

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 12:39:09.00

SUBJECT: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

TO: Pat.mcmurray@msnbc.com (Pat.mcmurray@msnbc.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 12:03:26.00

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Who should be in the meeting?

Eddie: counsel

Potter: OPL

Cahill: OPL

NSC?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tingen Terri <tingen-terri@dol.gov> (Tingen Terri <tingen-terri@dol.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 13-DEC-1999 09:37:54.00

SUBJECT: RE: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hi J -- it's like deja vu -- seeing your name pop up on my e-mail....

Hope you are doing well and that you and Mark have a happy holiday.

From:

Jennifer_M._Palmieri@who.eop.gov[SMTP:Jennifer_M._Palmieri@who.eop.gov]

Sent: Sunday, December 12, 1999 10:11 PM

To: Brian_S._Mason@who.eop.gov; Brooke_B._Livingston@who.eop.gov;
GlynnME@state.gove; SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov; backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu;
wh-outbox-distr@[198.137.240.100]; 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;
BARTHOLOW_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"@Ingate4.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"@Ingate4.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"@Ingate4.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@[198.137.240.100]; 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@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
Subject: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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: eric.dodds@gsa.gov (eric.dodds@gsa.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 11:45:21.00

SUBJECT: Today's Political Briefing - December 13, 1999

TO: Julie K. Anderson (CN=Julie K. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: nolenp9@aol.com (nolenp9@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Eric M. Dodds/C/CO/GSA/GOV
on 12/13/99 11:23 AM -----

Hap Connors
12/13/99 11:23 AM

To:
cc: (bcc: Eric M. Dodds/C/CO/GSA/GOV)

Subject: Today's Political Briefing - December 13, 1999

----- Forwarded by Hap Connors/X/CO/GSA/GOV on
12/13/99 11:21 AM -----

From: "The Political Insider" <Publisher@politicalinsider.com>
AT internet on 12/13/99 02:18 PM

To: Hap Connors/X/CO/GSA/GOV
cc:

Subject: Today's Political Briefing - December 13, 1999

- ckvga012.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Text Item

The Political Insider - <http://politicalinsider.com>

BUY POLITICAL TIES, WHITE HOUSE ORNAMENTS, POLITICAL STUFFED
ANIMALS and more for Christmas!
[http:](http://)

//st6.yahoo.com/cgi-bin/clink?politicalgifts+vpUYrP+index.html

FREE DELIVERY! Get your friends to sign up for FREE delivery by email, by printer, fax or direct to your Palm PDA!

<http://politicalinsider.com/delivery.htm>

Today's Political Briefing - December 13, 1999

(Links to all stories at <http://politicalinsider.com/briefing.htm>)

A customer poll shows most aren't satisfied by the White House's effort to "reinvent government," the Wall Street Journal reports. Customer satisfaction has become "a catch-phrase in the halls of government" since Vice President Al Gore launched a task force in 1993 to oversee the initiative. Bill Bradley and George W. Bush's top domestic policy advisor, Stephen Goldsmith, have both endorsed a book critical of Gore's reinventing government effort. An excerpt explains why government does not "work better and cost less" as Gore promised.

For the first time since their fateful friendship and taped conversations set off the investigation of a president, Monica Lewinsky and Linda Tripp will confront each other, this time in court, the NY Times reports.

Bill Clinton may be going Hollywood when he leaves office as head of the influential Motion Picture Association of America, according to a NY Post report. MPAA head Jack Valenti told the New Yorker "he'd like the person who replaces him to have 'a global reputation' and that it ought to be someone with a background 'in the political field.' And the movie czar says that Clinton would be exposed to a lot more 'beautiful women' in the show-biz job than if he were to take a dull, corporate post in the business world."

ELECTION 2000

For tonight's debate in Iowa, it t seems nearly everyone's strategy is to shake up George W. Bush now that they sense he's not a formidable debater, MSNBC reports. The Arizona Republic says Bush "needs to score" in the debate. ABC News summed it up this way: "John McCain wants to increase his momentum. Millionaire Steve Forbes needs a break-out performance. Conservative activist Gary Bauer, Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah and former ambassador Alan Keyes need the attention." The debate will start at 8 p.m. ET and will be carried on MSNBC.

Al Gore campaign in the South to offer himself as "the Democrat

better suited to win the region's blacks, senior citizens and environmentalists," the Washington Post reports. Gore and Bill Bradley also "opened a spirited competition for Florida voters" during the weekend, delivering dueling speeches before the state Democratic convention that sharply contrasted their records, styles and visions for the country, the NY Times and Palm Beach Post report. The Washington Post says the "new Gore" -- the more aggressive, passionate campaigner -- is actually much like the Gore who ran for president in 1988. Meanwhile, President Clinton formally endorsed Gore for president, the AP reports, but he cancelled a fundraising trip to Houston because of the flu, according to the Houston Chronicle. But Clinton will probably help Gore more by staying away from this week's formal handover of the Panama Canal, Reuters reports. The White House fears Republicans could use the surrender of the canal as campaign ammunition against Gore.

Bill Bradley said that his irregular heartbeat will have "no effect whatsoever" on his bid for the Democratic presidential nomination as he returned to the campaign trail for appearances on both coasts, USA Today reports. He said old shoulder, back and knee injuries from his days as a professional basketball player were actually more bothersome. Bradley blamed the ailment on skipped medication, according to the Washington Post. The NY Daily News has the best headline for the story: "Bradley: I Won't Miss a Beat." Nonetheless, the Chicago Tribune says the health of the candidates is now an issue in the campaign. Meanwhile, part 2 of a Washington Post profile says that Bradley continues to be "a loner" on the campaign trail, much like he was in the U.S. Senate, making his own decisions without consulting his staff and advisors." Part 1 ran on Sunday. And the Seattle Times endorsed Bradley over the weekend.

Orrin Hatch would "hit the ground running" if elected president, ABC News reports. Hatch "would immediately revoke a 1993 executive directive allowing federal clinics to offer abortion counseling, according to a copy of Hatch's plan for a new administration obtained by ABC News. In all, Hatch would revoke five executive orders already signed by President Clinton, including the directive on abortion ? one of Clinton's first presidential decisions, which caused a wave of protests by anti-abortion groups."

Steve Forbes recently came face to face with George W. Bush in Iowa "and was treated to a vision of his coming task in Iowa's caucuses next month," the NY Times reports.

John McCain "is a politician on a roll, gambling and gaining in the race against George W. Bush and the rest of the pack for the Republican presidential nomination." But he hopes skipping the lead-off Iowa caucuses on Jan. 24 won't choke off a remarkable rise in New Hampshire, which holds the nation's

first presidential primary eight days later, the AP reports. McCain called his campaign for the Republican presidential nomination "a great crusade" in which the odds were stacked strongly against him, Reuters writes. The Boston Globe profiles McCain's hardball tactics.

Alan Keyes was profiled by ABC News and his appeal to conservatives was analyzed. "They like that he can name obscure foreign leaders, that he doesn't wear tan suits, and that he can spin even a question about NASA into an impromptu sermon on spirituality."

Louisiana Republicans' plans for a first-in-the-nation presidential caucus Jan. 15 were scrapped today by a state central committee dominated by the forces of Gov. Mike Foster, the AP reports.

In the first Internet-era national election, presidential candidates "are eager to let voters know they are as comfortable with a mouse as the next guy is," the NY Times reports.

The White House is adjusting to an absent first lady as Hillary Clinton gears up for her New York Senate race, the Christian Science Monitor reports. "Already, she has dropped from her schedule some ceremonial duties, such as last week's lighting of the national Christmas tree. And because she'll be in Washington less often, she'll be absent from events she would not have missed before." The Washington Post's Howie Kurtz examines how the NY Post is a Hillary battering ram. "To no one's surprise, Rupert Murdoch's tabloid has emerged as a major force in the Senate showdown, relentlessly flailing the first lady while treating the mayor, Rudy Giuliani, with respect." Mrs. Clinton will be in Rhode Island today, the Providence Journal reports.

POLITICS

The Washington Post reports on a new political website set to debut in January, called SpeakOut. It will allow "visitors to gather information on politicians and issues and then voice their opinions about each."

Al Gore said that Elian Gonzalez' father in Cuba should be given a visa to visit this country so he can express, without possible intimidation, his views on the best interests of the boy, the Washington Post and CNN report.

The SF Chronicle previews Tuesday's mayoral runoff between Mayor Willie Brown and Supervisor Tom Ammiano.

At 11:59 and 59 seconds on Dec. 31, John Koskinen, "Y2K czar," will be seated in a specially built glass-walled war room,

where his staff "of more than 100 will keep watch on the global changeover to a new year, a new century, a new millennium," the NY Times reports. An MSNBC piece says that the White House is already trying to manage expectations. Meanwhile, President Clinton said he hoped to celebrate the millenium twice, Reuters reports.

The NY Times profiles Clinton's top fundraiser, Terry McAuliffe, who has "raised about \$275 million, an unprecedented sum, for Clinton's causes: election campaigns, the 1997 inaugural celebration, a legal defense trust, the millennium festivities, the presidential library and Hillary Rodham Clinton's Senate campaign."

President Clinton has sided with his wife Hillary in admitting that his "don't ask, don't tell" policy has failed to end discrimination and harassment for homosexuals in the armed forces, the Times of London reports.

OPINION

Robert Novak of the Chicago Sun-Times writes that "Margaret Thatcher was not pleased by her inclusion in television commercials boosting Steve Forbes for the Republican presidential nomination, and made clear to George W. Bush that it was used without her permission."

David Brooks writes in the LA Times that "what is unnerving about [George W. Bush's] performance [in the debates] is he hasn't shown that he has spent his life trying to acquire the deep pools of experience and wisdom he will need to draw upon if he becomes president."

Jeff Jacoby of the Boston Globe writes that "In the aftermath of riots that disrupted the World Trade Organization, caused millions of dollars in damage, and blackened the reputation of Seattle's police, Chief Norm Stamper did the stand-up thing. He stepped down."

Geneva Overholser of the Washington Post writes: "Fie on Steve Forbes. Just as Washington-bashing was beginning to feel passe, here he comes again, trying to renew the attack. A few thousand bucks for every time Forbes spits out "Washington" on the campaign trail, and we'd all soon be in his tax bracket."

Ron Brownstein of the LA Times writes that that after years of having "reducing the budget deficit" as a major policy goal, Bush and Bradley may be moving in the direction of high-cost ideas.

James Pinkerton writes in the SJ Mercury News that "The new e-campaigning is overwhelming the old politicking, and yet the existing bureaucratic-reformer complex in Washington insists on

fighting the last war, long after it's been lost."

Arianna Huffington writes in the Miami Herald: "Listen to any presidential contender or other political leader on what happened in Seattle, and cluelessness reigns."

IN THE MAGAZINES

Time covers the newly aggressive Al Gore. "If Bill Bradley ever really believed that running for President in 1999 could be a virtuous, high-minded mission--a journey to "a world of new possibilities, guided by goodness," as he likes to say--last week should have rid him of the notion once and for all.

Bradley spent the week fending off cheap shots (and effective politics) from Al Gore, his rival for the Democratic nomination, and spending big in New Hampshire to keep his poll numbers from slipping."

Newsweek says Warren Beatty will not run for president.

U.S. News and World Report is about a year early as it profiles Clinton's final days as president. Clinton "tells friends he'd love to run for a third term next year. He knows the 22nd Amendment makes that impossible but says it's a shame he has to leave office now that, he believes, he has finally become the president he always wanted to be?in firm control of the levers of power, master of the details of policy, at 53 still vigorous and in sync with the popular mood."

BUY THE UPDATED EDITION OF "HARDBALL" by Christopher Matthews.

http:

[//www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ISBN=0684845598/youwonnowwhatA/](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ISBN=0684845598/youwonnowwhatA/)

BEST POLITICAL NEWSWIRES! Political Insider scans over 1500 news sources and provides the headlines and links to stories 24 hours a day!

ELECTION NEWS: <http://politicalinsider.com/newswire.htm>

POLITICS NEWS: http:

[//politicalinsider.com/newswire-politicsnews.htm](http://politicalinsider.com/newswire-politicsnews.htm)

MEDIA NEWS: http:

[//politicalinsider.com/newswire-medianews.htm](http://politicalinsider.com/newswire-medianews.htm)

TOP NEWS: <http://politicalinsider.com/newswire-topnews.htm>

To unsubscribe, write to

politicalinsider-unsubscribe@listbot.com Start Your Own FREE
Email List at <http://www.listbot.com/links/joinlb>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 13:58:02.00

SUBJECT: Talk Daily -- 12/13/99

TEXT:

Welcome to TALK DAILY, an online service of Talkers
magazine.

Each weekday, TALK DAILY presents an overview of
issues and quotes excerpted from a cross-section of some of
the leading
issues-oriented radio talk show hosts in America.

Talk Daily was last updated on December 11th, 1999.

Friday, December 10

Rush Limbaugh

12-3pm (ET)

Radio Active Media - 550 Stations

ISSUE: George W. Bush as a Candidate

QUOTE:

Rush: "There is a genuine sick empty suit out there,
his name is Al Gore. The
man is telling abject lies that demand serious
psychological analysis. +I
invented the Internet, the movie and book Love Story
were about me, I
discovered Love Canal. I mean there's a candidate out
there with some
serious psychological flaws on par with Bill Clinton.
They are being ignored.
George W. Bush is not intellectually deficient in any
way, Al Gore definitely is,
in a whole bunch of ways. You're never going to get the
same queries or the
same analysis or the same curiosity about Al Gore that
they now are
drumming away at George W. Bush. I don't even know how
slowly they're
doing it now, I thought it would be a slow process
where they chip away
gradually, but it's pretty heavy now. You can count on
everyday some

member of the elite liberal press taking up the responsibility to keep this aspect of George W. Bush's life, character, personality alive as though it's been an assignment. It's not a spoken assignment, the mainstream press, the liberals, they all know what they've got to do. As I said to Russert, they're going to have to find a way to counter it. There are some who think that George W. Bush is purposely allowing for this caricature, and I don't know this to be true, this is somebody's theory, because the last thing America wants is a bunch of guys that run around and talk in Senate lingo. Bush, so goes the theory, might be cultivating this average guy mentality as a way to relate. I have no idea about that. All I can tell you is the last thing he is, is a lightweight and the fact that the columnists and the reporters in the mainstream press continue to focus on it is an indication to me that it is being done purposefully."

Don Imus

5:30-10am (ET)

Infinity - Westwood One

ISSUE: Interview with Howie Long

GUEST: Howie Long (Former football star and sports

analyst)

QUOTES:

Imus: "Apparently there's some attention convention going on at the Long household because of this commercial he did with Terry Hatcher, this Radio Shack commercial, but certainly your wife understands that the director says, you know, let's get some chemistry going here, you two." Howie Long(on the phone): "Oh yeah, she's just giving me a hard time, I mean the catch phrase in the whole commercial is get in, get out, get what you want and I hear that a lot here. She's got a good sense of humor."

Imus: "She better have one."

Howie Long: "Well you marry an Italian from Jersey and that's what you get."

Imus: "Now the St. Louis Rams, I don't even know the guy but Dick Vermeil,

I know he's 65 years-old but you have to stop crying-you're a football coach."

Howie: "You know Dick is a genuine guy. When I was coming out of Villanova I didn't really know what direction I was going to go in. I went to workout for the Philadelphia Eagles and Dick was there. Dick called me up to his office and he was being very sincere when he said this and this is the kind of guy Dick is, Dick is a good guy. He said, '+Howie I just don't think you can play defensive line in this league.' He said, '+make sure before they cut you that someone tries you at offensive guard' and you might take offense to that, but he sincerely meant it. Dick cries a lot."
Imus: "And what did you wind up playing for Oakland."
Howie: "Defensive end and defensive tackle."
Imus: "I guess you'll be going into the Hall of Fame at that position or at least you've been nominated for that."
Howie: "Yeah..."
Imus: "Maybe Dick will cry that day too."

Howard Stern

6-10am (ET)

Infinity - Westwood One

ISSUE: Emperor Stern

QUOTES:

Howard: "This whole society is screwed up, I have to get in control. If I can just be allowed to be the President of the United States for a year, not President, Emperor of the United States. I would straighten out every lawyer, I would straighten out everything. I'm a control freak, it would be so great to have me in office."
Robin: "You're head would explode."
Howard: "You think Giuliani is good, you should see me in office."
Robin: "You're head would explode if you really had to deal with people."
Howard: "No, I wouldn't deal with them, I would be Emperor, I would surpass all laws. I would be like the Supreme Emperor."
Robin: "Yeah and then the people would turn on you because they don't like what you're doing, trying to get them in line."
Howard: "Then I'll get the hell out of the country."

Neal Boortz

News Talk 750 WSB, Atlanta and National Syndication -

Cox Radio

Network

ISSUES: Bible Education/Panama Canal

QUOTES:

Neal: "The State Board of Education has decided to let local school boards decide whether or not they want to offer Bible education in the government schools. Smart move. As soon as these courses are offered lawsuits will be filed. Costs will be incurred and the local boards can take the heat from the local taxpayers. This is just as it should be."
"Clinton is backpedaling as hard as he can on his statement last week that +I would be very surprised if any adverse consequences flowed from the Chinese running the canal.' Oops! Sometimes the truth just doesn't serve Clinton well. No wonder he prefers lying. At any rate, he's trying to cover his tracks now. Yesterday he said that he is comfortable + turning over the control of the canal, and now he says that it is Panama, not China, who will run the show.' O.K., Clinton. If you're so comfortable with turning over the canal, why don't you hustle yourself down there to participate in the ceremony next Tuesday? Why don't you at least send Big Al down there? The answer is obvious ---- the turnover of the Panama Canal isn't going to play well with the American people, and Clinton wants to keep himself and his anointed as far away as possible. Please, no pictures."

