden, but these are--there are a variety of groups that we have been concerned about and are watching.

And we are concerned. There's no question about it. And we have to be vigilant, which is why we put out the warning.

SCHIEFFER: More than one group.

ALBRIGHT: Probably, yes.

BORGER: Madam Secretary, peace talks start next week between Israel and Syria. We have a wire report this morning that said that Syria's foreign minister is so optimistic that he's confident that a peace deal can be reached with Israel within a few months. Do you agree with that assessment?

ALBRIGHT: Well, you know, what is great is that this is the first time that we have had this kind of high-level meeting between a Syrian foreign minister and an Israeli prime minister. And I felt, when I was on my trip there last week, that there was a sense of optimism and a desire by both parties to stop talking about talking and getting down to negotiations.

There clearly are very hard decisions to be made, and they're going to be talking about four basic areas, that is, withdrawal from the Golan Heights, the mutual security arrangements, the content or character of the peace and the timetable.

And what we hope will happen while they're here this week is that they will set out the agenda for--obviously there'll be more talks--and I had a sense of optimism after I had my meeting with President Assad. But nobody should underestimate. This is going to be tough going, but we--this is an amazing moment, and there is a sense that a historic opportunity is present.

BORGER: Do you think this is the closest they've ever come right now?

ALBRIGHT: Well, it's certain they've never met at this level. And I think that that is very hopeful.

But I think there are lots of things that are going to have to be talked about.

BORGER: Let me also ask you, we have a wire story that says that this morning Israel signaled that it would look to United States taxpayers to bankroll any pullout from the Golan Heights. Would we be willing to finance that?

ALBRIGHT: Well, first of all, I think it's kind of premature to discuss it. But as a matter of record, I think that...

BORGER: They're saying that.

ALBRIGHT: Well, but I think that as a matter of record we've seen that after Camp David that there was--that the United States Congress and the administration came forward with some assistance after Wye.

And I think we've got to remember that if we manage this, this will be 50 years of work that will have been accomplished for a comprehensive peace that I think everybody will cheer and be happy to contribute to.

SCHIEFFER: You just called this an "amazing moment." Tell me why it's an amazing moment. What made it so?

ALBRIGHT: Well, I think--on my trip, what was interesting was even from the minute that I landed in Saudi Arabia and met with the king and Crown Prince Abdullah, there was a sense there that they wanted--they also, the Saudis, saw this as a time for moving forward and a time that we had to seize the opportunity.

And when I met with President Assad, I got a sense--some 20 minutes into the meeting--that we were going a somewhat different direction, that there was, again, that people were tired about negotiating about negotiations.

ALBRIGHT: And Prime Minister Barak has had such energy about getting into the peace process issues. And obviously, has set deadlines

for the Palestinian track. And what--and then when I met with Chairman Arafat, he also wanted to see that track move forward.

And what I have made quite clear is that we can do, or they can, we are there as the honest broker, the parties themselves have to make the decisions. But this is a time when the tracks can move forward on their own speed and we are not going to do one track at the expense of another.

BORGER: Would we be interested in participating or leading an international peacekeeping force?

ALBRIGHT: I think that is a premature question. And I think that we'll see how it develops. Neither party has asked us to do that. And I think we've got a ways to go before such questions can be answered.

SCHIEFFER: Madam secretary, I have to ask you about this thing that happened last week, we all learned about, that somehow or another, the Russians apparently put some very sophisticated listening device in a conference room on the very floor of the State Department where your office is. Do you know yet, how it got there, or how long it's been there?

ALBRIGHT: First of all, let me say I consider this a very serious matter. And we have worked very hard, the diplomatic service has, Diplomatic Security Service, has worked very hard with the FBI. They have been--I was briefed about this a couple of months ago, they have been working on this and we stopped it, we discovered it. And I think that's very important.

The other point I think is important for your viewers is while it was on the same floor that I'm on, the State Department is a huge square building, and this is on the other side of the square. And the most sensitive offices, which are my corridor, none of those have been--that we've swept those and there was nothing there.

SCHIEFFER: But as yet, you don't know how it got there, or how long it's been there?

ALBRIGHT: Well, this is under investigation. And I do not know the specifics of that. But I think that we are going about it the right way. We are very concerned about how this happened, and tightened security obviously.

SCHIEFFER: In a broader sense, does this say in some way that perhaps the Russians are stepping up their spy activities now?

