

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Bob Witeck to Elizabeth J. Potter at 12:48:30.00. Subject: RE: Bigger question today - "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." [partial] (1 page)	12/14/1999	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/14/1999 - 12/15/1999]

2015-0017-F

ab1542

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 08:30:01.00

SUBJECT: EARLYBIRDS: Bush & McCain Take Their Gloves Off

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

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

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

Hotline Earlybird: Bush and McCain exchange lively debate, Gore says
eliminate military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, Giuliani gears up for
transit strike, and Carter will represent the United States in today's
Panama Canal transfer.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/hotline.htm>

Greenwire Earlybird: WH 2000 GOP candidates clash over ethanol, FDA holds
final bio-engineered food hearing, and Japan passes new nuclear safety
laws.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/greenwire/>

Pundit Watch: The debates, the role of minor candidates in the presidential
process, and how party rules affect the candidates.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/pundits.htm>

TV Track: Mental illness study, WH 2000 GOP debate and Columbine videos.
<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/tvnews.htm>

Today on Cloakroom:

-- Budget Battles: One Issue That Was Settled This Year
<http://cloakroom.com/members/buzz/budget.htm>

-- Off To The Races: Eighteen Races Could Swing The House
<http://cloakroom.com/members/buzz/races.htm>

To stop receiving this E-mail Alert:

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

The Earlybirds are published daily by National Journal Group Inc. For more
information about National Journal Group's publications, go to

<http://www.nationaljournal.com>.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 10:20:16.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask--Don't Tell meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William Marshall (CN=William Marshall/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cathy L. Millison (CN=Cathy L. Millison/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jane E. Baker (CN=Jane E. Baker/OU=PFIAB/O=EOP@EOP [PFIAB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

4:00 PM Today. Room 117

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Craig Hughes (CN=Craig Hughes/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 10:16:17.00

SUBJECT: One more ProJo

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Raising the bucks: Hillary Clinton on the
East Side

That blondish blur in a brown outfit on the East Side (of Providence)
yesterday was New York Senate candidate Hillary Clinton, whizzing into
Democratic activist Jack McConnell's home for a pricey fundraising lunch.

When event co-chair Mark Weiner told me the take was \$108,000, Clinton
national finance director David Rosen gushed, ``He's speaking my
language."

In an Elmgrove Avenue neighborhood of drop-dead gorgeous homes, the
event was beautiful: Fir, tulips, roses, red tablecloths, gold chairs and
green

Astroturf lent a festive air in a heated tent. In caterer Guy Abelson's
buffet

was roasted boned rosemary and lemon chicken on herbed polenta. Did I
mention the lobster crab cakes?

The first lady talked up issues dear to many folks -- health, minimum wage
etc. -- and displayed political skills. ``She's very engaging . . . she
knows

how to make big issues resonate with individuals," enthused Myrth York,
former gubernatorial nominee.

Host McConnell marveled at how Mrs. Clinton made sure on her way out
that she posed for a photo with his parents. ``She said, 'Grab them both
for

me.' She went to the Secret Service and said, 'Let them through,' and
pulled them in. She's a cool lady."

But the day also had harsher realities. First of all, admission to the
fundraiser was \$1,000. Abelson, who spends a lot of time working to help
the needy, said of the tariff, ``It's expensive, but to get the right

people in
office, you have to do it, right?"

It's not just getting into office and it's not just New York candidates coming here. Sen. Jack Reed, an incumbent three years away from his next race, told me he just had a \$1,000 fundraiser with Wall Street types and others in New York. How much did it bring in? "I don't know. I'm in sales, not accounting," Reed quipped.

More seriously, he said you need to raise big bucks early to scare away some prospective challengers. And, for the race you do wind up in, you still need so much you can't wait until late in the cycle to raise it.

And don't think New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani, Mrs. Clinton's prospective Republican opponent, isn't also raising money wherever he can. An amused McConnell got a Giuliani mailing that warned, "Every left-wing group in the nation will pour in massive amounts of money and other support to help her win." Giuliani asked for donations of up to \$1,000.

McConnell sniffed, "You don't even get lunch out of it."

Mrs. Clinton may have dazzled yesterday's guests with her political skills, but she didn't dazzle me. Journalists generally were kept out, although a TV reporter attended on a background basis. It made me wonder again how this woman, whose fear/contempt of the press is well known, will fare in the hurly burly of a New York campaign.

I would have liked to shoot the breeze with her about Al Gore's constant pounding of Bill Bradley's health program as overly ambitious, even though it still falls short of what she and the administration tried to put across.

And I would have liked to talk to her about the fact that she last week deplored the nation's don't ask/don't tell gays-in-the-military policy, with her husband then echoing her lament. I might have asked her: Where have you and he been? It takes a Senate campaign to raise this issue?

It also was interesting that Mrs. Clinton, who's essentially abdicating her role as first lady, milked it enough to justify as official business her visit later yesterday to a school forum in Cumberland. This meant she could fob off to the taxpayers some of the costs of her trip.

There are people in Rhode Island who adore Mrs. Clinton and if they want her campaign to bring her here so they can give her money, that's terrific. But if she wants to meet with a group of school kids, can't she find any in New York? Why do we have to chip in so she can meet with some here?

M. Charles Bakst, The Journal's political columnist, can be reached by E-mail at mbakst@projo.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jody J. Kaplan (CN=Jody J. Kaplan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 16:50:58.00

SUBJECT: from the Providence Journal

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

A double-duty day

By MARIA MIRO JOHNSON

Journal Staff Writer

At 1 p.m. yesterday, she was Hillary Rodham Clinton, candidate. At 3, she was Hillary Rodham Clinton, first lady.

By the end of her three-hour visit to Rhode Island, audiences for the dual-action celebrity seemed satisfied -- and she, too, had reason to be happy: The first stop of the day, a fundraising luncheon at a private home on the East Side of Providence, added \$108,000 to her campaign war chest, as she seeks to become the next U.S. senator from New York.

It's a lot of money, said Mark Weiner, a veteran Democratic fundraiser who cosponsored the event. He believes it's the most ever raised at a single event for a non-presidential candidate in an out-of-state race in the history of Rhode Island.

Which raises a question: Why would Rhode Islanders care about such a candidate in such a race?

It was the question on several reporters' lips yesterday, but they had to content themselves with asking it of politicians other than Clinton. She is not granting interviews these days.

Republicans, of course, have a theory about the visit.

Said Rhode Island GOP Chairwoman Joan Quick in a statement: ``New York is a heavily populated state, full of corporate and individual campaign contributors. . . . [so if] Mrs. Clinton is visiting Rhode Island, the smallest state in the union, to raise money, there may be merit in reports by the New York and national media that hers is a campaign in jeopardy."

Not so, said Jack McConnell, the Democratic lawyer who, with his wife, Sara, hosted the \$1,000-a-plate event at their Elmgrove Avenue home. He says he volunteered his help as soon as he heard Clinton would run against

New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, ``because I care about the Senate, it's really that simple."

``I care about what issues get dealt with and how they're dealt with in the Senate. I want Hillary Clinton in there and not Rudy Giuliani. I want Tom Daschle in there and not Trent Lott."

The event drew a familiar stream of Democrats to the McConnells' front door. (``Every weekend, I see the same people," quipped Serena Conley, who dates U.S. Sen. Jack Reed.) A smattering of curious East Siders watched from nearby lawns.

``I have the nosiest friends," said Linda Baker, 59, who lives next door to the McConnells'. Members of her bridge club were being less than subtle in craning over the property line to see what was happening. ``They told me they would act with decorum. Oh, look at them. Look at my nosy friends."

Asked their take on Clinton, the three women -- their fourth was late -- agreed that she is very bright, and said they are inclined to like her ``as a woman."

``One wonders what she is, though, underneath it all," mused Sandra Scoliard of Providence.

``I feel sorry for her," said Beverly Cohen of Pawtucket. ``She's been through so much humiliation." If she ran in Rhode Island, she'd vote for her, ``probably because I have sympathy for her."

The candidate arrived about an hour late, stepped out of a blue Cadillac wearing a brown pantsuit, waved and called, ``Hi, how are you?" to the folks on the street, then shook hands with Reed and U.S. Rep. Patrick Kennedy and disappeared behind a closed door with a Christmas wreath on it.

Later, Weiner, who is finance chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, said Clinton spoke for about 20 minutes, posed for photos with guests and signed autographs.

Then she was on her way up the highway. She was the guest of honor -- appearing as first lady now -- at a gathering of students and officials at Cumberland High School gym, where they'd discuss violence in the schools.

Might that be so she could charge some of the cost of her trip to the federal government? Senator Reed was asked.

``Typically, we always try, if a first lady is here or anyone is here, to ensure that there is a public opportunity to see and talk to people in Rhode Island," he said.

This event was not entirely public, as it was for invited guests. But at least it was a whole gymnasium full of them -- students from public and private schools in the area, and local and state officials.

Julie Beral, a 16-year-old exchange student from Lyons, France, said she signed up to attend because Clinton is an important person, well-respected in France -- "People really like the way she reacted to all the Monica Lewinsky things. . . . The fact that she didn't say anything, that was appreciated."

Mike O'Connor, 17, of Cumberland, said Clinton "stands for good." It doesn't bother him that she's running from a recently adopted state. A candidate could be from anywhere, he said, "as long as they stand for what people want in that state."

When Clinton arrived at 2:44, she was greeted with cheers and a standing ovation.

She did not give a speech, but asked questions of the students -- a kind of "reverse Town Hall" forum.

One by one, students rose with questions and comments, until by the end of an hour, it was well-established that America is a violent society, that respect is a thing of the past, and that it's mainly the fault of the media, which accentuates the negative.

Parents also took it on the chin for not paying enough attention, or for giving up on trying to control their teenagers.

"There has to be a sea change in the culture," said Clinton, who won a hearty burst of applause for her comment that school districts and parents should support teachers who discipline students.

Agreeing with one teenager who observed that "all students want to be known," Clinton referred more than once to a "terrifying" Time magazine article she'd read about the motives of the killers in the Columbine massacre.

She exhorted the audience to be fearless in seeking mental help; "it is a sign of real courage."

On this subject, some of the strongest comments of the day were made by Kennedy, who offered his own experience as a teaching tool. "I was very fortunate to get mental health counseling," he said, apparently referring to the drug problems of his younger days. "I was very fortunate to get it. It means I'm a much stronger person."

There's no stigma about it for him, he said, because "guess what? The people that are really losers are those who are too afraid to face" their problems.

Clinton's summation of the problem with violence in schools is that while

"I do believe that there are some people who are, for some reason, evil and bad," others may simply suffer from undiagnosed mental health problems, or else are having "trouble coming to grips with who they are and their identity."

"But when you lose 13 kids a day to gun violence, we got too many people who are doing things that are stupid." There was no time left to go into what she might do about it.

After she left and the Secret Service released the crowd from the gym, students gave the first lady good reviews.

"I thought it was great," said Barcellia Bropheh, 15, who attends Tolman High School in Pawtucket. "Someone older showed us respect and took our opinions into consideration. It was about time that someone came to see what we stand for. She didn't look at us negatively, like the media usually looks at us" -- especially after some high school tragedy.

"She was positive toward us. She took the time to come down here and look at us in a positive position.

M. CHARLES BAKST

By BAKST

Raising the bucks: Hillary Clinton on the East Side

That blondish blur in a brown outfit on the East Side (of Providence) yesterday was New York Senate candidate Hillary Clinton, whizzing into Democratic activist Jack McConnell's home for a pricey fundraising lunch.

When event co-chair Mark Weiner told me the take was \$108,000, Clinton national finance director David Rosen gushed, "He's speaking my language."

In an Elmgrove Avenue neighborhood of drop-dead gorgeous homes, the event was beautiful: Fir, tulips, roses, red tablecloths, gold chairs and green

Astroturf lent a festive air in a heated tent. In caterer Guy Abelson's buffet

was roasted boned rosemary and lemon chicken on herbed polenta. Did I mention the lobster crab cakes?

The first lady talked up issues dear to many folks -- health, minimum wage etc. -- and displayed political skills. "She's very engaging . . . she knows

how to make big issues resonate with individuals," enthused Myrth York, former gubernatorial nominee.