Les Kinsolving

WCBM, 680 AM, Baltimore

ISSUE: John McCain and George W. Bush

QUOTES:

"During the 100th Army-Navy Game, one of the guests of Naval Academy Superintendent Admiral John Ryan was an Annapolis alumnus, who is a U.S. Senator and Republican candidate for the Presidency. WCBM asked Sen. John McCain: WCBM: 'When you met with the Log Cabin Republicans (a homosexual political organization) did you make any concessions?' Sen. McCain: 'None. In fact I told them that we were in disagreement on the don't

ask, don't tell policy, which I support; legalization of homosexual marriage, etcetera. But I also told them that we agreed on less government, lower taxes, stronger defense, etcetera. They're a part of the Republican Party, but we did not agree on their issues. But I will be glad to meet with any part of the Republican Party.' Sen. McCain's meeting with this organization was widely reported. But we were aware of no such media reporting of the fact that he told them of his opposition to recruiting self-identifying, advertising homosexuals into the armed forces--as Sen. Bill Bradley is--and so is Hillary Clinton--in opposition to her husband's policy. (Mrs. Clinton is moving out of the White House and beginning to campaign for the U.S. Senate. But the White House refuses to say whether or not the taxpayers will be obliged to continue to pay for 25 First Lady staffers at the White House) At a fund raiser in Arlington, Virginia on the day after the Army-Navy Game, WCBM was able to ask McCain if he is aware of any media who reported his stated position to this Republican homosexual group. --I'm not aware of any that reported that,' he replied. WCBM also asked during the Q. and A. period: WCBM: 'The New York Times headline this morning reported that you were Locked in Sweetness with Governor Bush. Does this mean that you have concluded that he would be a good Vice Presidential candidate?' (Laughter) Sen. McCain: 'I think he's well qualified! (Laughter)' WCBM: 'If, in your second term as President, Mrs. McCain decides to move out of the White House and run for U.S. Senator from New Jersey, will you provide her with Air Force One fleet service and a staff of 25 back at the White House? Sen. McCain: (with tongue firmly planted in cheek:) 'I think that's the LEAST I should do for my wife!'"

QUOTE:

Janet: "Look who's praising the traditional family.

President Clinton is now

taking credit for pro-family welfare reform * even

though he tried to defeat it

in Congress. If a movement's impact in politics can be

measured by what its

opposition does, the pro-family movement should take

heart at what's

happening in welfare reform. In a dramatic turnaround,

the President used his

radio address last Saturday to praise the bonuses that

are going to states

because of their progress in welfare reform. Clinton

also embraced another

pro-family position when he said, "The old welfare

system actually weakened

families, by discouraging couples from marrying or

living with their children.

We want to change that, so starting next year there

will also be bonuses for

states that do the most to get poor children into

two-parent homes, where we

know they have the best chance of breaking the cycle of

poverty.' Not

surprisingly, the administration's assistant secretary

for children and families is

also a sudden convert to the pro-family position.

Olivia Golden says, "It's (

important to reward state policies that strengthen and

support two-parent

families.' As his time in office ticks away, Clinton's

pretending can get

tiresome. He may be masquerading as a pro-family

advocate because of

public opinion. But he can't hide the real message that

the family is still the

most important department of health, education, and

welfare."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 19:54:24.00

SUBJECT: Gays in the Military

TO: Lisa M. Brown (CN=Lisa M. Brown/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is what I sent Morely. I was not sure what you needed. We can cut and paste.

----- Forwarded by Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP on
12/13/99 07:53 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter
12/13/99 07:53:07 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Morley A. Winograd/OVP@OVP

cc:

Subject: Gays in the Military

Here is a 4-5 page memo on the policy. It includes the background, status, recommendations and some appropriate language that can be used. G2K issued a statement tonight. I think Gore's statement might be farther out than my suggested talking points. I will get you a copy of the statement.

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D54]ARMS23531736L.336 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Morely Winograd
FR: Julian Potter
RE: "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" Policy
DT: December 13, 1999

Background

- Seven years ago the Clinton/Gore Administration was elected into office and attempted to fulfill a campaign pledge to issue an Executive Order (E.O.) prohibiting the mandatory discharge of gay military personnel.
- Congress, the military and the public vehemently opposed the E.O. and instead, 10 USC Section 654—known as the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" Policy (DA/DT/DP) was codified into law.
- Under this new policy, servicemembers can be discharged if they (1) state they are gay, (2) engage in hand holding, kissing or other physical contact with a person of the same gender, or (3) attempt to marry someone of the same gender.
- These reasons for discharge are identical to those in place since 1981. But, under the old regulations being homosexual was, by definition, incompatible with military service; under the new law gay people can, in theory, serve as long as they keep their orientation private and refrain from "homosexual acts."
- President Clinton, Congress and military leaders agreed to their part of the "DA/DT/DP" policy to implement new limits to gay investigations:
 - End affirmative efforts to pursue suspected gay members;
 - Stop asking service members about their sexual orientation;
 - End witch hunts and prevent anti-gay harassment;
 - Implement the law with regard to the privacy of servicemembers.

STATUS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY

- The policy has been in effect since February 1994. Over that time period we have seen soaring gay discharges. In 1998, the Pentagon fired 1,149 people under the "DA/DT/DP" policy, in 1997 it was 997. That amounts to 3-4 persons per day, costing the military \$31 million in training and replacement costs.
- **The frustration with these discharges is that it is not clear that the firings are because of a gay servicemembers violation of the "telling" part of the policy, but rather it appears that military personnel have gone beyond the limits of investigation and violated the "asking and pursuing" part of the policy.**
- It is well documented that servicemembers across the country continue to be interrogated, investigated, harassed and threatened about their sexual orientation. Psychotherapists have turned in gay members. Partners are being interrogated about their kids. Servicemembers are threatened with prison unless they confess to being gay or accuse others as gay.
- The Servicemembers legal Defense network, a non-profit legal aid and watchdog group set up to help people hurt by this policy has directly assisted over 2000 men and women facing harassment, with hunts and death threats since this policy was enacted.
- In addition to difficulties with the policy, the base climate surrounding gay servicemembers has gotten completely out of hand. On July 6, 1999, Private First Class Barry Winchell died at Fort Campbell, KY, after he was attacked and brutally beaten with a baseball bat in his barracks, by a fellow soldier.
- The military leadership at Fort Campbell allowed an anti-gay climate to thrive. Fellow soldiers have testified that the beating death of Winchell came after months of vile anti-gay name-calling and harassment, rumor mongering and inquiries into Winchell's private life.
- **Defense Secretary William Cohen today ordered a full review** by the Pentagon's inspector general into how the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy is being carried out, with a report due back in 90 days. Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon, who announced the new investigation, said that spot checks would be made on bases and installations of all the services.
- He said that Cohen shared President Clinton's recently expressed concerns that the policy was not working as intended. "Clearly there are issues that need to be addressed," Bacon said. He said that "any steps that are warranted" as a result of the inquiry would be taken by the Pentagon to make sure that instances of harassment are not condoned.

POLITICAL SITUATION

- Because of the Presidential election, and the tragic death of Barry Winchell, politicians have been talking about this issue and "breaking the code of silence" about the policy.
- **Candidate Bill Bradley** spoke out against the policy in the Advocate interview (Sept 99) and during the debate in New Hampshire (Oct 99). He said the policy does not work, it is a failure. Gays and lesbians should serve openly in the military as with dozens of other professions.
- **Mrs. Clinton** spoke out in New York (Dec 9, 99) said the policy had been a failure, if elected she would work to overturn the policy. She doesn't believe "don't ask, don't tell" has worked, and called for a policy under which gays and lesbians could serve without discrimination or harassment. "Fitness to serve in the military should be based on one's conduct, not one's sexual orientation," she said.
- **The President** said his policy was to have gays serve openly, yet in 1993 he lost in a vote with the Senate 68-32. "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 harrasment"
- The President continued, "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."
- On December 13 Reuters article by Charles Aldinger states that "The front-running candidates for the White House, Democrat Al Gore and Republican George W. Bush, support the Pentagon policy under which gays and lesbians are allowed to serve in the military if they do not openly discuss their sexual orientation."
- On a Saturday Radio talk show, **Barney Frank (D-MA) has called upon Vice President Al Gore to change his position on gays in the military**, to one supporting the policy's termination. "I think he should go beyond [criticism]," Frank said, "and I think as a Presidential candidate, he's fully entitled to give his position which I hope will be that it's a mistaken policy." "I know there's this sense that 'Oh well, the Vice President is not supposed to disagree with the President.' I think that's wrong," said Frank.
- Frank continued "I think as a Presidential candidate, he's fully entitled to give his position" in suggesting that Gore separate himself further from his administration's record on the issue, Frank went as far as to compare Gore's situation to that of former Vice President Hubert Humphrey. "I know there's this sense that 'Oh well, the Vice President is not supposed to disagree with the President.' I think that's

wrong," said Frank. "I think that Hubert Humphrey paid a price in 1968 because he delayed making clear his differences with Lyndon Johnson over Vietnam."

- The Vice President's public position on this policy is currently in line with Governor Bush and Senator McCain. Now, that is out of whack.
- It is painfully clear Tim Russert and the debates must ask both Gore and Bradley about his position on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy.

RECCOMENDATION

- The Vice President should align himself with the other democrats. He needs to be honest and admit the policy has not been implemented as was intended.
- If asked whether "**President Gore**" or the next administration would lift the ban on gays in the military, as Mrs. Clinton, Bill Bradley and the President, all seem to advocate, he can say:
 - *"We learned three critical lessons about gays and military service in the past seven years.*
 - *First, gays and lesbians always have served honorably and well in our armed forces, and they will in the future. They have fought, bled and died to protect and defend us. Let's never forget that and the debt we owe them and all veterans.*
 - *Second, we learned that changing the military policy takes a powerful consensus, and cannot be achieved without education and willingness of our military leaders and the American people.*
 - *Third, experience shows that the compromise we have in place does not work fairly, either for the military or for service members.*
 - *As President, I will have the best minds together to work with our military to reform the implementation of this policy, or abandon it altogether. What I know is that the President cannot achieve it alone, and we will need a smart, bipartisan strategy to put it right.*
 - *President Truman courageously acted to ban racial segregation among our troops over a half-century ago, however, it has taken decades to live up to that promise in the hearts and minds of the American people, too. I believe we are up to the challenge today."*
- **Today as Vice President,** *I vow to work very closely with the Department of Defense to ensure that this policy is implemented in the manner it was fashioned.*

The Administration and the leadership at the Pentagon must make it crystal clear that anti-gay harassment has no place in the U.S. military. We will work to implement this policy in a fair and just manner.

- *I applaud Secretary Cohen's move to issue a full investigation by the Inspector General, but that should not delay any training, guidelines and outreach to make sure that the current policy is implemented fairly.*

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.

Clinton proposed "don't ask, don't tell" during his first year in office. It took effect in February 1994. The Pentagon reported that 1,145 people were discharged from the armed forces last year for homosexuality, up from 997 in 1997. The lowest number of such discharges was 617 in 1994. Last August, the Pentagon updated "don't ask, don't tell" guidelines to require all troops to undergo periodic training on tolerance and to assign the task of investigating alleged homosexual activity to senior officials. It continues to bar inquiries into sexual orientation while allowing discharges for service members who engage in homosexual conduct or show a "propensity" for it, such as stating that he or she is gay.

Last week, first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton flatly said she doesn't believe "don't ask, don't tell" has worked, and called for a policy under which gays and lesbians could serve without discrimination or harassment. "Fitness to serve in the military should be based on one's conduct, not one's sexual orientation," she said.

"I don't have any problem with what she says," Clinton said Saturday. He said his wife's statements reflected the position "that both of us brought to the White House," but he decided on the current policy as a compromise after it became clear to him that there were sufficient votes in Congress to overrule him.

"So what I'd like to do is to focus on trying to make the policy we announced back in '93 work the way it was intended to," Clinton said. "It's out of whack now, and I don't think any serious person can say it's not."

Clinton said officials at the Pentagon and the White House were working on smoothing out the problems with the policy. "I think there's a greater awareness now it's not being implemented as it was announced and as it was intended."

Earlier Saturday, Clinton said he was profoundly saddened by the case of Army private Barry L. Winchell, 21, who was beaten to death by his barracks roommate, 18-year-old private Calvin N. Glover, at Fort Campbell, Ky. He said he looked at photographs of the killer and victim side-by-side in a newspaper and thought, "They could be my children."

"I was aching for the young man who had died, and for the young man whose life is now destroyed, who wasn't born hating that way. Somebody had to teach him to do that," Clinton said. . . . [another topic]

Gays in military could become U.S. election issue

By Charles Aldinger

WASHINGTON (Reuters) ? While the U.S. military claims that its "don't ask, don't tell" policy toward homosexuals in uniform is working, the 1994 rule has come under heavy fire and could emerge as an issue in next year's presidential election.

The front-running candidates for the White House, Democrat Al Gore and Republican George W. Bush, support the Pentagon policy under which gays and lesbians are allowed to serve in the military if they do not openly discuss their sexual orientation.

But civil rights groups are pushing hard for a change that would treat homosexuals without any bias, charging that more gays are being dismissed from the military now under the policy than before and that open harassment of suspected gays is increasing.

Even President Bill Clinton, under whom the policy was introduced, said the rule has not worked the way it was intended. His comments on Saturday came two days after first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, running for the U.S. Senate in New York, said she does not believe the rule is "ultimately the policy that we should have in our military."

"I think one thing that's maybe not clearly understood is the reason that I went for 'don't ask, don't tell' is that it was all I could do, because I had a clear signal from Congress that if I implemented my policy, they would reverse it by an overwhelming majority," the president told CBS radio.

"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 ... that those things would not be suspicion to keep them out of the military or certainly subject to harassment," Clinton added.

The issue was put in the spotlight in the past week after a military jury at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, convicted and sentenced an Army private to life in prison for beating a gay infantryman to death with a baseball bat as the victim slept.

Testimony in the trial of Army Pvt. Calvin Glover, 18, of Sulphur, Oklahoma, suggested his victim, Pfc. Barry Winchell, 21, of Kansas City, Missouri, was harassed by troops for months before his death and base commanders did nothing to stifle intolerance. Jurors rejected Glover's contention that he committed the crime on impulse while drunk.

POLICY CALLED A FAILURE

"The policy is a failure. Period," said C. Dixon Osburn of the Washington-based gay rights activist group Servicemembers Legal Defence Network. He said the rules were not benign and protective of gays as the Pentagon claimed, but actually fostered "a policy of violence."

"No command should ever allow harassment to thrive against any service member for any reason," Osburn said.

Pentagon figures show that 1,145 people were forced to leave the armed services in 1998 under provisions of the Military Homosexual Conduct Policy,

as it formally is known, compared to 617 in 1994, when the policy started.

The policy allows gays to serve, but continues a ban on homosexual acts and requires gays to keep their sexual orientation private. It also requires the military not to ask servicemen about their sexual orientation.

The compromise was reached after Congress in 1993 officially relaxed the military's 50-year ban on gays.

Former U.S. Sen. Bill Bradley, mounting a tough challenge to Gore for the Democratic presidential nomination, said gays should be allowed to serve openly in uniform.

In Washington, Defence Department spokesman Ken Bacon stressed that Defence Secretary William Cohen has spoken out repeatedly against intolerance of any kind in the military.

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

Bacon noted that Fort Campbell's commanders have agreed to investigate thoroughly other reports of harassment of gays as well as unsupervised and unpunished drinking on the post.

INCREASING NUMBER OF GAY TROOPS OUSTED

Bacon conceded that increasing numbers of homosexuals were being removed from the military, but said it was because they were violating the department's rule by speaking out openly about their homosexuality and leaving senior officers no alternative but to move legally against them.

While federal district judges in the past have ruled against the policy, calling it discriminatory, higher courts have upheld the rule. They say the military is a special case in which order and discipline are paramount.

Clinton promised to eliminate all restrictions on gays in the military when he ran for office, but later faced opposition from senior military officers who said gays openly serving in close quarters with other troops would damage "good order and discipline" in the ranks.

The Pentagon since has performed a delicate balancing act to implement the policy, upholding the right to remove gays for violating the rule while pressing commanders not to search out homosexuals without strong evidence.

"In August, Secretary Cohen made it clear ? as he had shortly after he took office ? that there is no room for a climate of harassment or discrimination within the military based on sexual orientation. That's the policy," Bacon said.

Among the benefits of presidential campaigns is that they can provide a cultural snapshot of where the country is. Eight years ago, Bill Clinton was the first major candidate to seek money directly from gay donors. Four

years ago, Bob Dole accepted, turned down and then accepted a check from the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay G.O.P. group. This year, George W. Bush drew flak for not personally meeting with the group. And in the latest sign of cultural change, the Gore campaign manager is Donna Brazile, a single black woman. Until recently, Brazile was an advocate in gay politics and sat on the board of the Millennium March on Washington, a gay rights demonstration planned for April.

The first lesbian to head a national presidential campaign? No one's saying, least of all Brazile. Is she heterosexual? On that question, too, she is mum. It is not that she is highly protective of her privacy. In a personal profile in The New York Times, Brazile let readers know before becoming Gore's campaign manager that she was looking for a relationship that lasted longer than two weeks; in The Washington Post, she said she was "single and available." She doesn't mince words. Of the challenges of being a black woman in politics, she told The Post: "I had to decide if I'd be a bitch or a whore. I chose bitch." She is an enthusiast for identity politics, stressing her black female outlook in every profile. And she is no stickler for others' privacy: she was fired from the 1988 Dukakis campaign for spreading rumors about Vice President George Bush's love life. As for emotional candor, the second stated goal of the Millennium March is for more homosexuals to come out. Of the 18 people on the board when Brazile was a member, 16 were openly gay or bisexual. One, representing Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, was openly straight. Brazile alone was openly ambiguous.

Why? Asked directly by Southern Voice, an Atlanta gay paper, she agreed that her orientation was "a fair question," but nevertheless declined to answer. She later told The Post, "If I had a personal life, I'd have a sexual orientation" -- implying that being homosexual is something you do rather than something you are, a stance held largely by the religious right. She also proffered: "The last time I talked about someone's personal life, I got fired. I'm not about to make my personal life public." But there's a difference between revealing your own life and spreading rumors about someone else's, and a large moral difference between committing adultery and being gay. Would she be fired for talking about being gay or straight? Not very likely by a candidate who supports making discrimination against homosexuals illegal.