ALBRIGHT: I wouldn't characterize it. I think the thing we have to remember is that spying is an old form; that it's always been going on. It's our responsibility to protect ourselves against it. We have to do a better job. I have been consistently tightening security from where I found it. We have specifically tightened a whole host of policies.

Our problem, to a great extent, is resources. Because at the same time that we're doing this, we've got the problem with trying to make our buildings overseas secure against terrorists.

BORGER: Is it possible that there's a mole in the State Department?

ALBRIGHT: I--you know, it's--I'm not going to speculate on that. We are--they're questioning people in terms of trying to find out, you know, witnesses to things, but I'm not going to speculate on something like that.

BORGER: So, but the fact that they're questioning people, it makes you think that this could have been an inside job, because they hid this bug in molding, and...?

ALBRIGHT: I can't comment on the details of it. But the

questioning is not in terms of questioning suspects. It's mainly trying to find out who saw what and trying to piece the story together.

And what I've done is, my Assistant Secretary for Security is not a diplomat, I can't disparage diplomats. But I now have a 27-year veteran of the secret service who is my Assistant Secretary David Carpenter. And he is going about this in a very, very systematic way.

SCHIEFFER: Just one more question about this. Do you know, or is it possible to know if serious security leaks came out of this? I mean were there discussions in this room that we wouldn't have wanted the Russians to know about?

ALBRIGHT: Well, this is not, as I said in the most sensitive part of the State Department. And as far as we can tell, a lot of the meetings there were not the kind that would be the most secret or sensitive as far as we know.

SCHIEFFER: Let's talk a little bit about this young boy that's become the center of this diplomatic situation between Cuba and the United States. What's going to happen there, Madam Secretary? Shouldn't this boy be sent back to his father? I mean, in any court in this country when there is a father there, wouldn't he have rights over anyone else's rights?

ALBRIGHT: Well, first of all we have to remember that this is a case--there's a little boy involved in it. And also there are various legal provisions. The immigration and naturalization service is going through processing. We have sought--or the INS has sought to interview the boy's father. And there has been no response from Cuba on that. And I think that what we have to do is follow through the legal parts of this, and that is what we're doing.

BORGER: Will you return the boy without an interview? Do you have to have an interview?

ALBRIGHT: I think that--we believe that INS is doing the processing. They are the ones that are in charge of it. I'm not going to speculate on that, but I think that the boy--I mean, Bob just said that often, you know, the parental rights, and what has to be established here are the parental rights and the father needs to be interviewed.

BORGER: Do you have any message to Fidel Castro on this?

ALBRIGHT: Well, the main thing that I have is just a general message, to remember that this is a little boy and not a political football.

SCHIEFFER: Let's talk a little bit about Russia. Mr. Yeltsin this week said perhaps the United States has forgotten that we're a country with nuclear weapons. Is that a threat? Is that something you take seriously? It sounds kind of scary on first hearing.

ALBRIGHT: Well, we don't take it as a threat and Prime Minister Putin indicated it was not. I think that we clearly are watching a very difficult situation in Russia, a country that has been a superpower, our major adversary, that is going through a very difficult time. I think that what President Yeltsin was doing was basically reminding the world that Russia counts. We met with President Yeltsin, President Clinton and I, in Istanbul. He is a fierce defender of Russian national interests and energetic. And at the same time, we have a lot of business to do with Russia.

SCHIEFFER: Some people say that maybe he was just drunk.

ALBRIGHT: I'm not--you know, I think that he was stating the case that Russia needs to be recognized. And one of the problems here, if

you think about it, here was a country, which for 70 years was out there as a superpower that's going through very, very difficult changes. And I think we have to recognize that.

BORGER: Realistically, Madam Secretary, what can we do about Chechnya? You have a situation where the top Russian commander has said we won't allow these people to survive the winter? What can you do?

ALBRIGHT: Well, let me just say the Chechnya issue is again a very difficult one. The Russians were concerned about terrorist threats. They had buildings that were bombed in Moscow. There was an attack by rebels from Chechnya into Dagestan. And they were concerned about that. The international community, we as leading it, have made very clear that while they may have a terrorist problem, they cannot deal with this by indiscriminate bombing of civilians, and that they need to understand that the only solution to this is a political solution.