Host McConnell marveled at how Mrs. Clinton made sure on her way out

that she posed for a photo with his parents. ``She said, `Grab them both for me.' She went to the Secret Service and said, `Let them through,' and pulled them in. She's a cool lady."

But the day also had harsher realities. First of all, admission to the fundraiser was \$1,000. Abelson, who spends a lot of time working to help the needy, said of the tariff, ``It's expensive, but to get the right people in office, you have to do it, right?"

It's not just getting into office and it's not just New York candidates coming here. Sen. Jack Reed, an incumbent three years away from his next race, told me he just had a \$1,000 fundraiser with Wall Street types and others in New York. How much did it bring in? ``I don't know. I'm in sales, not accounting," Reed quipped.

More seriously, he said you need to raise big bucks early to scare away some prospective challengers. And, for the race you do wind up in, you still need so much you can't wait until late in the cycle to raise it.

And don't think New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani, Mrs. Clinton's prospective Republican opponent, isn't also raising money wherever he can. An amused McConnell got a Giuliani mailing that warned, ``Every left-wing group in the nation will pour in massive amounts of money and other support to help her win." Giuliani asked for donations of up to \$1,000. McConnell sniffed, ``You don't even get lunch out of it."

Mrs. Clinton may have dazzled yesterday's guests with her political skills, but she didn't dazzle me. Journalists generally were kept out, although a TV reporter attended on a background basis. It made me wonder again how this woman, whose fear/contempt of the press is well known, will fare in the hurly burly of a New York campaign.

I would have liked to shoot the breeze with her about Al Gore's constant pounding of Bill Bradley's health program as overly ambitious, even though it still falls short of what she and the administration tried to put across.

And I would have liked to talk to her about the fact that she last week deplored the nation's don't ask/don't tell gays-in-the-military policy, with her husband then echoing her lament. I might have asked her: Where have you and he been? It takes a Senate campaign to raise this issue?

It also was interesting that Mrs. Clinton, who's essentially abdicating her role as first lady, milked it enough to justify as official business her visit later yesterday to a school forum in Cumberland. This meant she could fob off to the taxpayers some of the costs of her trip.

There are people in Rhode Island who adore Mrs. Clinton and if they want

her campaign to bring her here so they can give her money, that's terrific. But if she wants to meet with a group of school kids, can't she find any in New York? Why do we have to chip in so she can meet with some here?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 16:51:15.00

SUBJECT: Lockhart briefing

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP on 12/14/99
04:51 PM -----

Margaret M. Suntum
12/14/99 02:20:24 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: Lockhart briefing

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
December 14, 1999

PRESS BRIEFING BY
JOE LOCKHART

The Briefing Room

1:10 P.M. EST

MR. LOCKHART: It feels like it's been a long time since we've been together. No wonder I've been in such a good mood. Anyway, let me start with, first, one personnel announcement -- worst kept secret in Washington. As many of you know, Mr. Barry Toiv will be leaving our service at the end of the week. It says here on this paper that we are

amending our national monuments list -- we left one off and it's Barry. (Laughter.) But I'm going to, actually, have more to say on that on Friday, which is his last day.

But, as has been reported a few places, I do want to make a good announcement that Jim Kennedy has agreed to join my staff as a Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Press Secretary. Many of you know him as the Special Advisor to the White House Counsel, someone who was fully employed over the last year, but thankfully has seen a decline in his part of his economy. He's done a great job for the President for Chuck Ruff, for Beth Nolan, and everyone in the Counsel's Office, and will be joining us beginning after the new year, officially.

Those of you who still have an interest in those old, boring subjects that he sometimes trafficked in, he'll be able to continue to help you.

Q On Monica and all?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, you've got questions he'll be able to help.

Q And who is replacing Jim in the Counsel's Office?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think, given the fact that the press in Washington are interested in the budget and the issues that the President is going to move forward on to make this country a better place, thankfully, no one.

Q Does that mean there will never be another scandal again in this administration?

MR. LOCKHART: That's what it means. (Laughter.) We're confident.

Q Did the President get a flu shot?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes.

Q When?

MR. LOCKHART: November 3rd. The reason we know that is that it was one of the first questions in the "Ask the White House" series on the Internet last week, was did he get a flu shot.

Q But I guess it didn't work.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I don't know if he had a full-blown case of the flu. It was a bad cold combined with a bad -- the normal seasonal allergies, with all of the Christmas trees and decorations around, with some flu-like symptoms. You never know with these whether it keeps it from being a worse case, or whether it has no bearing. But this was, for him, who rarely misses a day of work, a pretty bad case.

Q So Christmas trees bother him?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes, the Christmas trees tend to flare up his allergies. What he does for the season.

Q Joe, the New York Times, in reporting that Panama feels slighted when Albright cancels date at Canal, notes that the President said scheduling conflicts prevented him from attending. But the perception among many here and in Washington was that the administration was loath to revive conservative resentment over the handover in the presidential campaign next year. And I have a two-part question. First, in order to prove that the President's absence was in no way political, can you tell us what the scheduled events today are that were more important than his being present with the Panamanians?

MR. LOCKHART: You want to give me the second one, so we can get it all -- so I can do it quickly?

Q Well, why don't we --

MR. LOCKHART: Give me the follow-up. It's just easier that way.

Q All right, fine. It's more of the same.

MR. LOCKHART: Okay. (Laughter.)

Q When the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and Senator Sarbanes, the floor manager for these treaties, all join the President in absenting themselves, how can you blame Panama's former President Calderon for saying, it shows the United States has lowered their estimation of us even more?

MR. LOCKHART: Let me deal with the second one first, because it doesn't indicate any lowering of estimation. We have an important relationship with Panama. We've worked closely with them over the last 22 years to reach this day. I think if you look at what the President has said when he's been asked on this on a couple of occasions, he was talking about his schedule in general.

I think we've taken 12 foreign trips this year; that puts a heavy load on both the President and the staff. And there are many trips that he wants to take that he believes are important that we just can't do; this fits that category. So this decision is not made based on the politics. The President supported this treaty in 1977 -- '79 -- I think they started debating it '77 or '78 -- supported it then, supports it now, believes that this is the right thing to do.

I think some of the somewhat hysterical comments coming from the right, notwithstanding, that seek to distort the record, just have to be ignored, as is oftentimes the best way to deal with some comments. But we can't do every trip that's important, but our commitment to that region of the world is unparalleled by any President. I think we've traveled there more than any recent President, and that commitment remains the same and remains strong.

Q The Vice President said that you never asked him to go. Is that true? And why, if it's true, didn't you ask him to go?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, the President thought it was most appropriate to have the former President, Jimmy Carter, and the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State, in turn, because of the breakthrough in the Middle East peace talks, needed to be here.

Q Well, it's not until tomorrow.

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think enterprising reporters will note that her role begins today.

Q You don't deny really that the U.S. doesn't look so great on this. After all, we're making a major change here. We built the canal. I don't know how many people died in building it and so forth. It's represented so much in terms of the Monroe Doctrine and World War II, and so forth.

Q 5,607 died.

MR. LOCKHART: Thank you. What's the question?

Q My point is, don't you think that the U.S. -- the President will be remiss --

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think the U.S. is well represented at this ceremony. We have a number of Cabinet officers there. It's unfortunate in one sense that the Secretary of State couldn't go, but in another sense, it's quite fortunate that we have these historic discussions that will begin tomorrow. So you take it as it comes.

Q Joe, is the United States letting the Taliban know that they will be held responsible for any acts of terrorism against U.S. citizens by the bin Laden network, and if so, how?

MR. LOCKHART: The head of the counterterrorism unit at the State Department, Michael Sheehan, met with the Taliban yesterday and delivered a message that any terrorist activities by the bin Laden group we would hold the Taliban responsible for.

Q And what does that mean? Does that mean if there were terrorist acts by his associates that we would reserve the same rights we did earlier to bomb his installations?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I'm not going to get into specifics. We just wanted to make sure they understood that their support and harboring of the bin Laden organization was noted here in the United States and that any activity that moved forward, we would hold them responsible for.

Q And what did Mullah Omar say in response to that?

MR. LOCKHART: I'll let them characterize their own response.

Q But can you tell us what Mr. Sheehan saw as the response?

MR. LOCKHART: No.

Q Did you have a good reason to give this kind of warning -- not you, per se, but did the U.S. --

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I think that you are all aware that there is a travel advisory from the Department of State that was issued over the weekend. I can tell you that, recently, there were some suspects arrested and that we believe that they belong to the bin Laden organization and were planning terrorist acts. But beyond that, I really can't go into any more detail, because we consider this work that we're doing to combat terrorism in this group and other groups to be an ongoing effort.

Q Is that in the United States?

MR. LOCKHART: I'm not going to get into where this happened.

Q Can you give us any indication at all of what kind of effort they were planning against Americans?

MR. LOCKHART: No. I can only tell you that I think the warning is clear about the cautions that we believe Americans should take. But beyond that, I don't think it would be productive to go into the details.

Q Joe, the President is quoted by The New York Times saying about the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, "the policy, as implemented, does not work as I announced, and as the leaders of our military, at that time in 1993 pledged to implement it." Does he believe General Colin Powell deliberately broke the 1993 pledge? And I have a follow-up.

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think as the Pentagon themselves have looked through in their review that they've done this year, there have been problems in implementation. There were recommendations out of the review that came -- that was released I think in August, and Secretary Cohen took further steps yesterday. So I think as the President was clear, there's problems with implementation that we need to address quickly.

Q And he's also quoted as saying, "I'm quite sympathetic with what she said," regarding Mrs. Clinton's statement, "fitness to serve should be based on an individual's conduct, not their sexual orientation." And my question is, this means that the President believes in recruiting all sexual orientations into our armed forces, doesn't it?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, if you look at the interview, which is quite clear, he said he was quite sympathetic to the statements she made because those were statements that were in the same vein as -- let me finish.

Q Oh, sure.

MR. LOCKHART: -- when he campaigned in 1992. Clearly, when the President assumed office, there was massive opposition on Capitol Hill, within some quarters in the Pentagon. We did the best we could, and the

President believes that his focus for the next year should be trying to take the steps necessary to ensure the best implementation of the policy.

Q But the question is, if she says, "fitness to serve should be based on an individual's conduct, not their sexual orientation," and he agrees with this, this means he feels that they should recruit any sexual orientation, doesn't it, Joe? Or would he discriminate? Are you saying he would discriminate against some?

MR. LOCKHART: You know, you've had your shot today. Let's go around the room.

Q It's six years into the policy. Where and how does the President think it went wrong?

MR. LOCKHART: I'd suggest you go and look at the interview. He went into some detail about some of the issues, about the rooting out of people. But I think he was very clear there, and I don't think I can really expand on it.

Q Yes,, but he was talking about the symptoms of it going wrong. What I'm asking is, how does he think it went off-track? Was it that commanders were not paying attention to people above them? Was it the Pentagon wasn't telling people that they need to work on this? Was it they didn't --

MR. LOCKHART: Listen, I can't really reflect on that, only to say that he thinks it hasn't been implemented well, the Pentagon agrees, and we're taking steps to address that.

Q So what's he going to do to try to make it work better, then?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, we have been working, for some time before you got interested in this in the last few days. We've been working with the Pentagon for much of this year to look at it, look at how it was implemented, see if there are things we can do to improve it. That's the process we've undertaken.

Q Just to clarify, Joe. It is not the policy of don't ask, don't tell that he's criticizing, it is the implementation of the policy?

MR. LOCKHART: The President -- it depends on what you're looking at here. He indicated in an interview that he had sympathy for those who criticize don't ask don't tell, because he campaigned on something different. But we couldn't get that through. And we live in the real world here in Washington, and when the vast majority of Congress is against something, it's not likely to implement new policy.

We've done the best we could. But within the context of don't ask don't tell, the President believes, and I believe the leadership of the Pentagon believes, that we need to do more as far as implementing that to accurately reflect the intent of the policy at the time when it was announced.

Q Joe, back to the terrorist arrest in the Middle East. Is it your understanding that they were in the late stages of planning, or the early stages?

MR. LOCKHART: Again, it would not be productive to get into the operational details of this.

Q Joe, it's been made clear by some people that there are some areas of the world that perhaps would be more dangerous, if they do follow through on these threats, than others. Isn't there some kind of obligation to let the American people know where the real danger spots would be, so they can plan accordingly?