Of course, Brazile has every right to say nothing if she wants to, even to the point of seeming ridiculous. But the ridiculousness is the point. Not so long ago the closet was a simple matter. Either gay men and women engaged in a complete silence about their emotional lives or they simply said they were straight. Now it's more complicated. At a time when the stigma against homosexuality is far weaker than even 10 years ago, a gay person doesn't need to lie to maintain social standing -- but he doesn't have to tell the truth, either. We went from Never Say Anything to Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Now we're at the point of Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell.

In politics, Brazile is not alone. There are almost no heterosexual politicians who aren't married, divorced, dating or openly straight, and I know of few who would object to being asked if they were heterosexual or dismiss it as nobody's business. But among homosexuals, it's still a different story. To be sure, Representative Barney Frank lives up to his

name. And even Republicans, like Representative Jim Kolbe, of Arizona, or the former Jesse Helms adviser Arthur Finkelstein, are increasingly matter-of-fact. But others equivocate. In Clinton's cabinet, almost everyone is married or divorced, but for two who aren't, Donna Shalala and Janet Reno, their orientations are shrouded in deep ambiguity. In a recent issue of New York magazine devoted to "singles," former New York Mayor Ed Koch was invited to write his own personals ad. This is what he wrote: "White Male, 70-something former C.E.O. and practicing attorney. . . . Have belatedly concluded that everyone, straight or gay, needs a partner in life. How'm I doing?" What on earth are we supposed to make of that? Surely no heterosexual wanting to find a partner in a personals ad would feel the need to conceal the sex of the person he is looking for. Why? Koch could have refused to join in the magazine's game, retaining complete privacy, or he could have written an ad clearly looking for a woman. Instead, he chose to play Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell.

This politesse is part of Hollywood as well. What other implication are we supposed to draw, for example, from Rosie O'Donnell's adoption of the Brazile model? Again, O'Donnell is pro-gay, politically liberal and hardly protective of her own privacy. Any viewer knows not only that she has adopted two children but also their names and eating habits. She has allowed network cameras into the nursery. She has told the world that she is distant from her living father. Almost every guest on her show talks about emotional or family life and is candid about his or her orientation. But not the host. This most obvious question is treated as if it were the most obscure. "I'm single and dating," she once told People magazine. But dating whom? O'Donnell won't even narrow the options to half the human race.

Ditto the Latin heartthrob Ricky Martin. Not so long ago such a prominent male singer would have gone out of his way to protest his heterosexuality. Now he goes out of his way to obfuscate. In a recent interview, Barbara Walters asked him how he was enjoying his sexuality. Martin responded, laughing, "I . . . I live la vida loca." Walters asked Martin if there was "somebody" in his life. Martin said yes, but managed to talk about it without either a female or a male pronoun crossing his lips. Or on a more comic note, there's the fitness guru Richard Simmons. Read his new autobiography, and you will find no stone unturned in his private life, down to gorging on Ex-Lax to lose weight. But about any relationships, the most candid passage is titled "The Woman I Live With." It begins: "Yes, there is a woman in my life -- a beautiful woman who looks like a 35-year-old Sophia Loren. Her name is Teresa. I know this is the part of the story you've been waiting for." Teresa, it turns out, is Simmons's housekeeper.

Perhaps I should be clear here. I don't believe in "outing" people. But I don't believe in "inning" them, either. I have no evidence that, say, Donna Brazile or Ricky Martin is gay or straight. But I do know that their studied avoidance of the subject, along with their eager divulgence of any number of other private matters, invites an obvious and legitimate question. And, yes, it is legitimate. There comes a point, surely, at which the diminishing public stigmatization of homosexuality makes this kind of coyness not so much understandably defensive as simply feeble: insulting to homosexuals, who know better, and condescending to

- att1.htm

</P>

<P>Not a Straight Story

When it comes to public figures disclosing their sexuality, the new rule is

Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell.
</P>

<P>Among the benefits of presidential campaigns is that they can provide a

cultural snapshot of where the country is. Eight years ago, Bill Clinton

was the first major candidate to seek money directly from gay donors. Four

years ago, Bob Dole accepted, turned down and then accepted a check from

the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay G.O.P. group. This year, George W. Bush

drew flak for not personally meeting with the group. And in the latest

sign of cultural change, the Gore campaign manager is Donna Brazile, a

single black woman. Until recently, Brazile was an advocate in gay

politics and sat on the board of the Millennium March on Washington, a gay

rights demonstration planned for April.
</P>

<P> The first lesbian to head a national presidential campaign? No one's

saying, least of all Brazile. Is she heterosexual? On that question, too,

she is mum. It is not that she is highly protective of her privacy. In a

personal profile in The New York Times, Brazile let readers know before

becoming Gore's campaign manager that she was looking for a relationship

that lasted longer than two weeks; in The Washington Post, she said she

was "single and available." She doesn't mince words. Of the challenges of

being a black woman in politics, she told The Post: "I had to decide if

I'd be a bitch or a whore. I chose bitch." She is an enthusiast for

identity politics, stressing her black female outlook in every profile.

And she is no stickler for others' privacy: she was fired from the 1988

Dukakis campaign for spreading rumors about Vice President George Bush's

love life. As for emotional candor, the second stated goal of the

Millennium March is for more homosexuals to come out. Of the 18 people on

the board when Brazile was a member, 16 were openly gay or bisexual. One,

representing Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, was

openly straight. Brazile alone was openly ambiguous.
</P>

<P>Why? Asked directly by Southern Voice, an Atlanta gay paper, she agreed

that her orientation was "a fair question," but nevertheless declined to

answer. She later told The Post, "If I had a personal life, I'd have a

sexual orientation" -- implying that being homosexual is something you do

rather than something you are, a stance held largely by the religious

right. She also proffered: "The last time I talked about someone's

personal life, I got fired. I'm not about to make my personal life

public." But there's a difference between revealing your own life and

spreading rumors about someone else's, and a large moral difference

between committing adultery and being gay. Would she be fired for talking

about being gay or straight? Not very likely by a candidate who supports

making discrimination against homosexuals illegal.
</P>

<P>Of course, Brazile has every right to say nothing if she wants to, even to

the point of seeming ridiculous. But the ridiculousness is the point. Not

so long ago the closet was a simple matter. Either gay men and women

engaged in a complete silence about their emotional lives or they simply

said they were straight. Now it's more complicated. At a time when the

stigma against homosexuality is far weaker than even 10 years ago, a gay

person doesn't need to lie to maintain social standing -- but he doesn't

have to tell the truth, either. We went from Never Say Anything to Don't

Ask, Don't Tell. Now we're at the point of Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell.
</P>

<P>In politics, Brazile is not alone. There are almost no heterose
xual

politicians who aren't married, divorced, dating or openly str
aight, and I

know of few who would object to being asked if they were heter
osexual or

dismiss it as nobody's business. But among homosexuals, it's s
till a

different story. To be sure, Representative Barney Frank lives
up to his

name. And even Republicans, like Representative Jim Kolbe, of
Arizona, or

the former Jesse Helms adviser Arthur Finkelstein, are increas
ingly

matter-of-fact. But others equivocate. In Clinton's cabinet, a
lmost

everyone is married or divorced, but for two who aren't, Donna
Shalala and

Janet Reno, their orientations are shrouded in deep ambiguity.
In a recent

issue of New York magazine devoted to "singles," for
mer New York Mayor Ed

Koch was invited to write his own personals ad. This is what h
e wrote:

"White Male, 70-something former C.E.O. and practicing at
torney. . . .

Have belatedly concluded that everyone, straight or gay, needs
a partner

in life. How'm I doing?" What on earth are we supposed to
make of that?

Surely no heterosexual wanting to find a partner in a personal
s ad would

feel the need to conceal the sex of the person he is looking f
or. Why?

Koch could have refused to join in the magazine's game, retain
ing complete

privacy, or he could have written an ad clearly looking for a
woman.

Instead, he chose to play Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell.
</P>

<P>This politesse is part of Hollywood as well. What other implica
tion are we

supposed to draw, for example, from Rosie O'Donnell's adoption
of the

Brazile model? Again, O'Donnell is pro-gay, politically libera
l and hardly

protective of her own privacy. Any viewer knows not only that
she has

adopted two children but also their names and eating habits. S
he has

allowed network cameras into the nursery. She has told the wor
ld that she

is distant from her living father. Almost every guest on her s

how talks

about emotional or family life and is candid about his or her orientation.

But not the host. This most obvious question is treated as if it were the

most obscure. "I'm single and dating," she once told People magazine. But

dating whom? O'Donnell won't even narrow the options to half the human

race.

</P>

<P>Ditto the Latin heartthrob Ricky Martin. Not so long ago such a prominent

male singer would have gone out of his way to protest his heterosexuality.

Now he goes out of his way to obfuscate. In a recent interview, Barbara

Walters asked him how he was enjoying his sexuality. Martin responded,

laughing, "I . . . I live la vida loca." Walters asked Martin if there was

"somebody" in his life. Martin said yes, but managed to talk about it

without either a female or a male pronoun crossing his lips. On a more

comic note, there's the fitness guru Richard Simmons. Read his new

autobiography, and you will find no stone unturned in his private life,

down to gorging on Ex-Lax to lose weight. But about any relationships, the

most candid passage is titled "The Woman I Live With." It begins: "Yes,

there is a woman in my life -- a beautiful woman who looks like a

35-year-old Sophia Loren. Her name is Teresa. I know this is the part of

the story you've been waiting for." Teresa, it turns out, is Simmons's

housekeeper.

</P>

<P>Perhaps I should be clear here. I don't believe in "outing" people. But I

don't believe in "inching" them, either. I have no evidence that, say,

Donna Brazile or Ricky Martin is gay or straight. But I do know that their

studied avoidance of the subject, along with their eager divulgence of any

number of other private matters, invites an obvious and legitimate

question. And, yes, it is legitimate. There comes a point, sur

ely, at

which the diminishing public stigmatization of homosexuality makes this

kind of coyness not so much understandably defensive as simply feeble:

insulting to homosexuals, who know better, and condescending to

heterosexuals, who deserve better. It's as if the closet has had every

foundation and bearing wall removed but still stands, supported by mere

expediency, etiquette and the lingering shards of shame. Does no one have

the gumption just to blow it down?
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 11:17:25.00

SUBJECT: Re: Looking for one ticket for tonight

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

oh, great! it is on my desk if i am not here

Michael A. Hammer
12/13/99 11:14:55 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Looking for one ticket for tonight

SUper! I'lld rop by. Also, Megan asked that I let you know that I did the Rhode Island radio interview on DOn't Ask, Don't tell this a.m.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 11:32:15.00

SUBJECT:

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

can I get a copy of the don't ask/don't tell letter sent to Reps. Campbell
and Frank? thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 13:01:53.00

SUBJECT: CBS 60 Minutes, December 12, 1999

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP on 12/13/99 01:01
PM -----

Lisa Ferdinando
12/13/99 11:23:11 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: CBS 60 Minutes, December 12, 1999

CBS 60 MINUTES
December 12, 1999

'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

RET. LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS: People that are gay that come into the military today have been, I think, hoodwinked in terms of thinking the military's gay-friendly. It's not.

JAVIER TORRES: Here is another soldier in the same position I am, and he was gay, and he got murdered over that fact.

ED BRADLEY, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (on camera): What did the other guys say after Barry Winchell was murdered?

TORRES: There was some who was, like, ``Hey, just one less fag to deal with. I mean, they don't really belong here anyways."

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

LEO MCKERN: I was about to put to Mr. Justice Oliphant (ph) the inexcusable manner in which he sighs and rolls his eyes to heaven when summing up the case for the defense.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

MORLEY SAFER, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): If you're looking for a lawyer whose command of the English language is, more often than not, more than the other side can cope with, you just found him. Trouble is, Horace Rumpole is not available. Worse than that, he doesn't even exist except in the mind of the British novelist John Mortimer.

GEOFFREY ROBERTSON (ph): John's great achievement in Rumpole is to create a lawyer that the world could love. I mean, we--we have far fewer lawyer jokes in Britain than you do in America, largely thanks to Rumpole.

CHRISTIANE AMANPOUR, CNN CORRESPONDENT: The reason the U.S. dumped millions and millions of gallons of Agent Orange on South Vietnam was to destroy thick jungle like this that provided cover for the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese army. But the American servicemen who sprayed it didn't know that it also contained a deadly byproduct, dioxin.

DR. TRAN MAN HONG (ph) (through translator): Areas that were sprayed by Agent Orange have 10 to 20 times more birth defects than normal. This girl is 6 years old, but she still cannot speak. She can't even sit up by herself.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

MIKE WALLACE, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT: I'm Mike Wallace.

SAFER: I'm Morley Safer.

BRADLEY: I'm Ed Bradley.

STEVE KROFT, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT: I'm Steve Kroft.

LESLEY STAHL, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT: I'm Lesley Stahl. Those stories and Andy Rooney tonight on 60 MINUTES.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

BRADLEY: The conviction this week of a soldier at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, for the murder of a fellow soldier who was gay has placed more light on the Pentagon's "Don't ask, don't tell" policy than the Pentagon ever wanted. The policy, which President Clinton signed into law six years ago, was designed to make it possible for homosexuals to serve in the U.S. armed forces.

Before that, gays were banned outright. Now, while open homosexuality is still against the law, gays are allowed to serve as long as they don't publicly reveal their sexual orientation. And commanders are forbidden from asking any members of the armed forces if he or she is gay.

Despite that, the latest figures from the Pentagon show that nearly twice as many gay troops are being discharged from the military now as when the policy was first adopted. And a group that tracks verbal and physical harassment cases against gays in the military says they've reached an all-time high, none more horrifying than the murder of Private Barry Winchell.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

(voice-over): Winchell was 21 years old when he was beaten to death this past July by Private Calvin Glover, who was sentenced to life in prison this week for repeatedly striking Winchell in the head with a baseball bat while he was asleep in his barracks. Private Winchell had never publicly disclosed that he was gay, but his mother, Patricia Kutteles, says that according to testimony in the case, there was a perception that he was gay, and that he had been harassed on a daily basis by his fellow soldiers at Fort Campbell.

PATRICIA KUTTELES: I found he had been harassed for three or four months, labeled as being gay.

BRADLEY (on-camera): By other soldiers.

KUTTELES: By other soldiers, and nothing was done to stop it.

BRADLEY: So there were superior officers at Fort Campbell, in his unit, who knew that he was being harassed?

KUTTELES: Yes, they knew he was being harassed daily.

BRADLEY: And what did they do about it?

KUTTELES: They did nothing. They didn't intervene. His sergeants asked him if he was gay. That shouldn't have ever even happened under the "Don't ask, don't tell."

BRADLEY: "Don't ask, don't tell" means the sergeant is not supposed to ask him.

KUTTELES: Right. It's against the law. He's not--he's not to ask him.

BRADLEY: What does that say to you about the "Don't ask, don't tell" policy?

KUTTELES: Oh, that it's useless.

BRADLEY (voice-over): At the time Barry Winchell was murdered, a private named Javier Torres, who is no longer in the Army, was also stationed at Fort Campbell and, like Winchell, also concealing his homosexuality.

JAVIER TORRES: Here is someone else, another soldier, in the same position I am, and he was gay, and he got murdered over that fact. When I heard it, inside I was scared. I was shocked. But on the outside, I pretended to be, like, "Cool. No big deal. Just a fag," you know? And that was the part that hurt the most because here I am, gay--I mean, obviously, I was scared. I was fearful of my own life.

BRADLEY (on-camera): What did the other guys say after Barry Winchell was murdered?

TORRES: There was some who was, like, "Hey, just one less fag to deal with. I mean, they don't really belong here anyways." You know, I mean, "It's their fault for putting themselves in that position. They should know better."

BRADLEY (voice-over): The "Don't ask, don't tell" policy also explicitly forbids gay harassment of any kind, but Private Torres says not a single day went by when he didn't hear slurs against homosexuals, like the time his entire platoon chanted an anti-gay slogan during a five-mile run around Fort Campbell.

TORRES: It was pretty much, from what I can remember, "Faggot, faggot down the street, shoot him, shoot him till he retreats."

BRADLEY (on-camera): Who was responsible for this? I mean, was there a sergeant there?

TORRES: It was a sergeant who was singing it.

BRADLEY: So the sergeant is singing this for the platoon?

TORRES: Yes. It's supposed to be our motivation to run.

BRADLEY: "Faggot, faggot down the street, shoot him, shoot him till he retreats?" Was this before or after the murder?

TORRES: It was after.

BRADLEY: So after a soldier is murdered because the soldier who killed him thinks he's gay, a sergeant is leading his men on a run with an anti-gay chant? What did you do?

TORRES: I sang it. I had to. I mean, I couldn't be the only one not singing it.

BRADLEY: So when you hear all of this talk during this time that you're in the military, did it ever occur to you that maybe you should say something to someone?

TORRES: Of course, but who? You have no one you can go to in complete confidence and say, "Hey, this is going on, and this is bothering me because of this reason."

BRADLEY: What about the chaplain? You couldn't go to the chaplain and say...

TORRES: They'll turn around and go to your chain of command. "Don't ask, don't tell," you know? You told, so they have every right to go and tell whoever needs to know about it.

BRADLEY (voice-over): Finally, Private Torres decided he'd had enough and told his superiors he was gay.

TORRES: I decided I can't live like this anymore. I can't. I can't put myself in this position where I have to live a lie every day. I mean, I was to a point where I was crying in my room because I was so alone. I have never felt so alone in my whole life. I wanted to serve my country. I wanted to make myself better, but I didn't want to do it this way.

BRADLEY: So after almost two years in the Army, because he publicly revealed his homosexuality Javier Torres was discharged on September 16th.

Lieutenant Colonel Robert Maginnis, who believes homosexuals should not be allowed to serve openly in the military, was one of the authors of "Don't ask, don't tell." Now retired from the Army, he has reached the startling conclusion that the policy he helped to write is inherently unfair and may even be dangerous for gays.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (RET.): People that are gay that come into the military today have been, I think, hoodwinked in terms of thinking the military's gay-friendly. It's not. We've deceived them into joining the military with promises that we're not going to be able to fulfill. And unfortunately, we may have set ourselves up for terrible crimes such as the one that was committed at Fort Campbell.