What has been hopeful in the last day is that Prime Minister Putin has indicated that they are beginning to talk to some of the representatives of the Chechen leader, Maskhadov. There is a mission going from the OSCE in the next couple of days and the international community, the Europeans with us, have been talking about a political solution. It is very bad. There is no question. We are very concerned about the civilians.

SCHIEFFER: But you seem to see just a glimmer of good news here?

ALBRIGHT: Perhaps. I want to be very realistic about this. They have a goal. They want to make sure that Chechnya does not keep causing them problems. On the other hand, I think that they have understood the international pressure to some extent and there is a sense that Russia is becoming isolated. We're having meetings next week in Europe. I'm going to be in Berlin where we're meeting with the G-8, where Russians are the eighth member of that. And clearly this is going to be a topic of discussion. And so they know that this is on our minds.

I have talked to Foreign Minister Ivanov practically every day. We are either talking about resolutions at the UN or about Chechnya or other things and they know how seriously we take this.

SCHIEFFER: Madam Secretary, thank you so much. It's an understatement to say that you have a busy week ahead of you here.

ALBRIGHT: Well, thank you. It's great to be with you both.

SCHIEFFER: When we come back, we'll switch gears and talk about that New York Senate race in just a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER: And we're back now with Harold Ickes, who of course was a senior adviser to Bill Clinton throughout a lot of his presidency. Now most people say you're the senior adviser to the Hillary Clinton campaign. Welcome, Mr. Ickes.

ICKES: Thank you, Bob.

SCHIEFFER: So your candidate this week separated herself from her husband. She said the president's don't ask-don't tell policy in regards to gays in the military has not worked. She seems to have convinced one person, the president. He now comes out yesterday and said well, in fact that is right. They haven't worked. Will we see more of this as this campaign unfolds?

ICKES: I think you're going to see differences of issues develop, Bob. I mean, the president represents the nation. He represents a different constituency than Hillary, who is running as we all know, has declared her candidacy, unlike Mr. Giuliani, and has said that she'll

serve the full six years, unlike Mr. Giuliani. So you are going to see some differences and you're going to see a lot of similarities.

SCHIEFFER: But is it fair to ask why now? Why all of a sudden do we find out that Hillary Clinton has decided don't ask-don't, tell doesn't work? And then the President of the United States says oh yes, that's right. Why didn't he say that last year?

ICKES: I don't know. That's a question you'll have to ask the president of the United States. I'm not in a position to answer that. She has looked at this and she thinks it doesn't work and she said so the other day.

BORGER: Is it difficult then for the president to campaign for her, if they disagree on more and more issues as the campaign goes along?

ICKES: No, absolutely not. First of all, this is Hillary's campaign. The president will be doing what, hopefully he will be doing what she asks him to do. But this is her campaign. She's got to run it and she's going to run it and win.

BORGER: But how involved is he? How involved is the president going to be in this campaign?

ICKES: That will depend upon Hillary and what she wants. He is, in my view, the best-campaign strategist that I have ever met. Obviously they are close. They talk about a number of issues on a continuing basis. But his exact role in the campaign has not been defined and that will be worked out.

SCHIEFFER: Is she going to march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade? Because as you know, with your background in New York politics, this is a very controversial area. Because the Order of Hibernians do not allow gay people to march in that parade. And now--or gay groups, her gay supporters are telling her now, don't march in this parade. Is she going to?

ICKES: She hopes to. She hopes the parade will be inclusive. I remind you that Pat Moynihan, Ed Koch, Peter Vallone (ph), Rudy Giuliani and many others marched in the parade. She hopes to but she hopes it will be inclusive.

SCHIEFFER: Well, what does that mean though? Does that mean if it's not inclusive, if they can't march, the gay folks can't march with their banners that she won't march?

ICKES: Right at this point she hopes to march and she hopes it will be inclusive. And that's where we are.

BORGER: Right now Mrs. Clinton is not doing as well in the polls as I think you would probably like, particularly in the suburban areas of New York. One latest poll said she's behind 59-34 in the suburbs. Why do you think that is?

ICKES: I think part of it--most of it, Gloria, is that people just really are not familiar yet with her issues. There are two overriding issues it seems to me. Number one, Hillary's on your side on a whole range of issues: education, health care, the economy. We can go into details on those at a later point.