MR. LOCKHART: I think we've made very clear in our warning that Americans who are planning to travel overseas around the time of the millennium should check in with the relevant embassies and consuls. And they will be given the information that they need.

Q Joe, what was the President's reaction to the Hawaiian Supreme Court decision?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't know, I haven't talked to him about it.

Q On same-sex marriage?

MR. LOCKHART: Haven't talked to him about it.

Q They upheld the referendum --

MR. LOCKHART: Haven't talked to him about it.

April?

Q Will you ask him about that, Joe?

MR. LOCKHART: No, I think we've done enough today.

April?

Q Joe, the environmental --

MR. LOCKHART: Anytime anyone else wants to jump in. I mean -- (laughter.)

Q I want to ask a question.

MR. LOCKHART: Okay.

Q The environmental event that the President just had, one of the sites is the King Center. There was a fight with the National Park Service and the King Center back in -- well, the feud began in '94. Do you know what kind of resolved that? Because I understand the National Park Service --

MR. LOCKHART: I don't know how it was resolved, but I understand, for the sites that we put forward, we now have the money to buy them, and we have sellers. So I think the process we need to go through is consulting and working with the appropriators on Capitol Hill. But I'm not aware of any particular problem.

Q Does the National Park Service have anything to do with this proposal the President is sending out, as far as the King Center is concerned?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, you'd have to go to the Park Service and Interior; I just don't know.

Q Joe, on the don't ask, don't tell again, the President's going to work hard to try to get this to work better in the next year. Why not just propose to Congress that they drop the ban altogether?

MR. LOCKHART: Because we make judgments from time to time about what we think we can get done and what we think we can't get done, and the President's made the judgment that at this point, the most appropriate use of our time and energy is to try to have this policy implemented in the best way possible.

Q You mean, there's not support on the Hill to get something passed?

MR. LOCKHART: In our judgment.

Q Joe, last week, the President indicated he was very willing to do almost anything it took to get the Syrians and the Israelis to come to a peace agreement. Would that include a trip to Syria while they're still listed by the State Department as a country that supports terrorism?

MR. LOCKHART: You're way down the road. We have an historic opportunity tomorrow to open -- I mean, I think that the Prime Minister of Israel has never sat down to talk with the Foreign Minister of Syria on any subject, much less a broad peace agreement. That's the important thing. The important thing tomorrow is to get this process begun in a positive way, find a way to get through the issues that they need to resolve, and I think anything else is just speculation. I'm looking way down the road.

Q And what's the President's plans tomorrow and Thursday in terms of appearing in public and making statements?

MR. LOCKHART: I expect you will see him tomorrow in some form. He'll have something to say as we start this process. We'll let you know the details once we finalize them. And then they'll go in to discussions. Both the three as a group of three, and the delegations, the President talking individually with the two parties, and then the two parties talking directly to each other. But how Thursday works out I think will depend a little bit on how Wednesday goes. We'll have some

people in here in a few minutes here who know a good bit more than I do on this subject --

Q Joe, beyond these logistics that you've just outlined, what role does the President see himself taking? Is he going to be a mediator, a conciliator?

MR. LOCKHART: I think the President and the United States government has played the role of helping the parties work through issues, and I think the President stands ready and willing to do whatever he believes to be constructive and appropriate. I don't know that we can completely predict how that will play out over the next days, weeks and months, but I think you should know from the past the President has been very deeply involved in this. He's talked to the leaders dozens of times and believes strongly that we are at an historic point where we have an opportunity for peace.

Q Joe, what kind of expectations should we have for these two days of talks? How far does he think he can take this over two days?

MR. LOCKHART: I think, realistically, what the two sides and the United States government can expect is they have a chance at the end of two days to discuss how they'll move forward. There is certainly no expectation that they can reach a broad, wide-ranging agreement on issues that are quite difficult and longstanding. But I think what they will hope to do over the next two days is work hard to find a process to allows them over a period of time to reach a peace agreement.

Q Joe, what was the President's reaction to that trial in Memphis regarding the assassination of Dr. King?

MR. LOCKHART: I have not had a chance to talk to him about that, so I don't know.

Q And what was his reaction to Exxon-Mobile's decision not to give benefits to unmarried couples?

MR. LOCKHART: I didn't talk to him about that, either.

Q Will you do some talking with the President?

MR. LOCKHART: I talk to him about a lot of issues, not necessarily the ones that seem to dominate your mind.

Q Merry Christmas, you all.

MR. LOCKHART: Thank you.

Q Happy New Year.

MR. LOCKHART: Um-hmm.

Q I always seem to end up following Lester.

MR. LOCKHART: Yes.

Q Back on the terrorism issue, is it correct that U.S. intelligence was not aware of this group's intentions until they were detained? And how did it get to that point without a red flag going up?

MR. LOCKHART: Again, this is a longstanding practice to not discuss intelligence matters -- a, because it is not productive; and b, that discussing sources and methods can put lives at risk. And I'm just not going to engage in any of this discussion.

Q What's the status of any recess appointments, especially Bill Lann Lee? Will those happen soon?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, Congress is coming back soon, so -- I can't tell you. I'm certain that between now and when Congress returns, that there will be some recess appointments. But I can't tell you who or how many.

Q Do you have a date for the State of the Union?

MR. LOCKHART: Are we confirmed on the State of the Union? If you look at a congressional website you might find the 27th of January to be prominently displayed. But I really can't confirm that.

Q Joe, you're saying Congress is coming back, therefore, the recess appointment will be short? They get to serve until the end of the term.

MR. LOCKHART: No, no, no. You've got to do the appointments before they come back.

Q But they're not coming back until the end of January, so you have plenty of time to do them.

MR. LOCKHART: Right. Of course we do.

Q Oh, okay.

MR. LOCKHART: I meant in the broadest sense. Thinking about the millennium and 1,000 years, and -- (laughter) -- a month seems so short.

Q Has Congress been sounded out on what you have in mind for the settlement for the Middle East?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, I mean we, obviously --

Q And what it is going to cost the United States?

MR. LOCKHART: Well, again, I haven't heard any real discussion about any additional aid that may be needed. We obviously provide a lot of aid to Israel. We provide economic aid to many of Israel's neighbors. And I expect that to continue.

We will keep Congress informed -- as many in Congress have a keen interest in the Middle East peace process -- informed as we move along. And if there is need for additional aid, obviously OMB will be involved with the appropriate appropriators.

Q Is the United States prepared to help Israel substantially to cover the costs of moving out of the Golan Heights, if indeed that should happen?

MR. LOCKHART: That is a hypothetical question. We have always stood ready to help our friend Israel. We've always stood ready to help to provide aid in the cause of peace. As we move forward, those questions I'm certain will be discussed.

Q Speaking of terrorism as we were earlier, is the United States confident as we go into these peace talks that Syria is no longer associated with terrorism in any shape, form or fashion, as has been alleged in the past by the United States?

MR. LOCKHART: To understand the United States view on that, the State Department has a report that's issued every year, and our concerns are expressed there, and expressed openly. As far as these talks, we think it's an important point in time, and we encourage both sides to work constructively together to find a peace deal.

Q Will the success of these talks lead to a decrease in terrorism?

Q Syria's still on the list, right? They're still on the list?

MR. LOCKHART: I phrased that carefully.

Q Exactly. If these talks are successful, and I'm not talking about just these two days, but over the long run, does the United States think that could lead to a decrease in terrorism?

MR. LOCKHART: I certainly think progress in the Middle East peace talks is a positive for not only the security of Israel, the security of the Middle East.

Q How about the security of the United States?

MR. LOCKHART: We'll see.

Q Can I ask you a question about -- the Israeli news media is carrying price tags for this. The Israelis are looking for \$8 billion to get their army bases off the Golan, another \$10 billion to move just 18,000 settlers and buy their new homes along the beach. Are those figures what you're looking at?

MR. LOCKHART: As well as I have been able to answer it, I've already answered, so I'd refer you to my transcript or the next briefers.

Q Do you expect a handshake tomorrow between Prime Minister Barak and Foreign Minister Shara? Will you be working on this?

MR. LOCKHART: No. I think we're working on some important issues of how to move forward in this process to find a way to a deal, rather than on any pictures or symbols.

Q Could I ask you a philosophical question?

MR. LOCKHART: Yes. Which I think I answered two, but -- (laughter) --

Q That's okay. I want it on the record.

MR. LOCKHART: Okay. On the record, I answered --

Q Why should the United States taxpayer subsidize either Israel or Syria to do what is in their own best interest to do that has made peace, anyhow?

MR. LOCKHART: I think, as a philosophical and hypothetical and whatever, the United States has always stood ready to help the peace process. We will remain ready to help in any way we can.

Q Where is the money coming from, Joe?

MR. LOCKHART: I don't know what money you're talking about, and I think this is a dry hook.

Q -- all those billions. Where is it coming from?

MR. LOCKHART: I answered these questions. So if anyone has other questions --

Q You did? Somehow I missed it.

MR. LOCKHART: April?

Q Joe, going back to the question about the President's flu, you said he rarely misses days. How many days has he missed because of sickness since the beginning of his presidency?

MR. LOCKHART: I'll tell you, since I've been here, which is now going on four years, I think this is the first day I can remember. He missed some days because of his knee, which I guess you could define -- it depends how you define sickness -- but it's the first time I remember having to put off a series of events because he wasn't feeling well.

Q Well, considering that there may be spending involved, what type of consultations will be ongoing this week with senior members of Congress as --

MR. LOCKHART: I think I've just answered that question.

Q How did you answer that?

Q How did you answer?

MR. LOCKHART: Look at the transcript. Go back and look at the transcript. I answered all these questions before.

Q You stand ready to do everything, but that's --

MR. LOCKHART: And I said we'd be consulting with members of Congress both on the peace process and on any funds that might be needed, and OMB would be doing that.

Q Thank you.

END 1:34 P.M. EST

#145-12/14

Message Sent

To:

Brian S. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brooke B. Livingston/WHO/EOP@EOP
GlynnME@state.gove
SUNTUM_M@a1.eop.gov
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu
wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov
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
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP@EOP
Mark H. Bartholomew/OA/EOP@EOP
BARTHOLOW_T@a1.eop.gov
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
"Alejandro G. Cabrera"@lmgate4.eop.gov
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
pcaplan@fbr.com
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
DICKY_L@a1.eop.gov
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
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Paul D. Glastri/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
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
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
KTORPEY@AOL.COM
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
"Christopher S. Lehane"@lgate4.eop.gov
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
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
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
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
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
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
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/ONDCP/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

carolmast@aol.com
dmilbank@tnr.com
john_see@ed.gov
klasky_helaine@ustr.gov
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP
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@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
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
Julia G. Bataille@OVP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
masonjulia@aol.com
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
jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
kit.judge@mail.house.gov
Abigail C. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordanindc@aol.com
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
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
Pamela P. Carpenter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Bob Witeck to Elizabeth J. Potter at 12:48:30.00. Subject: RE: Bigger question today - "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." [partial] (1 page)	12/14/1999	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/14/1999 - 12/15/1999]

2015-0017-F
ab1542

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Bob Witeck <BWiteck@Witeckcombs.com> (Bob Witeck <BWiteck@Witeckcombs.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 12:48:30.00

SUBJECT: RE: Bigger question today -- "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"

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

TEXT:

Aren't you the most thoughtful friend? Thanks, Julian. This is a big adventure you're leading, and I'm sure it demands enormous skill and patience right now. I'm truly happy to help in a small way, and hope we can build the strongest public case for Al Gore (and avoid the spears from our friends in the community).

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Yours,

Bob

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

From: Elizabeth_J._Potter@who.eop.gov

[mailto:Elizabeth_J._Potter@who.eop.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 1999 12:18 PM

To: Bob Witeck

Subject: Re: Bigger question today -- "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"

I hope that everything is okay with your family. I used a scaled down version of your talking points for Joe Lockhardt today...listen and see if

you hear yourself. Thank-you for all of the thoughtfulness you have put into addressing our issues. I am also making sure that language is included in Gore's debate prep book.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jane E. Baker (CN=Jane E. Baker/OU=PFIAB/O=EOP [PFIAB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 10:49:26.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask--Don't Tell meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James E. Baker (CN=James E. Baker/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

For brother Jamie!