BRADLEY (on-camera): Does anyone like this policy?

MAGINNIS: No one likes this policy. I haven't found a single person.

BRADLEY (voice-over): How did such a policy, which no one seems to like, become the law of the land? It was a compromise between President Clinton, who wanted to lift the long-standing ban on homosexuals in the military, and opponents at the Pentagon and in Congress who fought to keep it in place. While "Don't ask, don't tell" may appear more accommodating to gays, the fact is they still can't serve openly, and for good reason, according to retired Lieutenant Colonel Maginnis.

(on camera): When you say that homosexuality is incompatible with military service--why?

MAGINNIS: OK. Cohesion, first of all. Cohesion is the glue that hold small units together. But also...

BRADLEY: So how do homosexuals break down this cohesion?

MAGINNIS: Well, one of the things...

BRADLEY: Give me an example.

MAGINNIS: One of the things we did in Ranger school--we would, for instance, take this--this poncho liner, which was something that we would wrap ourselves in when it was cold, so you're

sharing body heat. If there's anything of a perception of--of inappropriate behavior that you think that might result from that--you have to have total trust that not only are they going to, you know, go out there and pull your wounded body off the battlefield, but that they won't do anything untoward in that setting.

BRADLEY: So if you were under that poncho, sharing that body heat with...

MAGINNIS: And I've done that.

BRADLEY: ... a soldier who was gay, that would make you uncomfortable.

MAGINNIS: Oh, it definitely would make me uncomfortable.

BRADLEY (voice-over): Pentagon officials insist anti-gay sentiment is not to blame for the rising number of homosexuals being discharged from the military. Rather, they claim the majority of gay servicemen are leaving voluntarily and declaring their homosexuality as an excuse.

MAGINNIS: Recruits today are softer physically, and they just don't have the mental--you know, they can't deal with the stress of what they--they're experiencing. So I see this as an easy out.

BRADLEY: But Army Reserve Lieutenant Steve May, who is gay, says he's not looking for an easy way out. May is also a state representative in Arizona, and during a political debate in the legislature over the issue of medical benefits for gay partners, he acknowledged his homosexuality. And for that the Army is trying to force him out of the military.

(on camera): On the face of it, you've clearly violated the "Don't ask, don't tell."

STEVE MAY: Well, obviously, people know. My soldiers know that I am gay.

BRADLEY: Well, doesn't that then give the Army grounds to take some kind of action against you? I mean, it is "Don't ask, don't tell," and you told.

MAY: And I told, but I told, of course, while I was a civilian. I think the policy, on its face, is immoral. At the same time the Army tells me I'm supposed to be honest and live my life with integrity, they're asking me to lie about who I am. And while my constituents expect me to be open and honest with them--not to talk about my private life, but not to lie about it--the Army is asking me to lie about it.

BRADLEY (voice-over): Lieutenant May, who still commands a platoon in the Army Reserves, is planning to sue the U.S. Army over the constitutionality of the "Don't ask, don't tell" policy, which he says promotes a violent anti-gay atmosphere that is driving homosexuals out of the military.

MAY: The military says homosexuals are unfit for military service, therefore we must discharge them as soon as we find out that they are gay or lesbian. That's their official policy. So this, of course, all gets translated by the soldier into "Gays are bad. They shouldn't be here."

BRADLEY (on-camera): Why would you want to be part of an organization that rejects you because of who you are, your own identity?

MAY: My obligation is to serve my country. I'm

willing to defend my nation. I'm willing to die for my country, and I have been since the first day I put on that uniform. The fact that the military has an absurd policy that in my opinion is immoral in no way decreases my obligation to be willing to die for my country.

BRADLEY: Since the murder of Barry Winchell, the Pentagon announced new guidelines that require all military personnel to receive anti-harassment training throughout their careers. That's in addition to required briefings on the "Don't ask, don't tell" law that all members of the armed forces were supposed to be receiving since 1994.

We asked the Pentagon to show us any of their training programs concerning gays in the military. They told us there weren't any going on at the present time.

TORRES: Two weeks before I got discharged, we had one of those meetings, and it lasted about a good, oh, between 20 and 30 seconds. And the first thing he says, "This is a meeting about fags. Don't bother them. They won't bother you. If you know someone's gay or a fag, just let it be. Go your own way, and let them go their own ways. And that's all that has to be said. So leave the fags alone."

BRADLEY: So the sergeant is using the term "fag."

TORRES: Uh-huh. It was making the whole situation a joke, like it really didn't matter. You know, "I'm supposed to talk to you about this stuff. Just bear with me for about 20 or 30 seconds, and then we can all go on our little happy ways." I mean, pretty much, everyone was laughing.

BRADLEY (voice-over): The debate over the rights of homosexuals to serve in the military may be taking a new turn. The armed forces are now facing a recruitment crisis, one of the worst manpower shortages in decades. And while the military has a \$268 million ad campaign this year for new recruits, it has also been discharging more and more gay service members.

MAY: The Army, the Air Force, the Navy will not be able to continue to defend the nation if they continue this policy of mandatory discrimination. Just today the Army announced they were going to offer \$20,000 signing bonuses for two-year enlistments. That almost doubles the income of a young private. At the same time, they're discharging three to four service members every day not because of qualification, not because of performance, but simply because these soldiers have said "I am gay."

BRADLEY: Since "Don't ask, don't tell" became law, nearly 4,500 people have been discharged from the military because of their sexual orientation. And legal advocates for gays say they've documented more than 2,000 cases where commanders violated the policy by asking about a service member's sexual orientation, by investigating their private lives or by condoning harassment. At the same time, no one has ever been officially punished for those violations of the policy.

So what does the Pentagon have to say about all of this? They declined to be interviewed, but officials there told us that they have a zero-tolerance policy regarding the harassment of gays and that "Don't ask, don't tell" is being implemented fairly and lawfully.

(voice-over): But don't try telling that to Barry Winchell's mother.

KUTTELES: The idea he was murdered is overwhelming. That it's--that it was a soldier, that he was asleep on a military base, where I thought he was protected--it's beyond words. He had tried to be

the best soldier the Army had, and it doesn't matter. He's dead.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

BRADLEY: In a CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT interview yesterday, President Clinton, under whose leadership the "Don't ask, don't tell" policy became law, now says the policy is way out of whack and is not being carried out as he intended and the military promised in 1993. The president also said the entire policy toward gays in the military should be reexamined.

END

Message Sent

To:

Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP

Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP
Steven Reich/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/OPD/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP@EOP
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nicole L. Davison/OPD/EOP@EOP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kristina Wolfe/OVP@OVP
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Scott Hynes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maura M. Pally/WHO/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gilbert S. Gonzalez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Reich/OVP@OVP
Joshua Gotbaum/OMB/EOP@EOP
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christine L. Anderson (CN=Christine L. Anderson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 08:59:41.00

SUBJECT: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

TO: lde@cbsnews.com (lde@cbsnews.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP on
12/13/99 08:59 AM -----

Jennifer M. Palmieri
12/12/99 10:11:02 PM
Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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: Lori Anderson <landerson@psw-inc.com> (Lori Anderson <landerson@psw-inc.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 14:44:33.00

SUBJECT: RE: FOX News Sunday, December 12, 1999

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Thank you - I assume you had no luck with the McLaughlin transcript?

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

From: Julia_M._Payne@who.eop.gov [mailto:Julia_M._Payne@who.eop.gov]

Sent: Monday, December 13, 1999 2:30 PM

To: landerson@psw-inc.com

Subject: FOX News Sunday, December 12, 1999

----- Forwarded by Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP on 12/13/99
02:29 PM -----

Lisa Ferdinando

12/12/99 03:59:56 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: FOX News Sunday, December 12, 1999

FOX NEWS SUNDAY

December 12, 1999

Guest: John McCain; Vito Fossella; Charles Rangel; Brit Hume; Mara
Liasson; Juan Williams

SNOW: There's a new GOP front-runner in New Hampshire. He's tanned, rested and ready. He's John McCain and he's all ours this morning. A yuletide brawl in Gotham. Rudy Giuliani says he wants the homeless indoors and in jobs. Does that make him Scrooge or the harbinger of reforms yet to come. We'll quiz New York Congressman Vito Fossella and Charles Rangel.

Plus, is it easy to spy on the State Department? We'll ask our panel: Brit Hume, Mara Liasson and Juan Williams on the December 12th edition of FOX NEWS SUNDAY.

Good morning, and welcome to FOX NEWS SUNDAY. Our guests will join us in a moment. But first, the headlines from Kathy Wolff at FOX NEWS CHANNEL in New York.

(NEWSBREAK)

SNOW: Thanks, Kathy.

Senator John McCain stormed into the lead in a series of New Hampshire polls last week, thus becoming the brand-new front-runner in the Granite State's Republican presidential primary. He joins us now.

We just saw this story about Senator Bill Bradley. You're going to have a press conference with him later in the week on campaign finance reform.

After this irregular heartbeat--and we all hope he's well...

MCCAIN: At least he has a heartbeat.

SNOW: That's right. Do you think it's important for all candidates to follow your lead and just dump out their full medical records?

MCCAIN: I don't know. I'd like to leave that decision up to them and to the media. I thought that probably I should, not only because of the fact that I'd committed to a full disclosure campaign, as far as the, you know, what we stood for and all those kind of things, but in addition, I thought that a lot of the media people would find it very interesting and entertaining. I'm an orthopedic surgeon's dream or nightmare, depending on how you look at it.

SNOW: You're the next best thing to a hockey player.

MCCAIN: That's right.

SNOW: With Senator Bradley, though, inquiring minds are going to want to know. Don't you think it would be sensible at least to put out that portion of his medical records?

MCCAIN: Yes, but that's a decision they have to make.

One thing I've tried not to do is decide for other candidates what they should do during this campaign.

SNOW: Another story we just saw in the news broadcast, and we've seen a lot of them in recent weeks, the president now says the ``don't ask, don't tell" policy was implemented improperly. Number one, do you support the ``don't ask, don't tell" policy?

MCCAIN: Absolutely, and I respect the individuals who are responsible for crafting it, including General Colin Powell.

SNOW: So the president is--what do you make of the president's latest statement?

MCCAIN: I don't know. It seems to me that that kind of statement undermines the men and women in the military who are trying to implement a policy that has been in existence for seven years. If the president wants to review the policy, that's fine with me. All policies should be reviewed from time to time, and I think it might be appropriate to do so. But to--this kind of thing.

What do you think the men and women now who are in positions of command all over the world in the military are saying to themselves this morning? ``What's he talking about? I've been trying to do the best that I can."

MCCAIN: Now, if they're problems in this policy, then let's talk about them in an orderly fashion under a policy review, rather than this kind of them in an orderly fashion under the aegis of a policy review rather than this kind of a--well, it's just kind of typical of this president, and naturally suspicions will arise that he's following on to help his wife's candidacy for the Senate. It's an inappropriate comment, especially in the

context in which he made it.

SNOW: Is it political pandering?

MCCAIN: There's going to be that suspicion because otherwise you would think he would call the joint chiefs together over at the White House and said in a formal way, look, I need to review this policy. I don't think it's being implemented right or it's not working right, or something like that, rather than coming on the heels of his wife's announcement.

SNOW: A state representative, a Republican representative from your home state is a reservist and acknowledged homosexual. Now it looks like he's going to get the boot. Is that the proper policy?

MCCAIN: I don't know because I don't know the details of it. Steve May is a fine man and a friend of mine, and I want to sit down with him and look at the specifics of his case.

Look, there will always be problems in a policy of this nature. This is the most volatile, emotional issue probably that we face in many respects, so I think we ought to correct where errors are made and we ought to implement policies that are correct, but if there's violations of it, like any other policy, then we should address them.

SNOW: Well, you've just said the president undermines moral when he doesn't follow--when he doesn't support military leaders. Members of the Army have already looked at this and said you violated the policy, and even though he's got top of the line marks, he's going to have to go. Doesn't it undermine their authority to say, well we've got to think about this?

MCCAIN: No. I'm his elected representative. I think every citizen has the right to come to their elected representative to seek help if they feel they're not being fairly treated.

SNOW: On gay rights, do you oppose same-sex marriages?

MCCAIN: Yes, I do.

SNOW: OK. You've met with the log cabin--how about hate crime statutes, for them or against them?

MCCAIN: I think existing statutes are appropriate and I think we ought to pursue existing statutes, and I don't think that it's necessary to have additional laws passed just on that basis.

SNOW: So, you don't support Attorney General Janet Reno's request for hate crime statutes? MCCAIN: No.

SNOW: That being the case, you've met with log cabin Republicans and it sounds like you're opposed to virtually every key portion of their agenda, is that true?

MCCAIN: First of all, they're Republicans, they believe in less government, lower taxes, a strong national defense. There's many issues in which we are in agreement. There's issues which we are in disagreements. You just articulated some of them. But every president should meet with people they disagree with, and in particular you should meet with members of your own party, even if you're in disagreement.

SNOW: What do you make of George W. Bush saying, well, I'm not going to meet with these guys?

MCCAIN: Again...

SNOW: Blown opportunity?

MCCAIN: ... that's a decision he has to make. Leave others to decide whether that's right or wrong. My position is that you should meet with everybody, no matter who you disagree with, and whether you disagree or not.

SNOW: Let's hit a hot button issue for Republicans...

MCCAIN: What did we just cover?

SNOW: Well, we're just getting warmed up. Abortion. You have said that you oppose abortion except in cases of rape, incest and the life of a mother.

MCCAIN: Yes.

SNOW: The life of the mother clearly a case where you have to competing rights to life.

MCCAIN: Yes.

SNOW: What is the moral distinction between a baby conceived by rape and incest and a baby conceived in other ways? Why don't those babies have a right to life?

MCCAIN: You're exactly right. This is a terrible moral dilemma that everybody faces when they address this issue. I happen to have obviously come down on making a very difficult, Solomon-like, decision on this.

SNOW: Why did you choose those two?

MCCAIN: Because I felt that they were compelling reasons to make exceptions. But look, I understand on a talmudic (ph) level that it's very difficult to make that differentiation.

SNOW: What are those reasons? That's what I'm curious about.

MCCAIN: Well, I think the exception of rape and incest are clearly those that are compelling reasons that an exception can be made because of the unique circumstances surrounding those two situations.

SNOW: I'm--rape being because it's not consensual?

MCCAIN: Yes, and the trauma associated with it and all of the aspects of it, that are very, very difficult. And by the way, very, very personal.

SNOW: And many people say, ``Well, there are other traumatic circumstances around abortion." If trauma is the key, then it seems to be you're on a slippery slope, are you not?

MCCAIN: Sure you are. You have to make--on many of these kinds of very difficult moral issues in America, you have to make decisions that are very difficult. I happen to have, after a lot of thought, come down on the issue of rape or incest.

And I know that that makes me less than pure and perhaps open to the same kind of discussion that we described. But it's a terrible personal moral issue. But what I intend to do, Tony, is sit down with pro-choice people and work together to make adoption easier in America, to improve foster care, and work on areas that we can together to reduce and eventually eliminate abortion in America.

We are polarized. The two ends of the spectrum have turned a cause into a business. The great middle in America would like to try to at least work together on issues we can agree on on this very difficult issue.

SNOW: If you reverse Roe vs. Wade States and people can debate it again, do you think it should be reversed?

MCCAIN: Yes. Yes.

SNOW: You do?

MCCAIN: Yes.

SNOW: Speaking of which, the United States Supreme Court...

MCCAIN: Are there any, is there any other non-controversial issue?

SNOW: I'll try--we'll try to work on it. We'll get there.

MCCAIN: OK.

SNOW: You said Sandra Day O'Connor is one of your favorite justices of the Supreme Court.

MCCAIN: Yes. She's a wonderful person from my home state of Arizona.

SNOW: What do you think is her most significant contribution to constitutional law?

MCCAIN: I think one area she's worked on is the protection of the rights of Native Americans. And I think that's a much neglected area, our first citizens. I think obviously she has been involved in some key decisions, as far as reversing, or at least modifying, some of the more liberal actions of previous courts.

SNOW: When you talk about Supreme Court, the next president is probably going to pick the--at least three members of the Supreme Court, the majority of the federal bench have enormous impact. Do you or do you not think that a person's position on such issues as abortion should figure into whether you would appoint them to the Court?

MCCAIN: I think there should be one overriding factor or consideration made in that selection process. And that is how closely they've adhered in the past to the Constitution of the United States. I would not impose any litmus test.

But if they have closely adhered to the views of our Founding Fathers, to the Constitution of the United States, then they're my select appointee.

SNOW: Well, people on the left and right will both say their guys are adhering to the Constitution. Who do you pick as your referee? MCCAIN: No. I think we all know that the Warren Court took great flights away from any envisioning that our Founding Fathers had about the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. Judge Scalia is a fine judge, Judge Rehnquist is a great hero of mine, along with a couple of others.

So, I think it's pretty clear what strict interpretation of the Constitution is all about.

SNOW: So anybody recently appointed that you wouldn't have appointed?

MCCAIN: No, I don't think so.

SNOW: One of the things you...

MCCAIN: Oh, I wouldn't have appointed the Clinton appointees. I would have appointed others. I'm sorry.

SNOW: OK.

MCCAIN: The Clinton appointees, I would not have appointed.

SNOW: You've talked a lot and feelingly about moral standards. One of the things you're now going after is the fact they use, I guess, cartoon characters in gaming? What's that all about?

MCCAIN: The gaming industry is now putting cartoons on slot machines. In other words, rather than the bar or whatever it is, there's like, cartoon characters.

MCCAIN: What's that all about? You know, let's not try to entice young children to be involved to make this very--frankly, a serious issue more attractive yet to young children. But I'm not advocating any censorship of them. I hope they'll show good sense.

SNOW: Now, you have said that your favorite rock band is...?

MCCAIN: Nine Inch Nails. Nine Inch Nails. Yes, my daughter who is now 15 has kept me up to speed. I think the Back Street Boys are her favorite, but I'm terribly concerned, she seems to become enamored with Ricky Martin and I know he is a handsome guy but that's not the one I want her to marry.

(LAUGHTER)

SNOW: Speaking of controversy, I want to flash up some Nine Inch Nails lyrics. This is one on their most recent album. It says, "I play a

game. It's called insincerity `` you can figure out what all those things are.