Two is, who is going to be most effective in the United States Senate? Those are two key issues and that's what the voters are going to be deciding on in November of 2000.

People know Hillary as the first lady. Many people don't know where she is on a number of issues. But as she campaigns now full bore in New York which she's going to--she's been there a lot already. She is going to increase that extensively after the first of the year. People are

going to really learn about her differences with the mayor.

For instance, on education, the mayor cut the construction budget \$7 billion for a school system that in many cases that is crumbling. He cut \$360 million from the education budget itself. Hillary is in favor of increasing educational opportunities. That is only one difference. As the differences come out, I think people will make a judgment on who is on your side and, two, as importantly, as importantly, who can best function in the United States Senate.

SCHIEFFER: Gail Sheehy says in her book about Mrs. Clinton that in a discussion between you and the first lady, you describe the Senate race as a race for redemption. First, did you say that? And do you believe that?

ICKES: No, I did not say that. And I don't believe it. I think that there are people who believe that, and people have said that to me, but I did not make the quote that Ms. Sheehy represents me as making in that book. But obviously there are a number of people who think that part of this is a race for redemption.

This race is two-fold. One, New Yorkers, a broad spectrum invited her to come in and run. Two, she was going to live New York anyway. ~~Three, she has~~ a history, a long history of public service and she wants to continue that. She felt that the United States Senate was a place she could achieve that.

BORGER: Al Gore is having a little bit of trouble in his presidential campaign these days. Do you think that he might actually hurt her race in New York?

ICKES: No. New Yorkers are notoriously independent. They are not--whoever they vote for for president is not going to affect their vote for the United States Senate, and there will be a large turnout.

BORGER: But do you think that he's doing so poorly that anyway he can drag her down?

ICKES: No, not in any way shape or form. People--New Yorkers are very, very independent. When they vote for the top of the ticket--as the president, the United States senator--they know exactly who they want to vote for when they pull the lever, and their vote for president is not going to affect their vote for the United States senator.

SCHIEFFER: Some of the New York dailies have been kind of hard on Mrs. Clinton, talking about her temperament. Does it concern you that maybe she might blow a gasket during this campaign?

ICKES: No. I think there was--I think when she first started to get out and about, there were people--members of the fourth estate who wondered how she would react towards the press, because there was a lot of mythology that she was--had sort of an adverse view towards the press.

I think as you look back over the sweep of the last five or six months, her relationship with the press has been terrific. She's been open, she's been holding press conferences on a weekly and sometimes a daily basis. Her relationship with the press I think is excellent.

She is not going to blow a gasket. Anybody who's watched Hillary Clinton knows that she is very self-disciplined.

SCHIEFFER: Well, we'd like to have her here, so we are depending on you to help us get her.

(LAUGHTER)

Thank you, Mr. Ickes, nice to have you this morning.

ICKES: Thank you.

SCHIEFFER: I'll be back with a final word in just a minute.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SCHIEFFER: Rummaging through a collection of Eric Sevareid's old commentaries, I suddenly realized what we're missing in this presidential campaign. We are sorely in need of more creative name calling. The best the Republicans have managed so far is when the Manchester Union leader endorsed Steve Forbes, even though he ``looks like a geek," as the newspaper put it. Now that's catchy, but we can't count that, since it was meant as a compliment, I guess.

No compliment was intended back in 1952 when Harry Truman called the Republicans ``smolligosters" (ph). And Washington was so shocked then that Eric Sevareid had to remind his listeners that name calling has always been a revered part of American politics. He remembered how General Winfield Scott's opponents called him the ``peacock of politics--all fuss, feathers and fireworks," and how they said President McKinley ``had the backbone of a chocolate eclair."

For pure invective, I have always been partial to John L. Lewis's description of Roosevelt's vice president, Garner, as a, quote, ``labor-baiting, poker playing, whiskey drinking evil old man."

Well, this year's Republican debates have been polite as a sixth-grade spelling bee. So if the Democrats want higher TV ratings for theirs, maybe Bill Bradley should start by calling Al Gore and ``Internet inventing, Love Canal discovering, earth-tone wearing tree hugger."

And what if Gore just called Bradley ``a big dribbler," and then sat down.

Anyhow, if you hear of a candidate in either party who says his opponent has the backbone of a chocolate eclair, call me. I may vote for him.

That's our report. We'll see you next Sunday right here on FACE THE NATION.

END