----- Forwarded by Jane E. Baker/PFIAB/EOP on 12/14/99
10:40 AM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter
12/14/99 10:20:07 AM
Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Don't Ask--Don't Tell meeting

4:00 PM Today. Room 117

Message Sent

To: _____
Johannes A. Binnendijk/NSC/EOP@EOP
Charles Allen/NSC/EOP@EOP
Jane E. Baker/PFIAB/EOP@EOP
Joan Hunerwadel/NSC/EOP@EOP
Cathy L. Millison/NSC/EOP@EOP
Maura M. Pally/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Marshall/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 08:31:03.00

SUBJECT: Re: Gays in the Military

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

thanks -- there was a piece on NPR this morning about the military evaluating the policy and its implementation, but they did not mention the VP's statement (it was probably recorded before his statement).

Elizabeth J. Potter@EOP

12/13/99 07:54:06 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Lisa M. Brown/OVP@OVP

cc:

Subject: Gays in the Military

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.D77]ARMS23726836K.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, withch 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@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY (Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 10:21:03.00

SUBJECT: gaggle

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

TO: Margaret M. Suntum@eop (Margaret M. Suntum@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak@eop (Natalie S. Wozniak@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Message Creation Date was at 14-DEC-1999 10:09:00

foster care --what-about needing high school education? helen
provides funds to finish high school
why accept babbitt's-rec at event but not commit? chris black
potus will take time to review
panama canal -potus comments? tina stage
potus paper statement this morning
logistics of middle east mtgs this week? hillman
will arrive at wh, then proceed to blair house
will start at blair house thursday, rest depends on how wed. goes
middle east - using us troops as buffer? keto
comments on closed vote on kenesset? jim engle, fox
chechnya - anything new? sonya
osce rep is working to promote dialogue
auto emission standards? dick keil
*** need guidance
don't ask don't tell - engle
- not just potus views - pentagon too
- current policy wasn't the policy potus campaigned on
agree with flotus on elimination? sonya
look at cbs interview transcript
given fight early in administration, still possible to include gays?
roberts
something we can hope for
why now? engle
this is not new - expressed concern during cspan interview
potus concerned for some time
how would perfect implementation change potus mind?
did he watch debate? chip reid

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 11:36:05.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: David C. Leavy (CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

this is pretty useless at this point. need q&a on questions like what about flotus, what about vp, should it be changed to what you first proposed, if so why don't you try to change it in the coming year, should the next congress do it, who's responsible for not getting it done right, is the leadership of the pentagon responsible for not implementing it right -- you get the idea. It needs to come from a combination of elizabeth and NSC, I think. Joe can handle these questions, but the guidance is needed for others.

----- Forwarded by Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP on 12/14/99
11:33 AM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

12/14/99 10:55:32 AM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

The President believes that gays and lesbians always have served honorably and well in our armed forces and that we must respect their contribution and allow them to serve with dignity.

ú Experience shows that the compromise that was reached with Congress in 1993 has not been implemented in a way that is good for the military or for service members.

ú Secretary Cohen has ordered a review of the policy. The President will look carefully at what he finds in order to determine if our present

policy can be better implemented or if further changes are needed. In the meantime, the Administration and the leadership at the Pentagon must make it crystal clear that Hate Crimes and anti-gay harassment have no place in the U.S. military.

Message Sent

To:

Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP

Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP@EOP

Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP

Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP

Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 10:17:11.00

SUBJECT: FW: Clinton: Gay policy a failure

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

TEXT:

-----Original Message-----From: LGBT Activists List [mailto:Doug.Case@sdsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 1999 12:31 AM
To: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu
Subject: Clinton: Gay policy a failure

San Francisco Examiner, December 12, 1999
(<http://www.examiner.com>)

Clinton: Gay policy a failure

Military's "don't ask, don't tell" is "out of whack," he says, echoing wife's criticism

By Carol Ness of the Examiner staff

Following his wife's lead, President Clinton admitted on Saturday for the first time that his "don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays in the military is a failure.

"It's out of whack, and I don't think any serious person could say it's not," the president said in an interview with CBS radio.

He criticized the Pentagon for not carrying out the intent of the policy, and said the White House would be working with military leaders to fix it.

Clinton didn't go as far as first lady Hillary Clinton did Tuesday in New York when she said she'd work to overturn the controversial policy if elected to the U.S. Senate.

But he did say, "For me, what's important is that the policy as implemented does not work as I announced and as the leaders of our military at the time in 1993 pledged to implement it."

A soldier's murder was the catalyst for Clinton to acknowledge what advocates for open military service by gays and lesbians have been trying to tell him since the policy was forged in a firestorm of controversy, in the first days of Clinton's first term in office.

"I can only hope that this last brutal beating death of a gay soldier will give some sobering impetus to a re-examination of how this policy is implemented, and whether we can do a better job of fulfilling its original intent," Clinton said, referring to the July murder of Army Pvt. Barry

Winchell by a fellow soldier who prosecutors said was driven by a hatred of homosexuals. "Its original intent was that people would not be rooted out."

Advocates for open service by gays and lesbians generally applauded the president's determination to fix problems with "don't ask, don't tell," under

which the number of service members thrown out of the military, and the number subjected to anti-gay harassment, have soared.

"I think the president's comments are dead on," said Dixon Osburn, head of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a Washington D.C.-based organization that's documented problems with "don't ask, don't tell" for six

years and worked to help soldiers affected by it.

Osburn said SLDN, whose 1995 annual report predicted the policy would lead to a service member's death, has tried to get both the White House and the Pentagon to take action for years.

"What I hope is that the president's comments will provide the impetus to make sure something is done. We will be asking to meet with the president on

Monday morning," Osburn said.

San Francisco Supervisor Mark Leno, who is gay, called the president's words encouraging, but said "the fact remains that 'don't ask, don't tell' was ill-conceived and is ill-fated."

A recent poll by the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force found that 70 percent of Americans support the right of gays and lesbians to serve in the military, Leno said.

"Our national leadership is far behind national opinion on this subject,

and the cruel murder of Barry Winchell is an extreme example of why 'don't ask, don't tell' cannot and will not ever work," said Leno.

"Don't ask, don't tell" was the result of Pentagon and congressional resistance to Clinton's 1992 campaign promise to end the U.S. military's ban

on gays. The policy allows gay men and lesbians to serve in the armed forces

if they do not disclose their orientation, and prohibits the military from opening unfounded investigations about homosexuality.

The policy, which took effect in 1994, infuriated both sides — those advocating open service by gays, and those who wanted to keep the ban intact.

Since then, the number of service members kicked out for being gay each year has almost doubled, reaching 1,149 last year, the most since 1987, according to Osburn.

Anti-gay harassment increased

Cases of anti-gay harassment have more than doubled, to 400 last year, he said.

And, according to SLDN, women soldiers have found themselves under investigation as lesbians for turning down the sexual advances of a male service member.

The kind of harassment that led to the killing of 21-year-old Winchell is common, according to SLDN, if its escalation to lethal violence is extreme.

Harassed by fellow soldiers who thought he was gay, Winchell didn't report it out of fear he'd come under official investigation and possible discharge.

Pvt. Calvin Glover, 18, was found guilty of premeditated murder Wednesday by a military court and sentenced to life in prison with the possibility of parole. A second soldier faces court martial this week.

"Both these young men put on the uniform of our country, and I could have sent them some place to die," Clinton told Florida's Democratic Convention Saturday in Orlando. "And 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."

Last August, after Winchell's killing, 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. But Osburn said that as of Saturday, the Army and Air Force had still not sent the new guidelines to their troops.

"The White House and the Pentagon have been perfectly aware of the failed implementation of this policy every year for the last six years, and responsibility falls on uniformed and civilian leaders at the Pentagon and on the commander in chief to make sure its original intent is lived up to," Osburn said.

"It's also important to note that President Clinton for the first time is saying strongly that the Pentagon shape up and follow the rules."

New issue for presidential campaign

In San Francisco, Keith Meinhold, the sailor who made legal history by winning a court battle to stay in the military after saying he was gay, called Clinton's remarks "significant progress."

Still, Meinhold, who is retired from the Navy, believes the announcement was only logical.

"What else could he have said? Could he have said the policy is working?

Clearly it's not."

In Los Angeles, David Mixner, who rallied the gay community behind Clinton's first presidential campaign in 1992 and felt betrayed by his agreement to "don't ask, don't tell," felt vindicated by the president's words.

"I think this is a major step for him to be saying this," said Mixner.

But he added that it's time for the United States to stop tinkering with the policy and to "do what's right, what every other major ally of ours has done." Canada, Australia and most NATO countries allow gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military, he said.

Clinton's unexpected comments may heighten the impact of the issue in the

presidential campaign.

Among the Democratic contenders, Vice President Al Gore last summer called for a more "compassionate" handling of the "don't ask, don't tell" rules by the military, while rival Bill Bradley has said the policy should be dropped and homosexuals allowed to serve openly in the armed forces.

Republican candidates, Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Sen. John McCain of Arizona have expressed support for the current policy, while their more conservatives GOP foes oppose allowing gays to serve.

Examiner wire services contributed to this report.

[Carol Ness is online at ccness@examiner.com]-----

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

- 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: Clinton: Gay policy a failure</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 1999 12:31 AM

To: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu

Subject: Clinton: Gay policy a failure

</P>

<P>San Francisco Examiner, December 12, 1999

(http://www
.examiner.com)

Clinton: Gay policy a failure

Military's "don't ask, don't tell" is "out of whack,
' he says, echoing wife's

criticism

By Carol Ness of the Examiner staff

 Following his wife's lead, President Clinto

n admitted on Saturday for the

first time that his "don't ask, don't tell" policy o

n gays in the military is

a failure.

 "It's out of whack, and I don't think

any serious person could say it's

not," the president said in an interview with CBS radio.<

/FONT>

 He criticized the Pentagon for not carrying

out the intent of the policy,

and said the White House would be working with military leader

s to fix it.

 Clinton didn't go as far as first lady Hill

ary Clinton did Tuesday in New

York when she said she'd work to overturn the controversial po

licy if elected

to the U.S. Senate.

 But he did say, "For me, what's import

ant is that the policy as

implemented does not work as I announced and as the leaders of

our military

at the time in 1993 pledged to implement it."

 A soldier's murder was the catalyst for Cli

nton to acknowledge what

advocates for open military service by gays and lesbians have

been trying to

tell him since the policy was forged in a firestorm of contro

versy, in the

first days of Clinton's first term in office.

 "I can only hope that this last brutal

beating death of a gay soldier

will give some sobering impetus to a re-examination of how thi

s policy is

implemented, and whether we can do a better job of fulfilling

its original

intent," Clinton said, referring to the July murder of Ar

my Pvt. Barry

Winchell by a fellow soldier who prosecutors said was driven b

y a hatred of

homosexuals. "Its original intent was that people w

ould not be rooted out."

 Advocates for open service by gays and lesb

ians generally applauded the

president's determination to fix problems with "don't ask

, don't tell," under

which the number of service members thrown out of the military

, and the

number subjected to anti-gay harassment, have soared.

 "I think the president's comments are

dead on," said Dixon Osburn, head

of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a Washington D.C.

-based

organization that's documented problems with "don't ask,

don't tell" for six

years and worked to help soldiers affected by it.

 Osburn said SLDN, whose 1995 annual report
predicted the policy would

lead to a service member's death, has tried to get both the Wh
ite House and

the Pentagon to take action for years.

 "What I hope is that the president's c
omments will provide the impetus to

make sure something is done. We will be asking to meet w
ith the president on

Monday morning," Osburn said.

 San Francisco Supervisor Mark Leno, who is
gay, called the president's

words encouraging, but said "the fact remains that "
don't ask, don't tell'

was ill-conceived and is ill-fated."

 A recent poll by the National Gay & Les
bian Task Force found that 70

percent of Americans support the right of gays and lesbians to
serve in the

military, Leno said.

 "Our national leadership is far behind
national opinion on this subject,

and the cruel murder of Barry Winchell is an extreme example o
f why "don't

ask, don't tell' cannot and will not ever work," said Len
o.