MCCAIN: Yeah.

SNOW: And after that the lyrics get really nasty.

MCCAIN: Yeah.

SNOW: Are you sure you're a Nine Inch Nails fan?

MCCAIN: I was joking when I said it. Obviously, I have not seen their words of their songs. And I was trying to make light of this whole issue of the generation gap that many of us politicians have with younger Americans. But, no, I take exception...

SNOW: Well, your daughter does promotion in the rock business.

MCCAIN: Oh, my daughter Sydney. I thought we're talking about my 15-year-old daughter. Yeah. My daughter Sydney works for Capital Records. I'm very happy and proud of the work that she does. She is a wonderful young woman.

SNOW: Well, if it's any consolation, we've had to hide our daughter's Britney Spears album. We're going to take a break. We'll be back with more of Senator John McCain in just a couple of minutes.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: We're back with Senator McCain. Now joining the fray, our FOX NEWS panel: Brit Hume, Washington managing editor of FOX NEWS; Mara Liasson of National Public Radio; and Juan Williams of the Washington Post.

Senator McCain, Vice President Al Gore has said that he is the only candidate that's supported campaign finance reform before he ran for president. What do you think?

MCCAIN: I just think that--then, therefore, while he was inventing the Internet I was inventing television. I mean, he also said that he cosponsored McCain-Feingold three years after he left the Senate. That's a unique parliamentary maneuver.

Look, I welcome the vice president's involvement in this issue. But the real scandal in Washington was not Monica Lewinsky, it was the debasement of the institutions of government by the Clinton-Gore campaign--renting the Lincoln bedroom, selling seats on official trade missions--and frankly, that will be a stain on American political history.

SNOW: Are you afraid all the records are going to be destroyed and we'll never find out?

MCCAIN: Oh, I think Fred Thompson will tell you that we will never find out all the--including how many millions of dollars of foreign money came into that campaign.

LIASSON: Senator McCain, you've said a lot about campaign finance reform but not as much about other domestic issues. I want to ask you about Social Security. Most of the experts say that to keep Social Security solvent for the baby boom generation we're going to have to do one or a combination of the following three things, which is: cut benefits, raise taxes or raise the age of eligibility. Do you agree with that?

MCCAIN: No. I think you take 62 percent of the surplus, put it into Social Security, make it solvent, keep it off budget--and I mean really off-budget, not for use for emergency purposes. We spent \$4.5 billion in emergency for the 2000 census. We didn't know the year 2000 was arriving, and--allow people to invest part of their taxes earmarked for Social Security to investment, in investments of their choice.

I am convinced that that will make the Social Security system solvent.

LIASSON: And not raise the eligibility age...

MCCAIN: And not raise the eligibility age limit or cut benefits.

LIASSON: And if you let people take the payroll taxes and put them into private retirement accounts, what happens when the market goes down and they're left without Social Security benefits?

MCCAIN: Well, since 1945 the stock market has had an average return of 5.5 percent. The return on Treasury bills is three percent. That's an average since 1945. And I don't think that this economy is going to meet the unending, rosy scenarios. I think we're going to have ups and downs, although I'm very optimistic about it.

But I'm confident that our last 45--nearly 50 years of experience will hold.

HUME: Senator, if you're optimistic about the long-term direction of the stock market, or perhaps the near-term as well, what prompted you say in one of those debates that you fear that this market's growth may be a bubble?

MCCAIN: What I said was that I am concerned that we haven't defied every single law of economics and history. I am excited about the future of America in this information technology revolution. But that doesn't mean there aren't going to be some cyclical effects still associated with it, and it doesn't have to be deep and it doesn't have to be severe. It can be soft landings. But I don't think that we have suspended all laws.

HUME: Well, which laws do you think would have to be suspended for this market to grow, just as it has, for example?

MCCAIN: Well, I just think it is--it is--the size of the growth is in some defiance of our history. Although this new technology has obviously allowed to define some of them.

I just think--and I'm very optimistic in the long term. But I don't think that it's appropriate for us to base all of our assumptions, i.e. tax cuts and others, on the most optimistic scenario. I think it's far better to pay for tax cuts with eliminating corporate welfare, eliminating unnecessary spending. In that way you can take any shocks that may come or any fluctuations.

But I am overall very--I'm not ``irrationally exuberant," but I am very ``rationally optimistic."

WILLIAMS: Senator McCain, one of the things that you and I have in common is that we were both born in Panama. We have the transition of the control of the Panama Canal to the Panamanians coming up shortly. Are you in support of that treaty signed by Jimmy Carter in the '70s, or do you think that it was a mistake?

MCCAIN: I think it was a mistake, and there's nothing we can do about it, though. I'm concerned about Chinese concessions at both ends of the canal.

But I'm also very worried, Juan, about the political will in Panama to continue to use the revenues for maintenance and upkeep and modernization of the canal. People tell me that that's going to be a very tempting source of money for the Panamanian government.

MCCAIN: But it's--there's nothing that's going to be done about it. I wish we hadn't done it. But I have to move on.

WILLIAMS: Well one of the affairs that's been articulated, the Chinese now have control of both ends of what's called a choke point in terms of shipping both militarily and economically, posing a threat. Do you in fact think the Chinese are out to dominate that canal and let's connect it for a second to Wen Ho Lee. Do you think Wen Ho Lee is guilty of espionage in that case out in New Mexico?

MCCAIN: I don't know whether Mr. Lee is guilty or not. I noticed he was just arrested and I think he deserves the benefits of our system of justice. I'm concerned when Chinese concessions are at both ends of the canal, but does that mean I think the Chinese are ready to strike and take over the canal? No, I wish that they had given those concessions on a more competitive basis than the government awarded them. But it's not a good thing, but I don't think it's reason for us to abrogate the treaty. I don't think any legal scholar would broach that.

SNOW: Senator, staying on the issue of China, the Chinese, according to press reports, are now aiming missiles at Taiwan. Do you--what does the United States need to do to demonstrate to the Chinese that it's serious and that it doesn't want China to do such things?

MCCAIN: Well, I think you can do several things. I think you could have a consistent foreign policy towards China, which this administration has not conducted. Candidate Clinton called them the Bloody Butchers of Beijing and in '98 he called them our strategic partners. They are neither.

I think we have to make it very clear the consequences of aggression against Taiwan far outweigh any benefits. From a practical standpoint, I would develop sea-based missile defense capabilities that I could move in international waters if necessary. I would also support Taiwan entry into the WTO. Look, the Chinese have got to understand that it is in their interest, not ours, in their interest, to enter the world stage as a superpower in a peaceful and cooperative manner.

SNOW: So in other words until the Chinese behave better, we'll treat Taiwan as an equal on the world stage with China?

MCCAIN: They are a freely elected democracy. You know that because you see pictures of them in fist fights on the floor of their parliament on occasion.

LIASSON: Senator McCain, you are for China's entry into the WTO.

MCCAIN: Yes.

LIASSON: The deal that was struck to let them in doesn't require that they improve their human rights record. It doesn't call for any kind of labor and environmental standards, the kind of things the president called for at the WTO meeting in Seattle. Why is that a good thing?

MCCAIN: Because they are entering the world stage as a superpower. The question is how do we most beneficially affect that entry and obviously the responsibility lies with them. But I believe that free trade and knowledge and information will lead to democracy and freedom over time.

I also think that we need to have a very clear message to them we expect progress in human rights and treatment of the Tibetan people. Sanctions have only worked once since the end of world war II effectively. That was against South Africa. And that was when every nation in the world joined in those sanctions. No other nation in the world would join us practically speaking if we impose sanctions on China. So it's not only a matter of practicality but a matter of how do you best think the Chinese will improve.

If you use Mao Zedong as a zero, and ten perfect, probably Deng Xiaoping was a three. A guy who was welcomed here as a hero. These people are about a six. We need to get them to a nine or ten.

HUME: Senator, you were widely credited after the second debate with having displayed a greater knowledge of Dean Acheson, a man about whom Governor Bush had just finished reading a book. And I want to ask you about him and what do you think, for example, about his role in the firing of Douglas MacArthur in the early 50s?

MCCAIN: First of all, I have not read the book. I've got a copy of it. But I think that Dean Acheson played a key role there. And yet, as Harry Truman had the sign on his desk, the buck stopped there. This was a situation where it was absolutely mandatory that Harry Truman and Dean Acheson assert the supremacy of civilian government over the military.

My personal hero is Douglas MacArthur. Anyone who has read "An American Caesar" knows this is an extraordinary man. But when he was acting in an insubordinate fashion he had to be removed from office. Dean Acheson played a very important role in that decision. But the real person who bore the responsibility and I think the historical credit was Harry Truman.

WILLIAMS: Let me ask you a quick question about affirmative action. Are you in favor or opposed to it?

MCCAIN: Again, it depends on definition. If you want to give people an equal opportunity, which they do not have in this country, I think it should be--and I do--I think it should be based on economic lines and not on ethnic lines.

WILLIAMS: And that makes you a supporter of vouchers in charter schools, is that right? But wouldn't that, in fact, therefore, undermine the quality of public schools available to most American children?

MCCAIN: I would like to see funds for a voucher--test voucher system come from corporate welfare such as sugar subsidies, ethanol subsidies and gas and oil subsidies. I would not take the money from existing public education. I'd like to test every school district in America, the poorest school districts and see if they work or not.

LIASSON: Can we follow up on this education issue?

MCCAIN: Yes.

LIASSON: You've said that a good teacher shouldn't be paid less than a bad senator.

MCCAIN: Exactly.

LIASSON: Now, I know you're not in the business of naming bad senators, but given how small the federal role is in education, how would you make that happen?

MCCAIN: I would...

LIASSON: How would you raise teacher pay?

MCCAIN: ... encourage, I would encourage in every one of the states in America merit pay for teachers, teacher testing, teacher competency and those who display that kind of competency should be--have their pay dramatically increased, those that don't, should be encouraged to find another line of work. It's a terrible inequity in America when a lawyers make an average of \$79,000 a year and a teacher \$39,000 a year.

SNOW: So, would you use federal money to provide that cushion?

MCCAIN: No. No, I would not.

SNOW: So, you'd encourage the states to find other ways to make money?

MCCAIN: And I would find ways to encourage the states to do that. I think it's a mistake for us to think that the federal government and the federal bureaucracies know what's best in Arizona, and I don't know why I mentioned New Hampshire...

(LAUGHTER)

... when they really know. But we've got to encourage choice and competition.

SNOW: Let's hit a series of issues very quickly. Number one, this Russia spy scandal. What do you make of this?

MCCAIN: I think the fact is, the Cold War's still over; countries still engage in espionage, our friends as well.

SNOW: Is it no big deal as the president says?

MCCAIN: I think it's--I think it's cause for a review of the security procedures at the State Department. But I'm not trying to excuse this administration. But throughout our history, this kind of thing has happened. Internal vigilance is the answer.

SNOW: Spying is not new. Elian Gonzalez, a young six-year-old who's in Miami right now. His father wants him back. You and others--the vice president says, well, why don't we offer his father a visa? And we can figure out if he really wants his son. What do you think?

MCCAIN: I think his father should come to the United States or even to a neutral country and then declare his intentions for his son. I don't think any father in the world wants his son to grow up under communist tyranny without a lack of opportunity that he would have in a free and democratic nation.

SNOW: If the father for some reason wanted to stay in Cuba, shouldn't the father and son be reunited?

MCCAIN: I think this is a very tough choice, and we've faced it in the past. It was a son of a Ukrainian Russian back many years ago during the Cold War, as you might remember. He sued his parents so that he could stay in the United States. It's a very difficult choice, but I think most children at the end of the day, would like to have...

SNOW: He's a six-year-old.

MCCAIN: Yes. Listen, I know this is a tough decision. But his mother gave her life in order that this son of hers might have the opportunity for freedom.

SNOW: Final question, I want to--we're going to talk about this in the next segment. Rudolph Giuliani's policy towards the homeless, good idea or bad idea?

MCCAIN: Listen, I'm a great believer in Rudy Giuliani. He's changed New York, and I lean towards his position, but I don't know enough of the details to know about it. But this is going to be the most exciting Senate race in the history of America, and if I'm the Republican nominee, I'm afraid it's going to be overshadowed by it.

LIASSON: Senator McCain, can we get off all this substance and talk about political tactics and strategy for a minute?

MCCAIN: Sure. Sure.

LIASSON: You're surging in New Hampshire, you've had a wonderful week, you're on the cover of Time magazine. But I want to ask you if you think you can go the distance. You're behind in South Carolina, you don't have the kind of money and organization of George W. Bush. What's your plan for after New Hampshire? How do you win this nomination?

MCCAIN: Candidates have safes full of strategic plans and ideas. Ours is very simple. "Win," you know, in New Hampshire. Win in South Carolina, continue the traction that we're making, move into the succeeding states, and use the earned media, as well as the money that we're coming in.

Look, I have no illusions. We're still way behind, a long way behind. The reason why I'm doing well in New Hampshire is because we've been able to get out the message of reform, reform, and reform. And I don't know if I can get that message out nationwide. We're way behind. We're still the underdog.

But I'm very happy with where we've come to and we're having a lot

of fun, and I'm not afraid of losing. So it's very enjoyable.

HUME: I was afraid you'd peaked too soon in New Hampshire, up 15 points in one recent poll.

MCCAIN: Obviously, I think that poll is an aberration. I think it's going to be very close in New Hampshire.

HUME: But it's in line with the trend, though Senator. I mean...

MCCAIN: Well, then it should be at 50 next week. But I think the point is that it's going to be very close. Governor Bush and his people are going to pour a lot of money into New Hampshire and the media. And I think--and he's a very fine candidate. He's a good man, and I've enjoyed these debates and I think it's going to be very tight in New Hampshire. We've got a long way to go in South Carolina, as you pointed out.

And so, look, we're still--odds strongly against us. But it's been a lot of--it's been a great crusade. SNOW: OK. Senator McCain, thanks for joining us.

MCCAIN: Thanks for having me on.

SNOW: Up next, is Rudy Giuliani a grinch or a visionary when it comes to the homeless?

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GIULIANI: The response to homelessness is not some romanticized general response, it's a practical response.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani has announced a two-pronged attack on homelessness. He wants police and social workers to move the homeless off the streets and into hospitals, shelters, or treatment

facilities. And he wants the city's sheltered dwellers to get a job or move out. Hillary Rodham Clinton and her backers have blasted the proposal, raising the question, "Is this a good or a bad idea?"

Here with answers are New York Congressman Vito Fossella and Charles Rangel. Also here, Juan Williams.

Representative Rangel, why is it a bad idea?

RANGEL: I didn't hear anything about social workers with the mayor. Certainly the courts have disagreed with the mayor and Cardinal O'Connor has disagreed, an expert that deals with the complex problems of the homeless, clearly it's a political thing. We had a tragic accident when someone who was thought to be homeless attacked an innocent person on the street. And the Mayor wanting to show how great he was by clearing the street and handcuffing and arresting the homeless.

SNOW: Well, Mr. Rangel, the mayor's office says it only arrested those who had actually broken the law or had outstanding warrants and that's moved four times as many into shelters or to treatment, as it has into jail.

Now my question is, "What's wrong with taking people off the streets in December and putting them in warm places?"

RANGEL: There's absolutely nothing wrong with it. The mayor's dramatically changed his position. But still he says that he's prepared to take children away from their parents, throw them in foster care, and the courts have said that this would strike terror in the hearts of those people who are poor and homeless through no fault of themselves.

What he should be doing is trying to get jobs for people and treatment for people. That's what any person should do. That's not how he started out. And fortunately public opinion has changed his mind and I'm

all for him correcting it. SNOW: Well, Mr. Rangel, as I understand it, the homeless are--able-bodied homeless are expected to get a job within a month. In that time, the city provides job training, child care, and free transportation, and those who can't get private sector jobs get public sector jobs, get jobs with the city. What's so brutal about that?

RANGEL: The truth of the matter, until we heard from Hillary Clinton on this, until we heard from the courts on this, until there was just an outcry from the decent citizens of the city of New York, this was not the policy of the mayor. He didn't say that, he just said if you don't get a job, you're not going to get into the shelter, and you're going to get arrested if you didn't get off the streets.

WILLIAMS: Congressman, for...

RANGEL: I think that if we take this approach as a sound approach and yet, the courts have restrained the mayor, the mayor's appealing the decision, and some of the mayor's people said the fact that it's Christmas, which the courts mentioned, the fact that it's winter, which the courts mentioned, should not be an issue because he's only dealing with the law. I don't really believe that the mayor's as really insensitive as he wants to be.

WILLIAMS: Congressman Fossella, let's...

RANGEL: I think he thinks he has a constituency and he's playing to it.

WILLIAMS: Congressman Fossella, let me quickly ask about the notion that even if you take a minimum wage job in these boom economic times, you may not have enough money to pay the rent in any place--to get a place in New York City. Doesn't that mean that the city should have a special care with the homeless?

FOSSELLA: Well, let me back up a step, because I think anybody, whether you're a resident of New York City, or have traveled to New York City in the last several years, have seen the dramatic difference.

You know, in 1992 and '93, New York was a crime zone, welfare rows were up, and there were people terrorizing the streets. You know, people in New York City were afraid to walk through Central Park, you were afraid to stop at a traffic light. My community in Staten Island Ferry Terminal was a den of drug addicts and despair. A group of individuals burned down that terminal, it is yet to be rebuilt.

And over the last several years, we've seen people put back to work, economic growth, meaning people can stand on their own two feet. And at the core of this is assuming that that individual who is homeless, but for a variety of reason, may suffer from mental illness or substance abuse or something else. At the core of it is the belief that those people can stand on their own two feet and provide for themselves and be free and independent.

Now lately, what we've heard is a trumpet of individuals who claim that trying to put people back to work, trying to put people--and allow them to stand on their own two feet and provide for themselves and their family, is somehow a bad idea.

FOSSELLA: I don't think that's the right policy for those individuals. And secondly, there are innocent New Yorkers who expect to live in a safe and secure city. And I think the mayor and elected officials have a responsibility to those individuals to provide for that.

WILLIAMS: But, Congressman, what I was saying to you is you don't want to demonize the poor. You mentioned the fire in the terminal. But, you know, I guess that brings to mind what happened in Worcester this week. But

nonetheless, you don't want to demonize the poor and you certainly don't want to demonize children, 40 percent of the homeless are children. So I think if you have adults taking minimum wage jobs, still can't house their children, you wouldn't want to point fingers at them and take their children away from them, would you?

FOSSELLA: No. I don't think anybody is demonizing the poor. If anybody is demonizing the poor, it is those that believe the poor have to live their whole life dependent on the government, whether it be the city or federal government. And what you try to do, and sadly, I haven't heard anybody on the other side, the first lady on down, offer constructive solutions to solve this problem. It is the same people that were saying in 1992, 1993, and 1994 that you can't reduce the welfare rolls, you can't solve the homeless problem. And we're hearing the same people and the same rusty rhetoric without real solutions.

WILLIAMS: Well, Charlie Rangel...

FOSSELLA: So nobody is demonizing the poor. If anybody is demonizing, it is those who believe these people who are really trying to work their way back into society and I think we should try and do that.

WILLIAMS: All right. Let me ask Congressman Rangel to quickly respond to what you are saying because I think Congressman Fossella makes a good point that the poor, or the homeless in this case, have to have some obligation to society. They have to be willing to show they want to do better for themselves, don't they Congressman Rangel?

RANGEL: You bet your life. And not only that, if they engage in criminal activities, they should be arrested and thrown into jail. You know, to listen to Vito and sometimes to listen to the mayor, even though he's now reformed, you would think these homeless people, these hopeless poor folks, wanted to lay in the street. That they enjoy what they're doing. Most all of the people, if they are able to work, they are looking for jobs. Some of the people that are in these darn shelters are working people. All they need is a hand. Some of them just need a place to wash up and to find a job. But to say that you've got to take away their children--and this is what the court stated--and to say you can't go to a shelter unless you have a job, and to use handcuffs instead of trying to find out what these hopeless people need, is wrong.

Now, the mayor is changing it because the whole world knows he's wrong. And this is not--you don't get a reputation like this just for dealing with the homeless. If you're dealing with powerless people, you expect whether they're vendors, whether they're college students, taxi drivers, the mayor is a get tough guy.

SNOW: But Charlie Rangel, isn't it also true this law is going to take effect in the Christmas season because there is a state law that was going to take effect December 12. The mayor wasn't responsible for that, was he?

RANGEL: I'll tell you one thing: The courts said that the mayor is wrong. Cardinal O'Connor asked him...

SNOW: No, the court said...

RANGEL: Yes.

SNOW: No, the court hasn't thrown it out. They said they want to hear it. But let me go back to Vito...

RANGEL: They said January 14. And the mayor wants it done before Christmas. What's the big deal?

SNOW: OK. Let me go to Vito Fossella. We've got about a minute. I want to focus in on the one point that Charlie Rangel has raised before.

Suppose you're a homeless mother. You have kids. You go ahead and get your job, and you have to stick your kids in child care all day long and you don't know the quality of that. Why is it such a good idea to separate mothers from their children?

FOSSELLA: I don't think that's been done, first of all. But, again, the important thing to remember here is the other side doesn't offer anything in terms of real solutions. Does this mean that this mother should spend her entire life in a shelter along with the kids? No, I don't think so. The fact the New York City spends over half a billion dollars in trying to help. And I disagree respectfully with Mr. Rangel to suggest there aren't people trying to help individuals get back on their own two feet.

If we truly believe in what this country is all about, we're going to try to help that mother get a job, raise her family, on her own and be a free and independent member of society. And not someone who has to live their whole life dependent on what the city elected officials think or the federal elected officials think for that matter.

SNOW: OK. Vito Fossella, you get the last word. Vito Fossella, Charlie Rangel, thanks for joining us this morning.

FOSSELLA: Thanks.

RANGEL: Thank you.

SNOW: When we return, our panel on spying at the State Department.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT, U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE: What I have tried to do ever since I became secretary, is to tighten the security arrangements in the department.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: And it's panel time for Brit, Mara and Juan. Let's begin with a subject we teased, Brit, which is this Russian--the Russian spies managed to, we presume they're Russian spies, managed to plant a listening device in a conference room on the seventh floor of the State Department.

HUME: One of my colleagues had a hilarious comment about that because this is a room in which a lot of discussions of oceanographic issues pertaining to the Baltic Sea or somewhere are discussed, and he said, they probably got some very interesting stuff about Charlie the Tuna. If I remember, Tony, that was you.

SNOW: That was me. And you'll hear that line again later in this broadcast, ladies and gentlemen.

HUME: Oops.

SNOW: But, that's OK.

HUME: Oops.

LIASSON: The point is, spying still goes on. And I guess what was interesting--was interesting was just the details of this and how it was placed. They don't still know how it was placed. It was clearly somebody on the inside had to go into that room at least twice. And it's unclear how much damage was done. As Brit said, this wasn't the room where the big foreign policy decisions were discussed.

WILLIAMS: Sounds to me like a baby monitor was stuck in there and the guy had to be across the street, right, like you're listening to your kid in the other room. This is a pretty ridiculous piece of spying.

HUME: It was a Radio Shack walkie talkie.

LIASSON: He had to activate it to hear it. In other words, he had to be very close to the building to turn it on and hear it.

SNOW: That's right.

WILLIAMS: Well, so I guess this is a pretty ridiculous piece of spying, not James Bond for sure. SNOW: Well, here's the interesting thing. You know, you had to walk in and activate it, so they had to know somebody was having meetings, so somebody has to sort of get tipped off and they go strolling around the State Department, you know, with their ears being pointed in the right direction.

LIASSON: A tin can, in other words.

HUME: A piece of tin foil and a...

SNOW: The question here is, are these the dumbest Russian spies or are we not getting the whole story?

LIASSON: Well, no, the fact that they could get in there and place it and it wasn't detected and it took a long time to find it, I mean, that shows some expertise. I think the question is how much damage was done and we don't know that yet.

HUME: I think the whole has--is still more comic than it is anything to worry about.

WILLIAMS: Definitely more Austin Powers.

HUME: It reminds of--yes, years ago when General Motors was spying on Ralph Nader, he figured out that he was being spied on because he said, it wasn't common for him to come out of stores and always find several guys in blue surge suits standing around looking at lamp posts.

(LAUGHTER)

This reminds me of that.

SNOW: Let's switch now to domestic politics. Mara, a week ago we were talking about the big speculation, which was, to put it bluntly, whether George W. Bush is a dope. What has happened in the last week?

LIASSON: Well, I think that he hasn't dispelled that. And the media has piled on. There have been a lot of articles about George Bush's gray matter, his performance in the debates, while he didn't destroy himself, he didn't implode or make any big gaffs. He wasn't dominant as a front-runner should be.

SNOW: But, Juan, is this one of these things where we in the press are sort of saying, we're smarter than you are? Because you take a look at the national polls, George W. Bush still has, as John McCain said, in fact I don't know if we can get our FOX NEWS opinion dynamics poll up on this in the Republican field. But he has basically a commanding lead. Sixty-five percent to 14 percent in the national polls despite the debates.

WILLIAMS: Well, the problem for George W. Bush is that at some point, the press barrage starts to take a toll. And the official word in all the press reports this week was lackluster. His performance in the debates was lackluster. It did not justify his front-running status or that 65 percent number that you saw. That could take impact. It could happen.

HUME: It's also worth noting, Tony, of course, this is not a national race. People don't go to the polls all at once and vote. This is a series of local races, that of course, that's where the debates are conducted. The viewership in New Hampshire of Mr. Bush and all the others for that first debate in which he took, it was very, very high and after that. And he's been skidding in the polls ever since.

He needs, it seems to me, and I think his people around him now recognize it, he needs to do well and to be commanding in one of these debates, and he's got to do it. And my guess is, he probably can, but that remains to be seen.

If he can, the atmosphere will quickly change and the story will move onto something else, but he has to do it.

LIASSON: Nothing about the debates has dispelled the tremendous advantages that George W. Bush has. Not just money, not just organization, but the loyalty of the Republican establishment, which is not going to throw him over the side as quickly as I think the Democrats were if Gore starting going south.

HUME: I think that's true, but I would also say, though, that the one thing that has gone is this sense that he's an inevitable winner.

LIASSON: That's right, that's right. The invincibility is gone.

HUME: Yes, that hurts.

WILLIAMS: The question becomes, how--if he's having such trouble in the debates against the Republican candidates, how would he do against Al Gore? How would he do against...

LIASSON: Right. How would he do against Gore? Of course. That has...

WILLIAMS: But, you know, the inside word in his campaign is, he's got such a strong reserve of capital, money, that he can take a bump against McCain and survive it.

HUME: I think that's true for the purposes of the nomination, Juan, but he doesn't want to be down in New Hampshire. He's changed the planning for his campaign to greatly increase the number of days he will spend in New Hampshire. It is now felt within his inner circle that not appearing in the earlier debates was a mistake. The point was made, you know, that when he appeared in these two, New Hampshire and Arizona, he doubled his lifetime political debate experience, which shows you also that these debates, you know, assuming he can do OK in them, maybe good for him.

LIASSON: Experience is extremely valuable. You cannot get it any other way but going into these debates.

SNOW: You can't get experience other than getting experience. There's been discussion, we didn't have a chance to get to this with Senator McCain, that he's just about tapped out in New Hampshire. About spent everything he can. George W. Bush still has a lot of money he can spend.

LIASSON: That's right.

SNOW: Is that part of the Bush strategy, too, at the end, you know, close with a flourish.

LIASSON: Sure, I mean, that means a lot. You can spend a lot of money on Boston television. That doesn't count against the New Hampshire limits. And you know we--the debates have been the big story of the last couple of weeks. Debates are not the only game in town. I mean, television counts for a lot. One-on-one campaigning where George W. Bush is quite good, counts for a lot in New Hampshire. So I think there are a lot of other factors here.

SNOW: We would be remiss if we didn't go to the Democratic side. We got to do this. Gore-Bradley. It's been a fun week and now all of a sudden Democrats are--at least Al Gore is saying he's going to raise taxes.

WILLIAMS: You know, there's so much distortion going on and I think Al Gore runs a risk now of beating up Bill Bradley too strongly. And it reached the point where people might have a response and say, listen, this is not true. In addition to which, you are both for these packages. It is a matter of the extent and the specifics. And on that basis, Al Gore is in trouble of demagoguing this issue and then being attacked for it.

LIASSON: One thing we know about Al Gore, nuance is not his strong point. He often doesn't know how to calibrate an attack and he is a very tough attacker.

But what I think is really interesting about the tax debate between Gore and Bradley, first of all, who would have thought raising taxes is a bad thing in a Democratic primary. It shows you who the party has changed. But also, the Gore people made a calculation and they know that Bradley is doing well among conservative Democratic men and independents. And those people are averse to taxes and that, I think, is one of those reasons why he made those attacks.

However, that being said, I think this did backfire on Gore. I talked to several Gore officials who said, well, this isn't exactly the result that we wanted, although it is a heck a lot better for Gore to be attacked about demagoguing on taxes than the color of his suits.

HUME: I think Mara has got it right. But I think this does emphasize the characteristic about Gore is that he is a savage campaigner. And as the Bush people look at this, they got to know this will not be easy if they end up against Gore.

SNOW: Very quickly, is Bradley's health an issue?

HUME: I wouldn't think so for very long.

LIASSON: It sounds like an annoyance, not a life-threatening...

WILLIAMS: Well, but it causes people to wonder. You don't want a sick president.

SNOW: Should he release his medical records so people know?

HUME: Sure.

LIASSON: Everybody should.

WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

SNOW: There we have it. OK. And on that note of advice to Senator Bradley, we're going to switch to another sport. It is time to preview the NFL on Fox with our good buddy, James Brown. J.B., good morning.

BROWN: Good morning, Tony and a non-political comment, I admired Bill Bradley when I was in high school because he was an excellent student athlete.

Coming up on FOX NFL SUNDAY, the King is alive and well, and I'm not talking about Elvis, but the rookie quarterback for the Tampa Bay Bucs, Shaun King who's got the Bucs believing in miracles. We'll also have a comeback story of Terry Collins of the New York Giants who had a giant week last week. Pam Oliver has that story. We'll have a report on the big Colts-Patriots match up. And also the Skins, what's happening with their struggling offense all of a sudden? We'll do all that coming up on FOX NFL SUNDAY. Now back to Washington where it's brisk. Tony Snow.

SNOW: All right. Thanks J.B. When we return, is Maxwell Smart running security at the State Department?

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

SNOW: Well, as you know, Russians broke into a high-level conference room at the State Department, and concealed a listening device in the middle of a wall. When somebody would tip them off about a meeting in the room, they'd send a snoop to the neighborhood and activate the bug.

Well, it took the administration two years to discover the breach. But the State Department says not to worry. It says they've sent disinformation through the microphone, and besides, the conference room is used for low-legal stuff, such as oceanography. Oceanographic disinformation. Meaning what, Charlie the Tuna?

The alibi sounds fishy to me. This administration has tried repeatedly to increase its power to snoop on private citizens. It always has dirt on political opponents. But it seems kind of laid back when it comes to keeping secrets from potential enemies. Which probably explains my

sick suspicion that we don't know the whole truth about this case and probably don't want to.

That's it for today. Have a great week and remember to start your Sundays right here on FOX NEWS SUNDAY.

END

Message Sent

To: _____

Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anthony R. Bernal/OVP@OVP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
William A. Halter/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Engskov/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alison Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rochester M. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachael E. Sullivan/OVP@OVP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steve Ricchetti/WHO/EOP@EOP

Melissa J. Prober/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Rebecca L. Walldorff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Laura J. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kimberly S. Anderson/OA/EOP@EOP
Steven Reich/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/OPD/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP@EOP
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nicole L. Davison/OPD/EOP@EOP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kristina Wolfe/OVP@OVP
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Scott Hynes/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maura M. Pally/WHO/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gilbert S. Gonzalez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Reich/OVP@OVP
Joshua Gotbaum/OMB/EOP@EOP
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP

CREATOR: Richard Socarides <RSocarides@rlmnet.com> (Richard Socarides <RSocarides@rlmnet.com> [UNKNOWN])

"Clearly there are issues that need to be addressed," Bacon said.

He said that ``any steps that are warranted" as a result of the inquiry would be taken by the Pentagon to make sure that instances of harassment are not condoned.

The announcement came a day after Clinton came under fire GOP presidential hopeful John McCain after the president said that the ``don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military isn't working.

McCain questioned the timing of Clinton's comments -- a week after his wife sharply criticized ``don't ask, don't tell." Meanwhile, Clinton's national security adviser and the Pentagon said steps are already under way to bring the policy closer to its original intent -- to allow gay soldiers to remain on duty without being persecuted.

The exchanges highlighted the continued sensitivity concerning the terms under which gays should be allowed to serve in the armed forces.

In an interview Saturday, Clinton said his policy had not been implemented as it was intended.

``It's out of whack now, and I don't think any serious person can say it's not," Clinton told CBS News.

Under the policy, the military is not supposed to ask service members about their sexual orientation, unless there is evidence of homosexual conduct. Still, soldiers who say they are gay may be discharged.

Clinton said the policy was never supposed to facilitate rooting out people who are gay or allow for harassment. He has cited repeatedly the case of a gay soldier who was beaten to death in Kentucky.

Defense Secretary Cohen ``has issued new rules and regulations to bring it back in line with its original intent. Let's see how that happens," National Security Adviser Sandy Berger said on ``Fox News Sunday."

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said that it is already working to fine-tune its policy. It has developed new training guidelines that are expected to be issued very shortly.

Those guidelines, announced in August, would require all troops to undergo periodic anti-harassment training and assign investigations of homosexual activity to more senior leaders.

``We are as determined as the president is to see that the policy is implemented fairly," Bacon said.

Clinton's comments Saturday were prompted by questions about Hillary Rodham Clinton, who said last week that she did not support the policy. Clinton did not go as far as his wife did, saying he understands why she wants to allow gays and lesbians to serve without discrimination in the military.

<P>He said that Cohen shared President Clinton's recently expressed concerns

that the policy was not working as intended.
</P>

<P>``Clearly there are issues that need to be addressed," Bacon said.
</P>

<P>He said that ``any steps that are warranted" as a result of the inquiry

would be taken by the Pentagon to make sure that instances of harassment

are not condoned.
</P>

<P>The announcement came a day after Clinton came under fire GOP presidential

hopeful John McCain after the president said that the ``don't ask, don't

tell" policy on gays in the military isn't working.
</P>

<P>McCain questioned the timing of Clinton's comments -- a week after his

wife sharply criticized ``don't ask, don't tell." Meanwhile, Clinton's

national security adviser and the Pentagon said steps are already under

way to bring the policy closer to its original intent -- to allow gay

soldiers to remain on duty without being persecuted.
</P>

<P>The exchanges highlighted the continued sensitivity concerning the terms

under which gays should be allowed to serve in the armed forces.
</P>

<P>In an interview Saturday, Clinton said his policy had not been implemented

as it was intended.
</P>

<P>``It's out of whack now, and I don't think any serious person can say it's

not," Clinton told CBS News.
</P>

<P>Under the policy, the military is not supposed to ask service members

about their sexual orientation, unless there is evidence of homosexual

homosexual

conduct. Still, soldiers who say they are gay may be discharged.
</P>

<P>Clinton said the policy was never supposed to facilitate rooting out

people who are gay or allow for harassment. He has cited repeatedly the

case of a gay soldier who was beaten to death in Kentucky.
<P>

<P>Defense Secretary Cohen ``has issued new rules and regulations to bring it

back in line with its original intent. Let's see how that happens,"

National Security Adviser Sandy Berger said on ``Fox News Sunday."
</P>

<P>Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said that it is already working to

fine-tune its policy. It has developed new training guidelines that are

expected to be issued very shortly.
</P>

<P>Those guidelines, announced in August, would require all troops to undergo

periodic anti-harassment training and assign investigations of homosexual

activity to more senior leaders.
</P>

<P>``We are as determined as the president is to see that the policy is

implemented fairly," Bacon said.
</P>

<P>Clinton's comments Saturday were prompted by questions about Hillary

Rodham Clinton, who said last week that she did not support the policy.