 "Don't ask, don't tell" was the r
esult of Pentagon and congressional

resistance to Clinton's 1992 campaign promise to end the U.S.
military's ban

on gays. The policy allows gay men and lesbians to serve
in the armed forces

if they do not disclose their orientation, and prohibits the m
ilitary from

opening unfounded investigations about homosexuality.

 The policy, which took effect in 1994, infu
riated both sides those

advocating open service by gays, and those who wanted to keep
the ban intact.

 Since then, the number of service members k
icked out for being gay each

year has almost doubled, reaching 1,149 last year, the most si
nce 1987,

according to Osburn.

 Anti-gay harassment increased

 Cases of anti-gay harassment have more than
doubled, to 400 last year, he

said.

 And, according to SLDN, women soldiers have
found themselves under

investigation as lesbians for turning down the sexual advances
of a male

service member.

 The kind of harassment that led to the kill
ing of 21-year-old Winchell is

common, according to SLDN, if its escalation to lethal violenc
e is extreme.

Harassed by fellow soldiers who thought he was gay, Winchell d
idn't report it

out of fear he'd come under official investigation and possibl
e discharge.

 Pvt. Calvin Glover, 18, was found guilty of
premeditated murder Wednesday

by a military court and sentenced to life in prison with the p
ossibility of

parole. A second soldier faces court martial this week.<
/FONT>

 "Both these young men put on the unifo
rm of our country, and I could have

sent them some place to die," Clinton told Florida's Demo
cratic Convention

Saturday in Orlando. "And I was aching for the youn
g 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."

 Last August, after Winchell's killing, the
Pentagon updated "don't ask,

don't tell" guidelines to require all troops to undergo p
eriodic training on

tolerance and to assign the task of investigating alleged homo
sexual activity

to senior officials. But Osburn said that as of Saturday
, the Army and Air

Force had still not sent the new guidelines to their troops.</
FONT>

 "The White House and the Pentagon have
been perfectly aware of the failed

implementation of this policy every year for the last six year
s, and

responsibility falls on uniformed and civilian leaders at the
Pentagon and on

the commander in chief to make sure its original intent is liv
ed up to,"

Osburn said.

 "It's also important to note that Pres
ident Clinton for the first time is

saying strongly that the Pentagon shape up and follow the rule
s."

 New issue for presidential campaign

 In San Francisco, Keith Meinhold, the sailo
r who made legal history by

winning a court battle to stay in the military after saying he
was gay,

called Clinton's remarks "significant progress."</FO
NT>

 Still, Meinhold, who is retired from the Navy, believes the announcement

was only logical.

 "What else could he have said? Could he have said the policy is working?

 Clearly it's not."

 In Los Angeles, David Mixner, who rallied the gay community behind Clinton's first presidential campaign in 1992 and felt betrayed by his agreement to "don't ask, don't tell," felt vindicated by the president's words.

 "I think this is a major step for him to be saying this," said Mixner.

 But he added that it's time for the United States to stop tinkering with the policy and to "do what's right, what every other major ally of ours has done." Canada, Australia and most NATO countries allow gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military, he said.

 Clinton's unexpected comments may heighten the impact of the issue in the presidential campaign.

 Among the Democratic contenders, Vice President Al Gore last summer called for a more "compassionate" handling of the "don't ask, don't tell" rules by the military, while rival Bill Bradley has said the policy should be dropped and homosexuals allowed to serve openly in the armed forces.

 Republican candidates, Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Sen. John McCain of Arizona have expressed support for the current policy, while their more conservative GOP foes oppose allowing gays to serve.

 Examiner wire services contributed to this report.

 [Carol Ness is online at ccness@examiner.com]

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

author. Please note that distribution of this item does
not necessarily

constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items ar
e distributed

as "opposition research."
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: earlybird-alert-owner@mail2.cloakroom.com@INET@LNGTWY (earlybird-alert-owner@mail2.cloakroom.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 08:26:06.00

SUBJECT: EARLYBIRDS: Bush & McCain Take Their Gloves Off

TO: Steven J. Naplan@eop (Steven J. Naplan@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah B. Mohile@eop (Deborah B. Mohile@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Today's Earlybirds are now available on
National Journal's Cloakroom:

<http://www.cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/>

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

Hotline Earlybird: Bush and McCain exchange lively debate, Gore says eliminate military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, Giuliani gears up for transit strike, and Carter will represent the United States in today's Panama Canal transfer.

<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/hotline.htm>

Greenwire Earlybird: WH 2000 GOP candidates clash over ethanol, FDA holds final bio-engineered food hearing, and Japan passes new nuclear safety laws.

<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/greenwire/>

Pundit Watch: The debates, the role of minor candidates in the presidential process, and how party rules affect the candidates.

<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/pundits.htm>

TV Track: Mental illness study, WH 2000 GOP debate and Columbine videos.

<http://cloakroom.com/members/earlybird/tvnews.htm>

Today on Cloakroom:

-- Budget Battles: One Issue That Was Settled This Year

<http://cloakroom.com/members/buzz/budget.htm>

-- Off To The Races: Eighteen Races Could Swing The House

<http://cloakroom.com/members/buzz/races.htm>

To stop receiving this E-mail Alert:

Reply to this message and include the word "unsubscribe" (without quotes)

in the BODY of the message.

The Earlybirds are published daily by National Journal Group Inc. For more information about National Journal Group's publications, go to <http://www.nationaljournal.com>.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY (Jason H. Schechter@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 10:20:36.00

SUBJECT: gaggle

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

TO: Margaret M. Suntum@eop (Margaret M. Suntum@eop [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak@eop (Natalie S. Wozniak@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Message Creation:Date was at 14-DEC-1999 10:09:00

foster care - what about needing high school education? helen
provides funds to finish high school
why accept babbitt's rec at event but not commit? chris black
potus will take time to review
panama canal -potus comments? tina stage
potus paper statement this morning
logistics of middle east mtgs this week? hillman
will arrive at wh, then proceed to blair house
will start at blair house thursday, rest depends on how wed. goes
middle east - using us troops as buffer? keto
comments on closed vote on kenesset? jim engle, fox
chechnya - anything new? sonya
osce rep is working to promote dialogue
auto emission standards? dick keil
*** need guidance
don't ask don't tell - engle
- not just potus views - pentagon too
- current policy wasn't the policy potus campaigned on
agree with flotus on elimination? sonya
look at cbs interview transcript
given fight early in administration, still possible to include gays?
roberts
something we can hope for
why now? engle
this is not new - expressed concern during cspan interview
potus concerned for some time
how would perfect implementation change potus mind?
did he watch debate? chip reid

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-DEC-1999 11:44:53.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask, Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: David C. Leavy (CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Thanks, Julian, this is helpful - specifically for Joe's briefing today,
can you also answer:

What does the President feel about the First Lady's views on elimination?

What does the President feel about the Vice President's views?

Should the policy be changed to what the President first proposed? If so
why don't you try to change it in the coming year? Should the next
congress do it?

Who's responsible for not getting it done right, is the leadership of the
pentagon responsible for not implementing it right?

Etc.... Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 16:03:21.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

TO: Betsy Pimentel (CN=Betsy Pimentel/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

let me know if/when you all have signed off.

----- Forwarded by Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP on 12/15/99

04:02 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

12/15/99 03:55:30 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP

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

Subject: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

I have made edits to reflect the President's position to focus on implementation. I have also incorporated the NSC Q/A on the IG report. I left out the rest of the NSC language because I felt that it was too detailed on DOD policy for the President to be commenting on.

Message Copied

To: _____

mary e. cahill/who/eop@eop

edward w. correia/who/eop@eop

betsy pimentel/nsc/eop@eop

laura s. marcus/who/eop@eop

william marshall/who/eop@eop

mary b. derosa/nsc/eop@eop

David B. Peterman/NSC/EOP@EOP

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D84]ARMS29419110N.046 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

Q's and A's: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

Q: How do you feel about the First Lady's views on elimination of the Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy?

A: First of all, I'm quite sympathetic with what she said. That was the position that both of us brought to the White House. I agree with her that the policy has not worked well. We ought to look toward a day when gays and lesbians can serve openly in the military alongside everyone else. The truth is that they have served in the military for a long time and they have made a great contribution to our national security.

Q: How do you feel about the Vice President's views? Was he opposed to the policy from the beginning?

A: Yes, the Vice President argued from the beginning to drop the ban entirely. I didn't implement don't ask, don't tell until the Senate voted 68-32 against the policy that I wanted. I thought a compromise with Congress was better for the military services as well as the gay men and women in uniform.

Q: Should the policy be changed to what you campaigned on? If so why don't you try to change it in the coming year?

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 think it makes more sense to improve the implementation of it rather to spend enormous effort working on changing the statute. We've already taken a number of steps to improve it and I believe it can be implemented even more effectively and fairly. The Pentagon will take the lead in doing that and they will work closely with all the military services and they will consult with Congress as well.

Q: Should the next congress address it?

I think that if there's a sense in the Congress or in the next White House that this policy can be changed for the better, then it will be addressed. We've made great progress in seeing people as individuals in this country and in looking beyond race and religion and gender. We're doing that with sexual orientation, too. We just have to keep working at it.

Q: Who is responsible for implementing the policy?

A: The Pentagon is responsible for implementing the policy and steps are being taken to improve implementation. For example, the Department of Defense directed the services to issue guidelines against harassment and has required training for service members. It strengthened the confidentiality of communications between service members and health care professionals. At

the recommendation of the Department of Defense, I issued an executive order authorizing higher penalties for hate crimes, based on sexual orientation, race and other factors. But there is more to be done, and I know Secretary Cohen is committed to doing it.

Q What is the purpose of the review ordered by Secretary Cohen?

He directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy at representative installations within each of the military departments. That report is due in 90 days. It should provide us with a better picture on how the policy is being implemented.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Betsy Pimentel (CN=Betsy Pimentel/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:20:21.00

SUBJECT: NSC DADT Guidance

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

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

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

TO: Mary B. DeRosa (CN=Mary B. DeRosa/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:

Attached is NSC guidance on this issue that was cleared yesterday. I believe this addresses most (except First Lady and VP questions) of the issues on your draft and reflects where we came out yesterday.

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D1]ARMS222067009.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL
December 14, 1999

Background: Secretary of Defense Cohen announced on December 13 that he had directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy at representative installations within each of the military departments.

Has the "don't ask, don't tell" policy failed to protect gay servicemembers?

- An April 1998 OSD review concluded that the Armed Forces have experienced challenges implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. For the most part the policy has been properly enforced. However, the constrained personal privacy of all servicemembers and a cultural emphasis on enforcing the 1993 law requiring that servicemembers with a propensity or intention to engage in homosexual acts must be separated have created problems in implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.
- Such problems can be seen in the number of annual discharges for homosexual conduct, which has doubled since 1994, and reports from outside groups that incidents of anti-gay harassment have increased significantly since 1997.
- President has expressed his concern about the manner in which the "don't ask, don't tell" policy is being implemented. This is consistent with many of the concerns expressed by Secretary Cohen.
- Yesterday, Secretary of Defense Cohen announced that he had directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy at representative installations within each of the military departments. That report is due in 90 days.
- The President will review the "don't ask, don't tell" policy after the Inspector General completes the assessment directed by Secretary Cohen.

What have you done to strengthen the "don't ask, don't tell" policy?

- DOD has taken several steps over the past three years to enhance implementation of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.
- In 1997, DOD issued guidance stating that a report by a servicemember of harassment because he or she is perceived to be gay is not a cause for the commanding officer to investigate the person being harassed. It also ordered prompt investigation of harassment charges made by possibly gay members and ordered training to prevent harassment.
- In August 1999, DOD issued additional policy guidance designed to promote consistent and fair application of this policy. For example, Service Inspector Generals are to make the

training of those charged with implementing the homosexual conduct policy – commanders, attorneys and investigators – a specific item of interest for inspection.

- The Armed Services are expected to issue their guidance shortly for carrying out DOD's August 1999 guidance, so we have not yet seen the impact of the changes made by DOD.
- We support DOD's efforts to improve implementation of the policy, ensure that service members are not subject to harassment based on alleged homosexuality, and eliminate tolerance of disparaging speech or expression relating to sexual orientation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 17:42:05.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Jason, sorry it is so late. I had difficulty merging the NSC guidance. Basically, NSC asserts the same position on this issue that DOD would. Therefore their guidance is overly technical and too detailed for use by POTUS (also a bit unfairly biased towards the military). I have taken some of their guidance but have left most out. NSA has reviewed this Q and A and their staff is comfortable with my final draft.

I hope this is helpful. I am forwarding the last email from the group that vetted the questions. You can see the list of people that were looking at the document. If I get any late editions I will email to you directly. THANKS

----- Forwarded by Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP on
12/15/99 05:35 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter
12/15/99 05:23:10 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
Subject: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

Okay, I took out the Senate vote because it was a bit confusing and I replaced it with general language that Congress was unwilling to support the President's original position.

I have kept the language in that focuses on our efforts towards a fair and just implementation.

But I would like to note that the President points out that this policy is not his original position but that he does not want to use the remaining time in office to try and change the statute.

I think we are ready to transmit to the press office.

Message Copied

To: _____
edward w. correia/who/eop@eop
elizabeth j. potter/who/eop@eop

karen tramontano/who/eop@eop
mary e. cahill/who/eop@eop
edward w. correia/who/eop@eop
betsy pimentel/nsc/eop@eop
laura s. marcus/who/eop@eop
william marshall/who/eop@eop
mary b. derosa/nsc/eop@eop
david b. peterman/nsc/eop@eop

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D42]ARMS23431310J.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

Q's and A's: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

Q: How do you feel about the First Lady's views on elimination of the Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy?

A: First of all, I'm quite sympathetic with what she said. That was the position that both of us brought to the White House. I agree with her that the policy has not worked well. We ought to look toward a day when gays and lesbians can serve openly in the military alongside everyone else. The truth is that they have served in the military for a long time and they have made a great contribution to our national security.

Q: How do you feel about the Vice President's views? Was he opposed to the policy from the beginning?

A: Yes, the Vice President argued from the beginning to drop the ban entirely. 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 thought a compromise with Congress was better for the military services as well as the gay men and women in uniform. I think many of us realize now that the policy has not worked as well as we had hoped.

Q: Should the policy be changed to what you campaigned on? If so why don't you try to change it in the coming year?

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 think it makes more sense to improve the implementation of it rather to spend enormous effort working on changing the statute. We've already taken a number of steps to improve it and I believe it can be implemented even more effectively and fairly. The Pentagon will take the lead in doing that and they will work closely with all the military services and they will consult with Congress as well.

Q: Should the next congress address it?

I think that if there's a sense in the Congress or in the next White House that this policy can be changed for the better, then it will be addressed. We've made great progress in seeing people as individuals in this country and in looking beyond race and religion and gender. We're doing that with sexual orientation, too. We just have to keep working at it.

Q: Who is responsible for implementing the policy?

A: The Pentagon is responsible for implementing the policy and steps are being taken to improve implementation. For example, the Department of Defense directed the services to issue

guidelines against harassment and has required training for service members. It strengthened the confidentiality of communications between service members and health care professionals. At the recommendation of the Department of Defense, I issued an executive order authorizing higher penalties for hate crimes, based on sexual orientation, race and other factors. But there is more to be done, and I know Secretary Cohen is committed to doing it.

Q What is the purpose of the review ordered by Secretary Cohen?

He directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy at representative installations within each of the military departments. That report is due in 90 days. It should provide us with a better picture on how the policy is being implemented.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 11:59:24.00

SUBJECT: AP story on R's and Congressional role

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Associated Press, December 14, 1999

Pentagon Says Little on Gay Issue

By TOM RAUM

WASHINGTON (AP) ? The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee said Tuesday that any overhaul of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy

toward

gays in the military should await the election of a new president and not be

attempted "in the heated rhetoric of an election year."

Sen. John Warner, R-Va., commented a day after Vice President Al Gore called for the policy's elimination. Democratic rival Bill Bradley had previously issued a similar call, as had first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, who is running for the Senate from New York.

This past weekend, President Clinton said the policy was "out of whack"

and wasn't working, pledging to help the Pentagon find a way to fix it.

Defense Secretary William Cohen on Monday ordered a 90-day review of the policy.

But Warner, whose committee would oversee any effort to overhaul the policy, urged against a rush to judgment.

In a statement, Warner said he shared deep concerns over harassment of gays in the military and that the beating death of a young soldier at Fort Campbell, Ky., was "a tragic loss for all."

But, he added, "In my view, the wise and fair course for future congressional action, particularly in view of the profound impact of these issues on military readiness, is not to take legislative action in the heated rhetoric of an election year."

"Congress should await a complete review by the next administration, and then promptly consider any specific recommendations for legislative action,"

Warner said.

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon, meanwhile, declined to comment on calls

from the campaign trail for elimination of the policy ? except to note that Congress, and not the Clinton administration, had created the policy.

"And of course both Vice President Gore and (former) Senator Bradley were

in Congress when the policy was passed and they understand what will be

required to change the policy," said Bacon.

Actually, Gore was vice president in 1993 when the law was passed ? but had been in the Senate prior to the 1992 presidential election.

The Pentagon put the policy in place in 1994.

"This happens to be a law that they're commenting on, and they understand

and we all understand that to make a fundamental change in the policy requires a change in the law," Bacon said.

Under the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, gay members of the military can continue to serve ? and their superiors cannot investigate and expel them

? as long as they keep their sexual orientation to themselves.

However, soldiers who say they are gay may be discharged.

Sen. John McCain of Arizona, a former Navy pilot who was shot down and held as a prisoner in Vietnam for 5 1/2 years, said he supports the current policy. He criticized Clinton and Gore for talking openly about making changes without consulting military leaders.

"Without even consulting them, to advocate the scrapping of a policy, in my view smacks of irresponsibility," the GOP presidential hopeful said from the campaign trail in Charleston, S.C.

Gore also took heat from the Bradley campaign for the timing of his pronouncement ? fully three months after Bradley condemned "don't ask, don't tell" and within days of similar commentary by the first lady and the president.

"Leadership means solving problems before they get too big to ignore politically," Bradley spokesman Eric Hauser said.

Conservative Gary Bauer, who also is seeking the Republican presidential nomination, said that, if elected, he would work to restore the ban on gays in the military.

"What we are witnessing is a symphony of liberal social experimentation," Bauer said in a statement. "The purpose of the American military is to secure America's national security and to win wars. It is not to advance the political agenda of the gay rights community."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 15:43:28.00

SUBJECT: Face

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joel Johnson (CN=Joel Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Face the Nation would like Mr. Podesta on their show Sunday. The topics, and it's quite a range, would be the Middle East; Campaign 2000; Don't Ask, Don't Tell; Guns; the President's Year and a preview of next year's agenda.

John is up in the rotation for Face.

Let me know. Thanks

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 17:23:16.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: david b. peterman (CN=david b. peterman/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: william marshall (CN=william marshall/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: betsy pimentel (CN=betsy pimentel/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary e. cahill (CN=mary e. cahill/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary b. derosa (CN=mary b. derosa/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: laura s. marcus (CN=laura s. marcus/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: karen tramontano (CN=karen tramontano/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Okay, I took out the Senate vote because it was a bit confusing and I replaced it with general language that Congress was unwilling to support the President's original position.

I have kept the language in that focuses on our efforts towards a fair and just implementation.

But I would like to note that the President points out that this policy is not his original position but that he does not want to use the remaining time in office to try and change the statute.

I think we are ready to transmit to the press office.===== ATTACHMENT 1

=====

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D63]ARMS27459210S.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

Q's and A's: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

Q: How do you feel about the First Lady's views on elimination of the Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy?

A: First of all, I'm quite sympathetic with what she said. That was the position that both of us brought to the White House. I agree with her that the policy has not worked well. We ought to look toward a day when gays and lesbians can serve openly in the military alongside everyone else. The truth is that they have served in the military for a long time and they have made a great contribution to our national security.

Q: How do you feel about the Vice President's views? Was he opposed to the policy from the beginning?

A: Yes, the Vice President argued from the beginning to drop the ban entirely. 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 thought a compromise with Congress was better for the military services as well as the gay men and women in uniform. I think many of us realize now that the policy has not worked as well as we had hoped.

Q: Should the policy be changed to what you campaigned on? If so why don't you try to change it in the coming year?

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 think it makes more sense to improve the implementation of it rather to spend enormous effort working on changing the statute. We've already taken a number of steps to improve it and I believe it can be implemented even more effectively and fairly. The Pentagon will take the lead in doing that and they will work closely with all the military services and they will consult with Congress as well.

Q: Should the next congress address it?

I think that if there's a sense in the Congress or in the next White House that this policy can be changed for the better, then it will be addressed. We've made great progress in seeing people as individuals in this country and in looking beyond race and religion and gender. We're doing that with sexual orientation, too. We just have to keep working at it.

Q: Who is responsible for implementing the policy?

A: The Pentagon is responsible for implementing the policy and steps are being taken to improve implementation. For example, the Department of Defense directed the services to issue

guidelines against harassment and has required training for service members. It strengthened the confidentiality of communications between service members and health care professionals. At the recommendation of the Department of Defense, I issued an executive order authorizing higher penalties for hate crimes, based on sexual orientation, race and other factors. But there is more to be done, and I know Secretary Cohen is committed to doing it.

Q What is the purpose of the review ordered by Secretary Cohen?

He directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy at representative installations within each of the military departments. That report is due in 90 days. It should provide us with a better picture on how the policy is being implemented.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:46:04.00

SUBJECT: Re: NSC DADT Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

perfect. thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 17:11:40.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary b. derosa (CN=mary b. derosa/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: laura s. marcus (CN=laura s. marcus/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: karen tramontano (CN=karen tramontano/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: david b. peterman (CN=david b. peterman/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: william marshall (CN=william marshall/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: betsy pimentel (CN=betsy pimentel/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary e. cahill (CN=mary e. cahill/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

eddy,

its great that you may favor it -- but if the president is not saying that

-- his words are our ultimate guidance

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:37:14.00

SUBJECT: Re: NSC DADT Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I think that Larua Marcus wants me to merge the two and send one version.
I will redistribute the final.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:35:53.00

SUBJECT: Re: NSC DADT Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

So, I will make edits to reflect Karen's comments, merge with NSC and redistribute.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David B. Peterman (CN=David B. Peterman/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 21:34:40.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary B. DeRosa (CN=Mary B. DeRosa/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Betsy Pimentel (CN=Betsy Pimentel/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Johannes A. Binnendijk (CN=Johannes A. Binnendijk/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: James R. Fallin (CN=James R. Fallin/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: David C. Leavy (CN=David C. Leavy/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

NSC staff clears on the attached press guidance.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 11:01:10.00

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

See what you think of this.

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D37]ARMS28629400N.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

Q's and A's: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

Q: How do you feel about the First Lady's views on elimination of Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy?

A: I agree with her that the policy has not worked well. We ought to look toward a day when gays and lesbians can serve openly in the military alongside everyone else. The truth is that they have served in the military for a long time and they have made great contribution to our national security.

Q: How do you feel about the Vice President's views? Was he opposed to the policy from the beginning?

A: Yes, he argued against it from the beginning. So did others. The basic question was whether we were going to try to work with Congress to reach a compromise or not. I thought a compromise was best for the military services as well as the gay men and women in uniform. I think many of us realize now that the policy has not worked as well as we had hoped.

Q: Who's responsible for not getting it done right, is the leadership of the pentagon responsible for not implementing it right?

A: The Pentagon is responsible for implementing the policy, but they have taken a number of steps to improve its implementation already, and I know Secretary Cohen is committed to doing more. For example, we've issued guidelines against harassment and required training for service members. We've strengthened the confidentiality of communications between service members and health care professionals. I issued an executive order authorizing higher penalties for hate crimes, based on sexual orientation, race and other factors. But there is more to be done.

Q: Should the policy be changed to what you campaigned on? If so why don't you try to change it in the coming year?

A: The policy should be changed but, frankly, it's not realistic to try to do it in the coming year. I think it makes more sense to try to improve the implementation of it rather to spend enormous effort working on changing the statute. We've already taken a number of steps to improve it and I believe it can be implemented even more effectively and fairly. The Pentagon will take the lead in doing that and they will work closely with all the services and they will consult with Congress as well.

Q: Should the next congress address it?

A: Yes. The beginning of a new millennium is a perfect time for Congress to concentrate on steps that will break down barriers between human beings. That's basically what's at stake with this policy. We've made great progress in seeing people as individuals in this country and in looking beyond race and religion and gender. We're doing that with sexual orientation, too. We just have to keep working at it.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 15:21:35.00

SUBJECT: clinton dadt

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

4

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.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:40:12.00

SUBJECT: Re: NSC DADT Guidance

TO: Betsy Pimentel (CN=Betsy Pimentel/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: laura s. marcus (CN=laura s. marcus/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

i think ~~laura marcus~~ asked that the nsc and opl guidance merge and that differences be worked out so that there is one document that has been cleared and correctly reflects the guidance -- thanks, kt

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:37:45.00

SUBJECT: Re: NSC DADT Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

laura did you get my earlier message -- i think that the issue is potentially resolved by potter's last e-mail -- she agrees that the president cannot be saying that he wants to change the policy -- take a look --

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:27:31.00

SUBJECT: NSC DADT Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I asked NSC to coordinate their points w/ you so we are working off one set.

----- Forwarded by Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP on 12/15/99
02:27 PM -----

Betsy Pimentel
12/15/99 02:20:15 PM
Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: NSC DADT Guidance

Attached is NSC guidance on this issue that was cleared yesterday. I believe this addresses most (except First Lady and VP questions) of the issues on your draft and reflects where we came out yesterday.

Message Sent

To:

Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Marshall/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary B. DeRosa/NSC/EOP@EOP

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D26]ARMS24327700E.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL
December 14, 1999

Background: Secretary of Defense Cohen announced on December 13 that he had directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy at representative installations within each of the military departments.

Has the "don't ask, don't tell" policy failed to protect gay servicemembers?

- An April 1998 OSD review concluded that the Armed Forces have experienced challenges implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. For the most part the policy has been properly enforced. However, the constrained personal privacy of all servicemembers and a cultural emphasis on enforcing the 1993 law requiring that servicemembers with a propensity or intention to engage in homosexual acts must be separated have created problems in implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.
- Such problems can be seen in the number of annual discharges for homosexual conduct, which has doubled since 1994, and reports from outside groups that incidents of anti-gay harassment have increased significantly since 1997.
- President has expressed his concern about the manner in which the "don't ask, don't tell" policy is being implemented. This is consistent with many of the concerns expressed by Secretary Cohen.
- Yesterday, Secretary of Defense Cohen announced that he had directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy at representative installations within each of the military departments. That report is due in 90 days.
- The President will review the "don't ask, don't tell" policy after the Inspector General completes the assessment directed by Secretary Cohen.

What have you done to strengthen the "don't ask, don't tell" policy?

- DOD has taken several steps over the past three years to enhance implementation of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.
- In 1997, DOD issued guidance stating that a report by a servicemember of harassment because he or she is perceived to be gay is not a cause for the commanding officer to investigate the person being harassed. It also ordered prompt investigation of harassment charges made by possibly gay members and ordered training to prevent harassment.
- In August 1999, DOD issued additional policy guidance designed to promote consistent and fair application of this policy. For example, Service Inspector Generals are to make the

training of those charged with implementing the homosexual conduct policy – commanders, attorneys and investigators – a specific item of interest for inspection.

- The Armed Services are expected to issue their guidance shortly for carrying out DOD's August 1999 guidance, so we have not yet seen the impact of the changes made by DOD.
- We support DOD's efforts to improve implementation of the policy, ensure that service members are not subject to harassment based on alleged homosexuality, and eliminate tolerance of disparaging speech or expression relating to sexual orientation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:18:55.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary b. derosa (CN=mary b. derosa/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: laura s. marcus (CN=laura s. marcus/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: william marshall (CN=william marshall/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: betsy pimentel (CN=betsy pimentel/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary e. cahill (CN=mary e. cahill/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I think you both have a point, but we need to stick as closely to what the President said in the radio interview . I do believe it is helpful to remind voters of how we ended up with the policy but the focus and pressure now should be on implementation; the President has not asked for a change in policy.

What the President has said implies that he would proposit or support a change in policy, but I am not sure we can say he is calling for one at this time.

The President said "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."

"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"

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:24:48.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: william marshall (CN=william marshall/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: betsy pimentel (CN=betsy pimentel/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary b. derosa (CN=mary b. derosa/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: laura s. marcus (CN=laura s. marcus/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary e. cahill (CN=mary e. cahill/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

your right julian --- i think it is important to put the finger on
congress -- while sticking w/ what the president has said. thanks

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 11:28:51.00

SUBJECT: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is some more stuff on Don't Ask/Don't Tell in light of the story in the Washington Times this morning. Julian Potter has looked at these. However, I have not had time to clear them with DOD. Do you need something else?

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D21]ARMS265925001.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

Guidance: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

Background

Today's Washington Times has a story on Don't Ask/Don't Tell, which claims that the Pentagon has made a sudden change in its position on the policy, as reflected by the review recently ordered by Secretary Cohen. The suggestion is that this change is the result of the upcoming 2000 elections.

Suggested Q's and A's

Q: Has the Pentagon suddenly changed its position on Don't Ask/Don't Tell because of election year politics?

A: The Department of Defense has been engaged in an evaluation of this policy over the last year. It has recognized problems in implementation for quite some time and has taken a number of steps to address them. The Department also recognizes that there is more to be done. In addition, of course, there was a tragic murder at Ft. Campbell, which provides additional evidence that more needs to be done.

Q: Did the Pentagon say the policy was working effectively as recently as last August.

A: In August 1999, the Pentagon released an August 1998 report, which said the policy is "generally being implemented properly." However, the August 1998 report recommended taking a number of steps to improve the implementation of the policy. Since then, a number of steps have already been taken to improve implementation of Don't Ask/Don't Tell, including the following:

- 1) In August 1999, DOD sent a memorandum to all the services directing that they disseminate guidance regarding the prohibition on harassing service members on the basis of sexual orientation. That guidance is to be part of training for commanding officers and others. DOD also required that significant investigations of service members for violation of the policy be approved at the Military Department secretarial level.
- 2) In October 1999, the President signed an executive order authorizing military courts to impose higher penalties in the case of crimes motivated by race, sexual orientation and other factors.
- 3) The October 1999 order also provided that communications between service members and their psychotherapists is privileged and confidentiality in court martial proceedings. This confidentiality protection would apply to statements regarding sexual orientation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 13:34:42.00

SUBJECT: AP story on R's and Congressional role

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Also, you want to discuss our strategy with Sandy Berger.

----- Forwarded by Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP on
12/15/99 01:34 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter
12/15/99 11:59:15 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: AP story on R's and Congressional role

Associated Press, December 14, 1999

Pentagon Says Little on Gay Issue

By TOM RAUM

WASHINGTON (AP) ? The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee said Tuesday that any overhaul of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy toward gays in the military should await the election of a new president and not be attempted "in the heated rhetoric of an election year."

Sen. John Warner, R-Va., commented a day after Vice President Al Gore called for the policy's elimination. Democratic rival Bill Bradley had previously issued a similar call, as had first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, who is running for the Senate from New York.

This past weekend, President Clinton said the policy was "out of whack"

and wasn't working, pledging to help the Pentagon find a way to fix it.

Defense Secretary William Cohen on Monday ordered a 90-day review of the policy.

But Warner, whose committee would oversee any effort to overhaul the policy, urged against a rush to judgment.

In a statement, Warner said he shared deep concerns over harassment of gays in the military and that the beating death of a young soldier at Fort Campbell, Ky., was "a tragic loss for all."

But, he added, "In my view, the wise and fair course for future congressional action, particularly in view of the profound impact of these

issues on military readiness, is not to take legislative action in the heated rhetoric of an election year."

"Congress should await a complete review by the next administration, and then promptly consider any specific recommendations for legislative action," Warner said.

Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon, meanwhile, declined to comment on calls from the campaign trail for elimination of the policy ? except to note that Congress, and not the Clinton administration, had created the policy.

"And of course both Vice President Gore and (former) Senator Bradley were in Congress when the policy was passed and they understand what will be required to change the policy," said Bacon.

Actually, Gore was vice president in 1993 when the law was passed ? but had been in the Senate prior to the 1992 presidential election.

The Pentagon put the policy in place in 1994.

"This happens to be a law that they're commenting on, and they understand

and we all understand that to make a fundamental change in the policy requires a change in the law," Bacon said.

Under the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, gay members of the military can continue to serve ? and their superiors cannot investigate and expel them

? as long as they-keep their sexual orientation to themselves.

~~However, soldiers who say they are gay may be discharged.~~

Sen. John McCain of Arizona, a former Navy pilot who was shot down and held as a prisoner in Vietnam for 5 1/2 years, said he supports the current policy. He criticized Clinton and Gore for talking openly about making changes without consulting military leaders.

"Without even consulting them, to advocate the scrapping of a policy, in my view smacks of irresponsibility," the GOP presidential hopeful said from the campaign trail in Charleston, S.C.

Gore also took heat from the Bradley campaign for the timing of his pronouncement ? fully three months after Bradley condemned "don't ask, don't tell" and within days of similar commentary by the first lady and the president.

"Leadership means solving problems before they get too big to ignore politically," Bradley spokesman Eric Hauser said.

Conservative Gary Bauer, who also is seeking the Republican presidential nomination, said that, if elected, he would work to restore the ban on gays in the military.

"What we are witnessing is a symphony of liberal social experimentation," Bauer said in a statement. "The purpose of the American military is to secure America's national security and to win wars. It is not to advance the political agenda of the gay rights community."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Bob Witeck <BWiteck@Witeckcombs.com> (Bob Witeck <BWiteck@Witeckcombs.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 09:45:12.00

SUBJECT: Another wake-up call -- this time from Atlanta...fyi

TO: "dzingale@aidsaction.org" <dzingale@aidsaction.org> ("dzingale@aidsaction.org" <dzingale@aidsaction.org> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "shelleysimpson@hotmail.com" <shelleysimpson@hotmail.com> ("shelleysimpson@hotmail.com" <shelleysimpson@hotmail.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Jtrammel@hillandknowlton.Com" <Jtrammel@hillandknowlton.Com> ("Jtrammel@hillandknowlton.Com" <Jtrammel@hillandknowlton.Com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

ATLANTA JOURNAL CONSTITUTION, December 15, 1999

72 Marietta Street NW, Atlanta, GA, 30303

(Fax 404-526-5746) (E-MAIL: journal@ajc.com)

(<http://www.accessatlanta.com>)

CAMPAIGN 2000: Gay voters in middle of Bradley-Gore tug of war
Rival's support from some key homosexual activists poses a threat to
vice

president in race for Democratic nomination.

Ken Foscett - Cox Washington Bureau

Washington -- Last spring, when Bill Bradley was still a blip on the

political radar, Vice President Al Gore's campaign sat down with two
dozen

gay and lesbian leaders in New York City.

The purpose of the meeting, led by Gore's former campaign manager,
Craig

Smith, was to build support for Gore in New York's influential gay and
lesbian community, said Kevin Finnegan, the president of a gay
Democratic

club and one of those who attended.

"It became clear that what they really meant by 'support' was
money,"

Finnegan recalled. "We said, 'Look, we don't know what the vice
president's

positions are and where he's going to take things.' Craig Smith didn't know anything. . . . It was a very disappointing meeting."

Enter Bill Bradley, who in the summer and early fall organized several of his own meetings with New York gay and lesbian leaders. Bradley's spadework paid-off. Two weeks ago, he picked up endorsements from several prominent gay and lesbian activists, including Finnegan and two New York city council members.

"Bradley-reached out to the community in a way that Gore did not," Finnegan said.

Gore is now doing some outreach of his own. On Monday, he issued a three-sentence statement calling for an end to the administration's "Don't ask, don't tell" policy toward gays and lesbians in the military.

Gore's opposition to the 1993 policy, universally decried by gay and lesbian-advocacy groups, ranks as one of his highest-profile breaks with the Clinton administration. The policy, which first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton last week also denounced, prohibits superiors from investigating or asking about the sexual orientation of military personnel. But it allows gay service men-and-women to be discharged if they talk about their sexuality openly.

Gore's decision to publicly abandon "Don't ask, don't tell," which aides say he privately opposed for years, underscores the extent to which the vice president has had to jettison his political strategy of focusing on the general election and the eventual Republican nominee in favor of one that confronts the threat Bradley poses to his Democratic nomination prospects.

Gore is now having to fight Bradley for votes among a constituency that, some gay and lesbian leaders say, he took for granted.

The intensifying contest for votes among gay and lesbian Americans also illustrates much about Bradley. While Bradley has publicly disparaged the politics of playing to special interest groups, privately he has waged an aggressive campaign to reach out to key constituencies within the Democratic Party.

In September, following several private meetings with gay and lesbian leaders in New York, Bradley announced his support for virtually every major

initiative supported by the gay and lesbian community, including opposition to "Don't ask, don't tell," and support for full equality of benefits for domestic partners. He remains opposed to government sanction of gay and lesbian marriages, and as a New Jersey senator, Bradley voted for the Defense of Marriage Act, which defined marriage as a union between a man and a woman.

Bradley's willingness to learn about issues important to gays and lesbians won over Ethan Geto, a gay activist in New York who became one of Bradley's state co-chairpersons.

"When somebody at that level comes to you and solicits your advice, then they take all of your advice in an aggressive, committed fashion, how can you not support them?" Geto said.

Gay and lesbian voters are only a small percentage of the electorate, but they comprise an influential block within the Democratic Party, particularly in New York and California.

"Bill Bradley and Al Gore have learned to count," said Keith Morrison, managing director of the Stonewall Democratic Federation, the gay and lesbian wing of the Democratic Party.

Morrison described the behind-the-scenes push for gay and lesbian votes as the most intense of any previous presidential election. "It's almost to the point where you wish they didn't have your phone number," he said.

The Human Rights Campaign, the largest gay and lesbian advocacy group, hasn't endorsed either Gore or Bradley but plans to endorse soon, said executive director Elizabeth Birch.

Birch welcomed Gore's opposition to "don't ask, don't tell" and hinted her organization would back the vice president.

"The overwhelming majority of gay people out there are supportive of the vice president because they have seen action," Birch said. "The fact is that Bill Bradley was never a leader on these issues. He was always a good vote, but he was never a leader."

In New York, Gore has picked up the endorsement of three of the state's five openly gay and lesbian public officeholders. Bradley has the endorsement of the other two.

Bradley also won the endorsement of Ronald Johnson, the city's former

AIDS administrator and an influential figure in the fight against the disease.

"I was impressed with our early meetings with former Sen. Bradley and the degree to which and the way he addressed issues that were important to gay men," Johnson said.

After Johnson and others announced their support for Bradley, Gore's New York campaign elevated state Sen. Tom Duane, an influential gay legislator, to the position of honorary co-chairman and named Emily Giske, vice chairwoman of the state party, as a senior adviser to his campaign.

Giske said the Gore campaign "probably miscalculated" in not reaching out to New York gay and lesbian leaders sooner. But she said Bradley had made a calculated effort to split the gay and lesbian vote.

"The Bradley campaign was very astute," she said. "They took a big chart and they put it on the wall and they said, 'What makes up this primary vote?' You can still do that in this primary."

In California, the majority of the gay and lesbian Democratic clubs have not endorsed either candidate yet, although the vice president enjoys widespread popularity.

But even in the Golden State, Gore can take nothing for granted. The Stonewall Democratic Club of Los Angeles, the largest Democratic club in the state, gay or otherwise, endorsed Gore in January.

But many members are now unhappy with the early endorsement, said West Hollywood city councilmember Steve Martin, a former club president. Martin, who is not committed to either Gore or Bradley, said he is considering offering a motion to rescind the endorsement.

"There was a sense that Gore could wrap this up in the gay and lesbian community and take our constituency for granted," Martin said. "I don't see that it's in our community's best interest to swear allegiance to one Democratic candidate when there is another candidate who is wooing us and whose record is very credible on our issues."

Eric Bauman, the club's current president, said the majority of Stonewall members still support Gore.

"Al Gore has been consistently the gay and lesbian community's best friend in the White House," Bauman said. "Bradley has made some proposals that are very progressive on gay rights, but I always urge people to look at

someone's record."

One of the top issues for gays and lesbians in California is a ballot initiative scheduled for March 7 that would make gay and lesbian marriages illegal. Bradley was the first presidential candidate to announce his opposition to the ballot question, and Gore quickly followed suit. Both Gore and Bradley also support hate crimes legislation. Bradley said he would seek to amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act to include gays and lesbians as a protected group.

Bob Witeck
Witeck-Combs Communications
2120 L Street N.W. Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20037
202-887-0500 ext. 19
202-887-5633 fax

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura S. Marcus (CN=Laura S. Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:26:26.00

SUBJECT: NSC DADT Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I've encouraged NSC and OPL to merge their guidance. I don't want to take JDP 2 sets of points.

----- Forwarded by Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP on 12/15/99
02:25 PM -----

Betsy Pimentel
12/15/99 02:20:15 PM
Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: NSC DADT Guidance

Attached is NSC guidance on this issue that was cleared yesterday. I believe this addresses most (except First Lady and VP questions) of the issues on your draft and reflects where we came out yesterday.

Message Sent

To:

Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Marshall/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary B. DeRosa/NSC/EOP@EOP

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D78]ARMS21317700A.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL
December 14, 1999

Background: Secretary of Defense Cohen announced on December 13 that he had directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy at representative installations within each of the military departments.

Has the "don't ask, don't tell" policy failed to protect gay servicemembers?

- An April 1998 OSD review concluded that the Armed Forces have experienced challenges implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. For the most part the policy has been properly enforced. However, the constrained personal privacy of all servicemembers and a cultural emphasis on enforcing the 1993 law requiring that servicemembers with a propensity or intention to engage in homosexual acts must be separated have created problems in implementing the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.
- Such problems can be seen in the number of annual discharges for homosexual conduct, which has doubled since 1994, and reports from outside groups that incidents of anti-gay harassment have increased significantly since 1997.
- President has expressed his concern about the manner in which the "don't ask, don't tell" policy is being implemented. This is consistent with many of the concerns expressed by Secretary Cohen.
- Yesterday, Secretary of Defense Cohen announced that he had directed the DOD Inspector General to assess the environment with respect to application of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy at representative installations within each of the military departments. That report is due in 90 days.
- The President will review the "don't ask, don't tell" policy after the Inspector General completes the assessment directed by Secretary Cohen.

What have you done to strengthen the "don't ask, don't tell" policy?

- DOD has taken several steps over the past three years to enhance implementation of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.
- In 1997, DOD issued guidance stating that a report by a servicemember of harassment because he or she is perceived to be gay is not a cause for the commanding officer to investigate the person being harassed. It also ordered prompt investigation of harassment charges made by possibly gay members and ordered training to prevent harassment.
- In August 1999, DOD issued additional policy guidance designed to promote consistent and fair application of this policy. For example, Service Inspector Generals are to make the

training of those charged with implementing the homosexual conduct policy – commanders, attorneys and investigators – a specific item of interest for inspection.

- The Armed Services are expected to issue their guidance shortly for carrying out DOD's August 1999 guidance, so we have not yet seen the impact of the changes made by DOD.
- We support DOD's efforts to improve implementation of the policy, ensure that service members are not subject to harassment based on alleged homosexuality, and eliminate tolerance of disparaging speech or expression relating to sexual orientation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 11:52:54.00

SUBJECT: minor recommendations

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Should we send these by our NSA pals and or Laura Marcus?

Q's and A's: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

Q: How do you feel about the First Lady's views on elimination of Don't Ask/Don't Tell policy?

A: I agree with her that the policy has not worked well. We ought to look toward a day when gays and lesbians can serve openly in the military alongside everyone else. The truth is that they have served in the military for a long time and they have made great contribution to our national security.

Q: How do you feel about the Vice President's views? Was he opposed to the policy from the beginning?

A: Yes, he argued against it from the beginning. So did others. The basic question was whether we were going to try to work with Congress to reach a compromise or not. I thought a compromise was best for the military services as well as the gay men and women in uniform. I think many of us realize now that the policy has not worked as well as we had hoped.

Q: Who's responsible for not getting it done right, is the leadership of the pentagon responsible for not implementing it right?

A: The Pentagon is responsible for implementing the policy, and they have taken steps to improve implementation already, and I know Secretary Cohen is committed to doing more. For example, the Dept of Defense issued guidelines against harassment to the services and has requested training for service members. We've strengthened the

confidentiality of communications between service members and health care professionals. I issued an executive order authorizing higher penalties for hate crimes, based on sexual orientation, race and other factors. But there is more to be done.

Should be a question. or at least an answer on Secretary Cohen asking for an IG investigation...

Q: Should the policy be changed to what you campaigned on? If so why don't you try to change it in the coming year?

A: The policy should be changed but, frankly, it's not realistic to try to do it in the coming year.

I think it makes more sense to try to improve the implementation of it rather to spend enormous effort working on changing the statute. We've already taken a number of steps to improve it and

I believe it can be implemented even more effectively and fairly. The Pentagon will take the lead in doing that and they will work closely with all the services and they will consult with Congress as well.

Q: Should the next congress address it?

A: Yes. The beginning of a new millennium is a perfect time for Congress to concentrate on steps that will break down barriers between human beings. That's basically what's at stake

with this policy. We've made great progress in seeing people as individuals in this country and in looking beyond race and religion and gender. We're doing that with sexual orientation, too. We just have to keep working at it.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:27:49.00

SUBJECT: Re: NSC DADT Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Betsy Pimentel (CN=Betsy Pimentel/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I don't think these two version are inconsistent although they cover somewhat different territory. Why don't you send both of them to Jason and let him figure out how to put them together?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 13:59:16.00

SUBJECT: 12/15 don't ask-don't tell

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D50]ARMS26033700P.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

Don't Ask/Don't Tell
December 15, 1999

Background

Today's Washington Times has a story on Don't Ask/Don't Tell, which claims that the Pentagon has made a sudden change in its position on the policy, as reflected by the review recently ordered by Secretary Cohen. The suggestion is that this change is the result of the upcoming 2000 elections.

Q: Has the Pentagon suddenly changed its position on Don't Ask/Don't Tell because of election year politics?

A: The Department of Defense has been engaged in an evaluation of this policy over the last year. It has recognized problems in implementation for quite some time and has taken a number of steps to address them. The Department also recognizes that there is more to be done. In addition, of course, there was a tragic murder at Ft. Campbell, which provides additional evidence that more needs to be done.

Q: Did the Pentagon say the policy was working effectively as recently as last August?

A: In August 1999, the Pentagon released an August 1998 report, which said the policy is "generally being implemented properly." However, the August 1998 report recommended taking a number of steps to improve the implementation of the policy. Since then, a number of steps have already been taken to improve implementation of Don't Ask/Don't Tell, including the following:

- 1) In August 1999, DOD sent a memorandum to all the services directing that they disseminate guidance regarding the prohibition on harassing service members on the basis of sexual orientation. That guidance is to be part of training for commanding officers and others. DOD also required that significant investigations of service members for violation of the policy be approved at the Military Department secretarial level.
- 2) In October 1999, the President signed an executive order authorizing military courts to impose higher penalties in the case of crimes motivated by race, sexual orientation and other factors.
- 3) The October 1999 order also provided that communications between service members and their psychotherapists is privileged and confidentiality in court martial proceedings. This confidentiality protection would apply to statements regarding sexual orientation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-DEC-1999 14:25:12.00

SUBJECT: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

you may not need to take this to john -- julian has straightened it out --

----- Forwarded by Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP on 12/15/99

02:24 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

12/15/99 02:18:49 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP

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

Subject: Re: Don't Ask Don't Tell Press Q/A Guidance

I think you both have a point, but we need to stick as closely to what the President said in the radio interview . I do believe it is helpful to remind voters of how we ended up with the policy but the focus and pressure now should be on implementation; the President has not asked for a change in policy.

What the President has said implies that he would proposit or support a change in policy, but I am not sure we can say he is calling for one at this time.

The President said "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."

"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"

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

Message Copied

To:

edward w. correia/who/eop@eop

elizabeth j. potter/who/eop@eop

mary e. cahill/who/eop@eop

edward w. correia/who/eop@eop

betsy pimentel/nsc/eop@eop

laura s. marcus/who/eop@eop

william marshall/who/eop@eop

mary b. derosa/nsc/eop@eop