Clinton did not go as far as his wife did, saying he understands why she

wants to allow gays and lesbians to serve without discrimination in the

military.
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 11:32:23.00

SUBJECT: Re: gays in the military guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The President's remarks during on the radio interview and "60 Minutes" were well recieved by gay and lesbian constituents and Servicemembers Legal Defense Fund (SLDN), the watchdog group which has documented violations in this policy for the past 6 years.

Although pleased about the President's recent acknowledgements, the community is concerned about how he will ensure that the policy is being implemented and that the necessary and appropriate training is actually occurring.

Additionally, the Ft. Campbell case has made it very clear that the military commanders violated the policy. The military has never reprimanded any officer for violating the "Don't Ask or Don't Pursue" portion of the policy. Once the trial is over the community will be looking for someone to take the blame.

PS. I go by Julian Potter.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 19:53:18.00

SUBJECT: Gays in the Military

TO: Morley A. Winograd (CN=Morley A. Winograd/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is a 4-5 page memo on the policy. It includes the background, status, recommendations and some appropriate language that can be used. G2K issued a statement tonight. I think Gore's statement might be farther out than my suggested talking points. I will get you a copy of the statement.

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D32]ARMS260317366.336 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Morely Winograd
FR: Julian Potter
RE: "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" Policy
DT: December 13, 1999

Background

- Seven years ago the Clinton/Gore Administration was elected into office and attempted to fulfill a campaign pledge to issue an Executive Order (E.O.) prohibiting the mandatory discharge of gay military personnel.
- Congress, the military and the public vehemently opposed the E.O. and instead, 10 USC Section 654—known as the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue" Policy (DA/DT/DP) was codified into law.
- Under this new policy, servicemembers can be discharged if they (1) state they are gay, (2) engage in hand holding, kissing or other physical contact with a person of the same gender, or (3) attempt to marry someone of the same gender.
- These reasons for discharge are identical to those in place since 1981. But, under the old regulations being homosexual was, by definition, incompatible with military service; under the new law gay people can, in theory, serve as long as they keep their orientation private and refrain from "homosexual acts."
- President Clinton, Congress and military leaders agreed to their part of the "DA/DT/DP" policy to implement new limits to gay investigations:
 - End affirmative efforts to pursue suspected gay members;
 - Stop asking service members about their sexual orientation;
 - End witch hunts and prevent anti-gay harassment;
 - Implement the law with regard to the privacy of servicemembers.

STATUS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY

- The policy has been in effect since February 1994. Over that time period we have seen soaring gay discharges. In 1998, the Pentagon fired 1,149 people under the "DA/DT/DP" policy, in 1997 it was 997. That amounts to 3-4 persons per day, costing the military \$31 million in training and replacement costs.
- **The frustration with these discharges is that it is not clear that the firings are because of a gay servicemembers violation of the "telling" part of the policy, but rather it appears that military personnel have gone beyond the limits of investigation and violated the "asking and pursuing" part of the policy.**
- It is well documented that servicemembers across the country continue to be interrogated, investigated, harassed and threatened about their sexual orientation. Psychotherapists have turned in gay members. Partners are being interrogated about their kids. Servicemembers are threatened with prison unless they confess to being gay or accuse others as gay.
- The Servicemembers legal Defense network, a non-profit legal aid and watchdog group set up to help people hurt by this policy has directly assisted over 2000 men and women facing harassment, with hunts and death threats since this policy was enacted.
- In addition to difficulties with the policy, the base climate surrounding gay servicemembers has gotten completely out of hand. On July 6, 1999, Private First Class Barry Winchell died at Fort Campbell, KY, after he was attacked and brutally beaten with a baseball bat in his barracks, by a fellow soldier.
- The military leadership at Fort Campbell allowed an anti-gay climate to thrive. Fellow soldiers have testified that the beating death of Winchell came after months of vile anti-gay name-calling and harassment, rumor mongering and inquiries into Winchell's private life.
- **Defense Secretary William Cohen today ordered a full review** by the Pentagon's inspector general into how the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy is being carried out, with a report due back in 90 days. Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon, who announced the new investigation, said that spot checks would be made on bases and installations of all the services.
- He said that Cohen shared President Clinton's recently expressed concerns that the policy was not working as intended. "Clearly there are issues that need to be addressed," Bacon said. He said that "any steps that are warranted" as a result of the inquiry would be taken by the Pentagon to make sure that instances of harassment are not condoned.

POLITICAL SITUATION

- Because of the Presidential election, and the tragic death of Barry Winchell, politicians have been talking about this issue and “breaking the code of silence” about the policy.
- **Candidate Bill Bradley** spoke out against the policy in the Advocate interview (Sept 99) and during the debate in New Hampshire (Oct 99). He said the policy does not work, it is a failure. Gays and lesbians should serve openly in the military as with dozens of other professions.
- **Mrs. Clinton** spoke out in New York (Dec 9, 99) said the policy had been a failure, if elected she would work to overturn the policy. She doesn't believe "don't ask, don't tell" has worked, and called for a policy under which gays and lesbians could serve without discrimination or harassment. "Fitness to serve in the military should be based on one's conduct, not one's sexual orientation," she said.
- **The President** said his policy was to have gays serve openly, yet in 1993 he lost in a vote with the Senate 68-32. "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 harrasment"
- The President continued, "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."
- On December 13 Reuters article by Charles Aldinger states that "The front-running candidates for the White House, Democrat Al Gore and Republican George W. Bush, support the Pentagon policy under which gays and lesbians are allowed to serve in the military if they do not openly discuss their sexual orientation.
- On a Saturday Radio talk show, **Barney Frank (D-MA) has called upon Vice President Al Gore to change his position on gays in the military**, to one supporting the policy's termination. "I think he should go beyond [criticism]," Frank said, "and I think as a Presidential candidate, he's fully entitled to give his position which I hope will be that it's a mistaken policy." "I know there's this sense that 'Oh well, the Vice President is not supposed to disagree with the President.' I think that's wrong," said Frank.
- Frank continued "I think as a Presidential candidate, he's fully entitled to give his position" in suggesting that Gore separate himself further from his administration's record on the issue, Frank went as far as to compare Gore's situation to that of former Vice President Hubert Humphrey. "I know there's this sense that 'Oh well, the Vice President is not supposed to disagree with the President.' I think that's

wrong," said Frank. "I think that Hubert Humphrey paid a price in 1968 because he delayed making clear his differences with Lyndon Johnson over Vietnam."

- The Vice President's public position on this policy is currently in line with Governor Bush and Senator McCain. Now, that is out of whack.
- It is painfully clear Tim Russert and the debates must ask both Gore and Bradley about his position on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy.

RECCOMENDATION

- The Vice President should align himself with the other democrats. He needs to be honest and admit the policy has not been implemented as was intended.
- If asked whether "**President Gore**" or the next administration would lift the ban on gays in the military, as Mrs. Clinton, Bill Bradley and the President, all seem to advocate, he can say:
 - *"We learned three critical lessons about gays and military service in the past seven years.*
 - *First, gays and lesbians always have served honorably and well in our armed forces, and they will in the future. They have fought, bled and died to protect and defend us. Let's never forget that and the debt we owe them and all veterans.*
 - *Second, we learned that changing the military policy takes a powerful consensus, and cannot be achieved without education and willingness of our military leaders and the American people.*
 - *Third, experience shows that the compromise we have in place does not work fairly, either for the military or for service members.*
 - *As President, I will have the best minds together to work with our military to reform the implementation of this policy, or abandon it altogether. What I know is that the President cannot achieve it alone, and we will need a smart, bipartisan strategy to put it right.*
 - *President Truman courageously acted to ban racial segregation among our troops over a half-century ago, however, it has taken decades to live up to that promise in the hearts and minds of the American people, too. I believe we are up to the challenge today."*
- **Today as Vice President, I vow to work very closely with the Department of Defense to ensure that this policy is implemented in the manner it was fashioned.**

The Administration and the leadership at the Pentagon must make it crystal clear that anti-gay harassment has no place in the U.S. military. We will work to implement this policy in a fair and just manner.

- *I applaud Secretary Cohen's move to issue a full investigation by the Inspector General, but that should not delay any training, guidelines and outreach to make sure that the current policy is implemented fairly.*

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.

Clinton proposed "don't ask, don't tell" during his first year in office. It took effect in February 1994. The Pentagon reported that 1,145 people were discharged from the armed forces last year for homosexuality, up from 997 in 1997. The lowest number of such discharges was 617 in 1994. Last August, the Pentagon updated "don't ask, don't tell" guidelines to require all troops to undergo periodic training on tolerance and to assign the task of investigating alleged homosexual activity to senior officials. It continues to bar inquiries into sexual orientation while allowing discharges for service members who engage in homosexual conduct or show a "propensity" for it, such as stating that he or she is gay.

Last week, first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton flatly said she doesn't believe "don't ask, don't tell" has worked, and called for a policy under which gays and lesbians could serve without discrimination or harassment. "Fitness to serve in the military should be based on one's conduct, not one's sexual orientation," she said.

"I don't have any problem with what she says," Clinton said Saturday. He said his wife's statements reflected the position "that both of us brought to the White House," but he decided on the current policy as a compromise after it became clear to him that there were sufficient votes in Congress to overrule him.

"So what I'd like to do is to focus on trying to make the policy we announced back in '93 work the way it was intended to," Clinton said. "It's out of whack now, and I don't think any serious person can say it's not."

Clinton said officials at the Pentagon and the White House were working on smoothing out the problems with the policy. "I think there's a greater awareness now it's not being implemented as it was announced and as it was intended."

Earlier Saturday, Clinton said he was profoundly saddened by the case of Army private Barry L. Winchell, 21, who was beaten to death by his barracks roommate, 18-year-old private Calvin N. Glover, at Fort Campbell, Ky. He said he looked at photographs of the killer and victim side-by-side in a newspaper and thought, "They could be my children."

"I was aching for the young man who had died, and for the young man whose life is now destroyed, who wasn't born hating that way. Somebody had to teach him to do that," Clinton said. . . . [another topic]

Gays in military could become U.S. election issue

By Charles Aldinger

WASHINGTON (Reuters) ? While the U.S. military claims that its "don't ask, don't tell" policy toward homosexuals in uniform is working, the 1994 rule has come under heavy fire and could emerge as an issue in next year's presidential election.

The front-running candidates for the White House, Democrat Al Gore and Republican George W. Bush, support the Pentagon policy under which gays and lesbians are allowed to serve in the military if they do not openly discuss their sexual orientation.

But civil rights groups are pushing hard for a change that would treat homosexuals without any bias, charging that more gays are being dismissed from the military now under the policy than before and that open harassment of suspected gays is increasing.

Even President Bill Clinton, under whom the policy was introduced, said the rule has not worked the way it was intended. His comments on Saturday came two days after first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, running for the U.S. Senate in New York, said she does not believe the rule is "ultimately the policy that we should have in our military."

"I think one thing that's maybe not clearly understood is the reason that I went for 'don't ask, don't tell' is that it was all I could do, because I had a clear signal from Congress that if I implemented my policy, they would reverse it by an overwhelming majority," the president told CBS radio.

"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 ... that those things would not be suspicion to keep them out of the military or certainly subject to harassment," Clinton added.

The issue was put in the spotlight in the past week after a military jury at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, convicted and sentenced an Army private to life in prison for beating a gay infantryman to death with a baseball bat as the victim slept.

Testimony in the trial of Army Pvt. Calvin Glover, 18, of Sulphur, Oklahoma, suggested his victim, Pfc. Barry Winchell, 21, of Kansas City, Missouri, was harassed by troops for months before his death and base commanders did nothing to stifle intolerance. Jurors rejected Glover's contention that he committed the crime on impulse while drunk.

POLICY CALLED A FAILURE

"The policy is a failure. Period," said C. Dixon Osburn of the Washington-based gay rights activist group Servicemembers Legal Defence Network. He said the rules were not benign and protective of gays as the Pentagon claimed, but actually fostered "a policy of violence."

"No command should ever allow harassment to thrive against any service member for any reason," Osburn said.

Pentagon figures show that 1,145 people were forced to leave the armed services in 1998 under provisions of the Military Homosexual Conduct Policy,

as it formally is known, compared to 617 in 1994, when the policy started.

The policy allows gays to serve, but continues a ban on homosexual acts and requires gays to keep their sexual orientation private. It also requires the military not to ask servicemen about their sexual orientation.

The compromise was reached after Congress in 1993 officially relaxed the military's 50-year ban on gays.

Former U.S. Sen. Bill Bradley, mounting a tough challenge to Gore for the Democratic presidential nomination, said gays should be allowed to serve openly in uniform.

In Washington, Defence Department spokesman Ken Bacon stressed that Defence Secretary William Cohen has spoken out repeatedly against intolerance of any kind in the military.

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

Bacon noted that Fort Campbell's commanders have agreed to investigate thoroughly other reports of harassment of gays as well as unsupervised and unpunished drinking on the post.

INCREASING NUMBER OF GAY TROOPS OUSTED

Bacon conceded that increasing numbers of homosexuals were being removed from the military, but said it was because they were violating the department's rule by speaking out openly about their homosexuality and leaving senior officers no alternative but to move legally against them.

While federal district judges in the past have ruled against the policy, calling it discriminatory, higher courts have upheld the rule. They say the military is a special case in which order and discipline are paramount.

Clinton promised to eliminate all restrictions on gays in the military when he ran for office, but later faced opposition from senior military officers who said gays openly serving in close quarters with other troops would damage "good order and discipline" in the ranks.

The Pentagon since has performed a delicate balancing act to implement the policy, upholding the right to remove gays for violating the rule while pressing commanders not to search out homosexuals without strong evidence.

"In August, Secretary Cohen made it clear ? as he had shortly after he took office ? that there is no room for a climate of harassment or discrimination within the military based on sexual orientation. That's the policy," Bacon said.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 11:50:41.00

SUBJECT: Re: gays in the military guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Thanks - I appreciate your help.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides <RSocarides@rlmnet.com> (Richard Socarides <RSocarides@rlmnet.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 09:27:41.00

SUBJECT: FW: Army moves to discharge Rep. May

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

TEXT:
I guess they didn't like the letter

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

From: LGBT Activists List [mailto:Doug.Case@sdsu.edu]
Sent: Sunday, December 12, 1999 9:29 PM
To: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu
Subject: Army moves to discharge Rep. May

ARIZONA REPUBLIC, December 12, 1999
Phoenix, AZ
(<http://www.azcentral.com/>)

Army moves to discharge Rep. May
Says he violated 'don't ask' rule
By Chris Moeser, The Arizona Republic
The Army is moving forward with plans to discharge openly gay state Rep.

Steve May, an Army reservist, under the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, despite glowing performance evaluations.

Officials had rated the east Phoenix Republican legislator as "one of the finest young officers" in the Army and had urged quick promotions, according to a report obtained by The Arizona Republic.

May's case has become a lightning rod nationally for opponents of the Army policy since The Republic reported in August that he was under investigation for violating it.

This comes at a time when the policy is under increasing scrutiny after the beating death of a gay soldier at an Army base in Kentucky. Earlier this week, Hillary Clinton called "don't ask, don't tell" a failed policy.

And one of President Clinton's staunchest allies in Congress, Rep. Barney

Frank, D-Mass., blasted Clinton's handling of May's case in a letter to the president last week.

Frank also called on Arizona Sen. John McCain, whom May is supporting in the presidential race, to be supportive of May. McCain is courting gay Republican voters and expects to raise \$50,000 at fund-raiser held Tuesday

night by the Log Cabin Republicans.

May, 28, a lieutenant in the Reserves, who is scheduled to be interviewed tonight on 60 Minutes (Channel 5, 6 p.m.), argues that his case proves the policy has been a disaster that forces highly qualified people out of the military.

"If you look at my evaluations, they say, 'Yep, he's a great officer, but we're going to kick you out anyway.' It's absurd," May said. "This is stupid. This makes no sense. There is no justification to prevent qualified gay and lesbian Americans from serving their country in uniform."

The Army investigation, which May provided to The Republic, was launched this spring after a soldier in May's Phoenix reserve unit noticed news stories in which May said that he is gay. The Army notified May of the report's findings when he reported for exercises Dec. 3.

May made the comments Feb. 3 in a legislative hearing in response to an anti-gay bill. Two days later, he was recalled to active duty.

The Army concluded May violated the policy by discussing his sexual orientation.

"Based on evidence from multimedia sources, coupled with your open admissions, I have determined that you have made statements that you are a homosexual," investigator Patricia Maddox wrote.

May and his attorneys have argued that he made the comments in his role as a state legislator and not while he was on active duty. To prevent him from exercising his rights as a legislator amounts to a violation of his rights.

"Even for people who like the policy, it seems to me this is a clear violation of a basic principle of legislative independence and the notion that the federal government would in effect be censoring what a state legislator says in the course of legislative business. It's outrageous," Frank said.

May's attorneys also plan to argue in their response to the charges that an obscure Defense Department directive allows a commanding officer to disregard the "don't ask, don't tell" policy if discharging the person would not be in the best interests of the armed forces.

"The chain of command keeps hiding behind the regulations and saying they have no choice," said Dixon Osburn, co-executive director of the Service Members Legal Defense Network, a Washington, D.C.-based group that has defended more than 2,000 service people facing discharge over the policy. "Losing Representative May would be detrimental."

May's evaluations confirm that view. His commanding officer, Maj. Eileen

Norton, concluded in her final report that although May had openly acknowledged his sexual orientation, he is an excellent officer.

"It is my recommendation that each commander in Lt. May's chain of command . . . take into consideration Lt. May's outstanding military performance . . . and his unlimited potential to be an outstanding asset as a future officer and leader in the Army Reserves," she wrote.

Other soldiers in May's outfit agreed.

"I do not believe that this knowledge has in any way been detrimental to the morale of my troops or the morale of the troops directly under Lt. May's command," Lt. Jeffrey Clark wrote.

May's attorney, Christopher Wolf, has written to Norton and asked her to terminate the investigation.

Norton did not return a call seeking comment.

But the architect of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, Northwestern University sociology Professor Charles Moskos, said May doesn't have a case.

"By telling, he should be discharged. . . . A state representative, of all people, should not be above the law," Moskos said.

He suggested the policy shortly after the Clinton administration became engulfed in controversy surrounding the issue of gays in the military in 1993.

Moskos argues it would violate the rights of heterosexual service men and women to be housed in "intimate" conditions with gay members.

"I'm sure the Army will survive without Steve May," he said.

May calls the argument ridiculous.

"The idea that homosexuals should be prohibited from military service because of the fears of a few homophobes is unfounded," he said. "We don't forbid Blacks from serving even though there are racists in the Army."

Opponents also point out that with 1,149 gay and lesbian service personnel being discharged under the policy in 1998, military readiness is being damaged. May, for example, is trained as a chemical-weapons defense officer.

"It shows that the policy is dumb. It's not based on reality; it's based on political perception," Frank said. "This has never made a lot of sense militarily, particularly when they come to complain to us that they can't get enough people in the military."

Last month, Frank wrote Clinton and asked him to call off the investigation of May. He received a reply from a White House counsel, Beth Nolan, stating that his request had been forwarded to the Defense Department.

"I well remember the political difficulties that arose that led to this decision, . . ." Frank wrote back to Clinton last week. "But none of that justifies the brush-off that Ms. Nolan has given me."

Frank also is critical of McCain, whom he said should take up May's cause.

"This is an issue at home. He knows Steve May well. Does John McCain think he should be kicked out of the military?" Frank asked. "McCain thinks

I have been very unfair to him when I've said he's been very unsympathetic to the question of fair treatment for gay people. Steve May is a supporter of his. He certainly does not seem to be reciprocating."

McCain's campaign spokesman did not return calls seeking comment.

May, who donated \$1,000 to McCain as part of the fund-raiser Tuesday

night and has been a vocal supporter, said he has not discussed his situation with McCain. May was inspired to join the military as a kid after talking with McCain about his experience in Vietnam.

"I don't think he wants his opinion to be confronted by the facts of this case," May said. "I think it would be hard for a man like John McCain not to recognize this is a failed policy."

May hopes his attorneys can persuade his Army commanders to end the discharge proceedings. If they don't, the case will progress and he likely will be discharged in the next four to six months.

"I don't feel my sexual orientation should be an issue. I should be judged on the basis of my performance. I think most Americans agree," he said.

"The Army evaluates me on the basis of honesty, integrity, courage, responsibility and service. At the same time they expect me to live a deceitful life. It's immoral."

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

- 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: Army moves to discharge Rep. May</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

<P>I guess they didn't like the letter
</P>

<P>-----Original Message-----

From: LGBT Activists List [<mailto:Doug.Case@sdsu.edu>]
><mailto:Doug.Case@sdsu.edu>]

Sent: Sunday, December 12, 1999 9:29 PM

To: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu

Subject: Army moves to discharge Rep. May
</P>

<P>ARIZONA REPUBLIC, December 12, 1999

Phoenix, AZ

(http://www.azcentral.com/)
</P>

<P>Army moves to discharge Rep. May

Says he violated 'don't ask' rule

By Chris Moeser, The Arizona Republic

 The Army is moving forward with plans to discharge openly gay state Rep.

Steve May, an Army reservist, under the "don't ask, don't tell" policy,

despite glowing performance evaluations.

 Officials had rated the east Phoenix Republican legislator as "one of the

finest young officers" in the Army and had urged quick promotions, according

to a report obtained by The Arizona Republic.

 May's case has become a lightning rod nationally for opponents of the

Army policy since The Republic reported in August that he was under

investigation for violating it.

 This comes at a time when the policy is under increasing scrutiny after

the beating death of a gay soldier at an Army base in Kentucky. Earlier this

week, Hillary Clinton called "don't ask, don't tell" a failed policy.

 And one of President Clinton's staunchest allies in Congress, Rep. Barney

Frank, D-Mass., blasted Clinton's handling of May's case in a letter to the

president last week.

 Frank also called on Arizona Sen. John McCain, whom May is supporting in

the presidential race, to be supportive of May. McCain is courting gay

Republican voters and expects to raise \$50,000 at fund-raiser held Tuesday

night by the Log Cabin Republicans.

 May, 28, a lieutenant in the Reserves, who is scheduled to be interviewed

tonight on 60 Minutes (Channel 5, 6 p.m.), argues that his case proves the

policy has been a disaster that forces highly qualified people out of the

military.

 "If you look at my evaluations, they say, 'Yep, he's a great officer, but

we're going to kick you out anyway.' It's absurd," May said. "This is

stupid. This makes no sense. There is no justification to prevent qualified

gay and lesbian Americans from serving their country in uniform

m."

The Army investigation, which May provided to The Republic, was launched

this spring after a soldier in May's Phoenix reserve unit notified news

stories in which May said that he is gay. The Army notified May of the

report's findings when he reported for exercises Dec. 3.

May made the comments Feb. 3 in a legislative hearing in response to an

anti-gay bill. Two days later, he was recalled to active duty.

The Army concluded May violated the policy by discussing his sexual

orientation.

"Based on evidence from multimedia sources, coupled with your open

admissions, I have determined that you have made statements that you are a

homosexual," investigator Patricia Maddox wrote.

May and his attorneys have argued that he made the comments in his role

as a state legislator and not while he was on active duty. To prevent him

from exercising his rights as a legislator amounts to a violation of his

rights.

"Even for people who like the policy, it seems to me this is a clear

violation of a basic principle of legislative independence and the notion

that the federal government would in effect be censoring what a state

legislator says in the course of legislative business. It's outrageous,"

Frank said.

May's attorneys also plan to argue in their response to the charges that

an obscure Defense Department directive allows a commanding officer to

disregard the "don't ask, don't tell" policy if discharging the person would

not be in the best interests of the armed forces.

"The chain of command keeps hiding behind the regulations and saying they

have no choice," said Dixon Osburn, co-executive director of the Service

Members Legal Defense Network, a Washington, D.C.-based group that has

defended more than 2,000 service people facing discharge over the policy.

"Losing Representative May would be detrimental."

ONT>

 May's evaluations confirm that view.
His commanding officer, Maj. Eileen

Norton, concluded in her final report that although May had op
only

acknowledged his sexual orientation, he is an excellent office
r.

 "It is my recommendation that each com
mander in Lt. May's chain of

command . . . take into consideration Lt. May's outstanding mi
litary

performance . . . and his unlimited potential to be an outstan
ding asset as a

future officer and leader in the Army Reserves," she wrot
e.

 Other soldiers in May's outfit agreed.</FON
T>

 "I do not believe that this knowledge
has in any way been detrimental to

the morale of my troops or the morale of the troops directly u
nder Lt. May's

command," Lt. Jeffrey Clark wrote.

 May's attorney, Christopher Wolf, has writt
en to Norton and asked her to

terminate the investigation.

 Norton did not return a call seeking commen
t.

 But the architect of the "don't ask, d
on't tell" policy, Northwestern

University sociology Professor Charles Moskos, said May doesn'
t have a case.

 "By telling, he should be discharged.
. . . A state representative, of

all people, should not be above the law," Moskos said.</F
ONT>

 He suggested the policy shortly after the C
linton administration became

engulfed in controversy surrounding the issue of gays in the m
ilitary in

1993.

 Moskos argues it would violate the rights o
f heterosexual service men and

women to be housed in "intimate" conditions with gay
members.

 "I'm sure the Army will survive withou
t Steve May," he said.

 May calls the argument ridiculous.

 "The idea that homosexuals should be p
rohibited from military service

because of the fears of a few homophobes is unfounded," h
e said. "We don't

forbid Blacks from serving even though there are racists in th
e Army."

 Opponents also point out that with 1,149 ga
y and lesbian service

personnel being discharged under the policy in 1998, military readiness is

being damaged. May, for example, is trained as a chemical-weapons defense

officer.

 "It shows that the policy is dumb. p; It's not based on reality; it's based

on political perception," Frank said. "This has never made a lot of sense

militarily, particularly when they come to complain to us that they can't get

enough people in the military."

 Last month, Frank wrote Clinton and asked him to call off the

investigation of May. He received a reply from a White House counsel, Beth

Nolan, stating that his request had been forwarded to the Defense Department.

 "I well remember the political difficulties that arose that led to this

decision, . . ." Frank wrote back to Clinton last week. sp; "But none of that

justifies the brush-off that Ms. Nolan has given me."

 Frank also is critical of McCain, whom he said should take up May's

cause.

 "This is an issue at home. He knows Steve May well. Does John McCain

think he should be kicked out of the military?" Frank asked. "McCain thinks

I have been very unfair to him when I've said he's been very unsympathetic to

the question of fair treatment for gay people. Steve May is a supporter of

his. He certainly does not seem to be reciprocating."t;

 McCain's campaign spokesman did not return calls seeking comment.

 May, who donated \$1,000 to McCain as part of the fund-raiser Tuesday

night and has been a vocal supporter, said he has not discussed his situation

with McCain. May was inspired to join the military as a kid after talking

with McCain about his experience in Vietnam.

 "I don't think he wants his opinion to be confronted by the facts of this

case," May said. "I think it would be hard for a man like John McCain not to

recognize this is a failed policy."

 May hopes his attorneys can persuade his Army commanders to end the

discharge proceedings. If they don't, the case will prog

ress and he likely

will be discharged in the next four to six months.

 "I don't feel my sexual orientation sh
ould be an issue. I should be

judged on the basis of my performance. I think most Amer
icans agree," he

said.

 "The Army evaluates me on the basis of
honesty, integrity, courage,

responsibility and service. At the same time they expect
me to live a

deceitful life. It's immoral."

The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit info
rmational

service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed
interest in

this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please
do not

redistribute or post copyrighted material anyplace on the Inte
rnet

accessible to the public without attribution and permission fr
om the

author. Please note that distribution of this item does
not necessarily

constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items ar
e distributed

as "opposition research."
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 08:28:44.00

SUBJECT: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

interns need to put out in bins

----- Forwarded by Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP on 12/13/99 08:28

AM -----

Jennifer M. Palmieri

12/12/99 10:11:02 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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

Message Sent

To:

Brian S. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP

Brooke B. Livingston/WHO/EOP@EOP

GlynnME@state.gove @ inet

SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov @ inet
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu @ inet
wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov @ inet
Kathleen K. Ahn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/OA/EOP@EOP
Ralph Alswang/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Eli G. Attie"@lgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP@EOP
Mark H. Bartholomew/OA/EOP@EOP
BARTHOLOW_T@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark J. Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marsha E. Berry/WHO/EOP@EOP
Todd A. Bledsoe/WHO/EOP@EOP
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP@EOP
"Brian A. Reich"@OVP.eop.gov @ inet
"Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
pcaplan@fbr.com @ inet
George G. Caudill/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
CUTLER_L@a1.eop.gov @ inet
DICKY_L@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Elliot J. Diringer/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Bird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon Farmer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP@EOP
FORDE_R@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
GRAY_W@a1.eop.gov @ inet
John A. Gribben/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Hadley/OA/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP@EOP
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP

Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sheyda Jahanbani/NSC/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP@EOP
Wayne C. Johnson/OA/EOP@EOP
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
John_See@ed.gov @ inet
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Jim Kohlenberger"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet
KTORPEY@AOL.COM @ inet
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Christopher S. Lehane"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP@EOP
MOFFETT_J@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Nathan B. Naylor"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Ellen E. Olcott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Denver R. Peacock/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEOP/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov @
inet
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP@EOP
Evan Ryan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christopher K. Scully/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/OPD/EOP@EOP
Mark C. Sheppard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
SMITH_BD@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maria E. Soto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dana C. Strand/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael J. Sullivan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sylvia M. Mathews/OMB/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Loretta M. Ucelli/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Janice H. Vranich/WHO/EOP@EOP
Setti D. Warren/WHO/EOP@EOP
Essence P. Washington/OPD/EOP@EOP
Robert S. Weiner/ONDCEP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
WOZNIAK_N@a1.eop.gov @ inet
carolmast@aol.com @ inet
dmilbank@tnr.com @ inet
john_see@ed.gov @ inet
klasky_helaine@ustr.gov @ inet
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP
skgmd@umich.edu @ inet
tingen-terri@dol.gov @ inet
usia01@access.digex.com @ inet
62955104@eln.attmail.com @ inet
INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov @ inet
newsdesk@usnewswire.com @ inet
pubs_backup@oa.eop.gov @ inet
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alberto O. Feraren/OA/EOP@EOP
Pub_Arch@oa.eop.gov@inet
Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@inet
Hildy Kuryk/WHO/EOP@EOP
Pub_Arch@EOP
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sally Katzen/OMB/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP

John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us @ inet
Rachel A. Redington/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon H. Yuan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Nicole L. Davison/OPD/EOP@EOP
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Francisco J. Sanchez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Bridget T. Leininger/WHO/EOP@EOP
Abigail L. McDermott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laurie P. Kelleher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Samir Afridi/WHO/EOP@EOP
Terry Edmonds/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kymberly M. Escobar/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
sean.carr@cnn.com @ inet
Julia G. Bataille@OVP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
masonjulie@aol.com @ inet
Jason E. Hartke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Alexander/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrienne K. Elrod/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisel Loy/WHO/EOP@EOP
releases@wwwO.whitehouse.gov @ inet
jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com @ inet
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
kit.judge@mail.house.gov @ inet
Abigail C. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordanindc@aol.com @ inet
Deanne E. Benos/OPD/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gilbert S. Gonzalez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsay R. Drewel/WHO/EOP@EOP

Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Erica_Lepping@ed.gov @ inet
Mark D. Magana/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Barreto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lauren M. Supina/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrian E. Miller/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
Renee Sagiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather F. Hurlburt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean R. Dobson/OPD/EOP@EOP
deborah.charles@reuters.com @ inet
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 09:13:54.00

SUBJECT: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

pfaves 1 (pfaves 1 [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

state (state [UNKNOWN])

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:13-DEC-1999 09:13:00.00

SUBJECT: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP on 12/13/99 09:12
AM -----

Jennifer M. Palmieri
12/12/99 10:11:02 PM
Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: EMBARGOED: Radio Interview of the President By CBS News

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

Message Sent

To:

Brian S. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP

Brooke B. Livingston/WHO/EOP@EOP

GlynnME@state.gov @ inet

SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov @ inet

backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu @ inet
wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov @ inet
Kathleen K. Ahn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/OA/EOP@EOP
Ralph Alswang/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Eli G. Attie"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP@EOP
Mark H. Bartholomew/OA/EOP@EOP
BARTHOLOW_T@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark J. Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marsha E. Berry/WHO/EOP@EOP
Todd A. Bledsoe/WHO/EOP@EOP
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP@EOP
"Brian A. Reich"@OVP.eop.gov @ inet
"Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
pcaplan@fbr.com @ inet
George G. Caudill/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
CUTLER_L@a1.eop.gov @ inet
DICKY_L@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Elliot J. Diringer/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Bird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon Farmer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP@EOP
FORDE_R@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
GRAY_W@a1.eop.gov @ inet
John A. Gribben/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Hadley/OA/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP@EOP
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP

Sheyda Jahanbani/NSC/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP@EOP
Wayne C. Johnson/OA/EOP@EOP
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
John_See@ed.gov @ inet
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Jim Kohlenberger"@lgate4.eop.gov @ inet
KTORPEY@AOL.COM @ inet
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Christopher S. Lehane"@lgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP@EOP
MOFFETT_J@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr/OSTP/EOP@EOP
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Nathan B. Naylor"@lgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Ellen E. Olcott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Denver R. Peacock/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
"/R=OPUS/R=MRP/PR-L=AVUOEOB/PR-U=TDIXON/FFN=Timothy Dixon/"@mr.eop.gov @
inet
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP@EOP
Evan Ryan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
NAPLAN_S@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christopher K. Scully/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/OPD/EOP@EOP
Mark C. Sheppard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP

Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
SMITH_BD@a1.eop.gov @ inet
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maria E. Soto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dana C. Strand/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael J. Sullivan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sylvia M. Mathews/OMB/EOP@EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Thomas M. Rosshirt"@lmgate4.eop.gov @ inet
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Loretta M. Ucelli/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Janice H. Vranich/WHO/EOP@EOP
Setti D. Warren/WHO/EOP@EOP
Essence P. Washington/OPD/EOP@EOP
Robert S. Weiner/ONDCEP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
WOZNIAC_N@a1.eop.gov @ inet
carolmast@aol.com @ inet
dmilbank@tnr.com @ inet
john_see@ed.gov @ inet
klasky_helaine@ustr.gov @ inet
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP
skgmd@umich.edu @ inet
tingen-terri@dol.gov @ inet
usia01@access.digex.com @ inet
62955104@eln.attmail.com @ inet
INFOMGT@a1.eop.gov @ inet
newsdesk@usnewswire.com @ inet
pubs_backup@oa.eop.gov @ inet
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alberto O. Feraren/OA/EOP@EOP
Pub_Arch@oa.eop.gov@inet
Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@inet
Hildy Kuryk/WHO/EOP@EOP
Pub_Arch@EOP
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sally Katzen/OMB/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP

Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us @ inet
Rachel A. Redington/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon H. Yuan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Nicole L. Davison/OPD/EOP@EOP
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Francisco J. Sanchez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Bridget T. Leininger/WHO/EOP@EOP
Abigail L. McDermott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laurie P. Kelleher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Samir Afridi/WHO/EOP@EOP
Terry Edmonds/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kymberly M. Escobar/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
sean.carr@cnn.com @ inet
Julia G. Bataille@OVP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
masonjulie@aol.com @ inet
Jason E. Hartke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Alexander/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrienne K. Elrod/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisel Loy/WHO/EOP@EOP
releases@wwwO.whitehouse.gov @ inet
jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com @ inet
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
kit.judge@mail.house.gov @ inet
Abigail C. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordanindc@aol.com @ inet
Deanne E. Benos/OPD/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gilbert S. Gonzalez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsay R. Drewel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP

Erica_Lepping@ed.gov @ inet
Mark D. Magana/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Barreto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lauren M. Supina/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrian E. Miller/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
Renee Sagiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather F. Hurlburt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean R. Dobson/OPD/EOP@EOP
deborah.charles@reuters.com @ inet
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP