

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-2000 15:26:47.00

SUBJECT:

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Roseanne M. Hill (CN=Roseanne M. Hill/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Julian - Rudy DeLeon told Hans he expects to call a meeting of the DOD DADT working group sometime next week. As you know, the WH has been invited to participate although, they would like to keep it at a relatively low level. I would like to suggest that we have an EOP meeting prior to the DOD's to map out any agenda we might want to present. We should also decide who will represent the EOP. Would you like to host such a meeting? I'd be happy to put together a point paper that examines the recommendations that NSC and Eddie have proposed to further improve DADT implementation.

Brian

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-2000 12:05:09.00

SUBJECT: PBS NewsHour, February 1, 2000

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
PBS NewsHour
Feb 1, 2000

PRIMARY PRESS

Media correspondent Terence Smith takes a look at
the legions of
reporters who flocked to New Hampshire to cover the
nation's first
presidential primary.

The NewsHour Media Unit is funded by a grant from
the Pew Charitable
Trusts.

SEN. JOHN McCAIN: You know and I know that labor gives millions of dollars, and it would...

TERENCE SMITH: There's nothing the media love more than a good fight.

AL GORE: If I could finish. I haven't interrupted you,

Bill.

Spinning a "fast and furious" race

TERENCE SMITH: And this year, they've got one. With contested races in both parties for an open seat in the Oval Office, campaign coverage is up sharply. According to the independent Tyndall Report, the major commercial networks

have not devoted this much air time to the presidential campaign since 1988, the last time a two-term president was vacating the White House.

Ceci Connolly is covering Vice President Gore for The Washington Post.

CECI CONNOLLY, The Washington Post: The phase that we are in right now is very intense because of these early contests. They're so early; they come so fast and furious, especially on the Republican side, and I think you see a

lot

of news outlets trying to cram so much into such a limited time period right now.

TERENCE SMITH: Little surprise, then, that a small army of news people has descended on New Hampshire to cover today's first-in-the-nation primary. Many have followed the campaign for months, tracking the ups and downs of this hotly contested battle for the presidential nominations of both parties.

The so-called "spin room" was where campaign operatives were busy during last week's debate trying to convince journalists that their man had won, even before the event was over. Clarence Page, a columnist for the Chicago Tribune, was among those being spun by Doug Berman, chairman of the Bill Bradley campaign.

SPOKESMAN: It took them three days to correct that statement.

CLARENCE PAGE, Chicago Tribune: For the past 20 years, I've said that the coverage and the public relations game has

gotten to be like a "Road Runner" cartoon. We're kind of like Wiley Coyote trying to get the best of those spin doctors, and they keep coming up with new tricks every four years.

chiefs

TERENCE SMITH: Validating the notion of presidential politics as a high-profile spectator sport, corporate

like Gerald Levin, the newly announced CEO of AOL Time Warner, came to see the process for themselves.

In the spotlight: George W. Bush

The press scrum was equally visible out on the stump. From the time he launched his campaign eight months ago, George W. Bush has been followed every step of the way by a huge press corps that has

often treated him as his country's presumptive presidential nominee. But that same press corps has also questioned whether he has the experience, the credentials, and even

the

intelligence for the job.

REPORTER: Can you name the president of Chechnya?

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH: No, can you?

REPORTER: Can you name the prime minister of India?

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH: Ah, the new prime minister of India is... Uh, no.

GEORGE WILL, ABC NEWS: The media this fall came to the conclusion-- and I won't mince words-- that you're not smart enough to be president, and aren't educated enough. What can you do to combat this?

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH: You win.

TERENCE SMITH: These days, ahead in the polls nationally, Governor Bush can joke about this press portrayal of him, as he did in this exchange Friday in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

REPORTER: As president of our country, what are your plans to continue the battle against racism and to help our company... this country, rather, embrace diversity rather than be afraid of it?

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH: I appreciate it. I know how

you feel. Some of the best of us mispronounce words, and some of the best of us can't even name all the foreign leaders. (Applause)

TERENCE SMITH: Karen Hughes is communications director for the Bush campaign.

KAREN HUGHES: There are topics in the news and to some extent there's still a pack mentality that when one subject comes up, like intelligence, or like the pop quiz. I can't, you know, there are different hot topics that become hot in the media. And those are the subjects for a few days. Sometimes the subjects that the media focuses on are sometimes not the same subjects that the voters are focused on. So occasionally there's a disconnect. But I think by

and

large the coverage has been fair.

The Straight Talk Express: John McCain

SEN. JOHN McCAIN: I'm always going to tell you the truth.

TERENCE SMITH: Like Governor Bush, the press coverage of John McCain has been both positive and negative.

But the Arizona Senator has maintained an open-door policy.

When it comes to the care and feeding of the political press, nothing succeeds like access. Senator John McCain has provided it virtually nonstop to the reporters who travel with him aboard his campaign bus, which he has dubbed "The Straight Talk Express." Not surprisingly, McCain has won rave reviews from reporters for his openness.

FOX NEWS REPORTER: There's a situation on the McCain bus -- all access, all the time to reporters -- and

it

has worked very well for John McCain. He has achieved very, very favorable media coverage.

TED KOPPEL, ABC NEWS "NIGHTLINE": If the usual problems of a press corps covering a presidential candidate

is inefficient access or a candidate who doesn't like to answer a variety of pointed questions, if that's the problem, John McCain may be the solution.

TERENCE SMITH: Jeff Greenfield is a senior analyst for CNN.

TERENCE SMITH: Does access equal love?

JEFF GREENFIELD, CNN: Look, it is very hard not to treat someone well who treats you well. And after days when you go on a press bus and you're, you know, and the Secret Service pins you against the wall if you walk three feet toward a water cooler and other candidates give you, you know, eight minutes or ten minutes, the idea that you're sitting with a candidate who will answer any question you ask can help but be treated favorably.

TERENCE SMITH: But it has not been all roses for John McCain. Newspaper headlines dogged him earlier in the campaign about his famously volatile temper, and Tim Russert challenged him about it on "Meet the Press."

TIM RUSSERT: How many senators have you apologized to for blowing your stack?

SEN. JOHN McCAIN: Oh, maybe three or four, from time to time.

TIM RUSSERT: Your temper's under control?

SEN. JOHN McCAIN: Absolutely. Again, it's not only under control, but I've been through now 11, 12 months of this campaign.

Coverage of the Democratic race

TERENCE SMITH: Vice President Al Gore too has experienced bumps in the media road, from criticisms of his speaking skills and his controversial "alpha male" advisor, to policy questions on his record on abortion and his position on gays in the military.

CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT: The issue of gays in the military has become a focal point in the Democratic race for president, one that has Vice President Al Gore scrambling to explain himself. But it's not the only issue that's causing him problems.

TERENCE SMITH: Ceci Connolly says the coverage of the Vice President has waxed and waned.

CECI CONNOLLY, The Washington Post: If we go back to pre- presidential campaign, when he was just "good ol' Vice President Al Gore," he had pretty good press coverage, with the exception of the campaign finance scandal off of the '96 race. And then he had a pretty good go of it for a while. But what became obvious in, say, spring into the summer, was that this was a man who couldn't settle on a campaign staff. There were all sorts of palace intrigue

going

on, a lot of back stabbing, who is up, who is down? And he couldn't seem to figure out who he himself was, and he had a very public almost soul-searching process that was obviously reflected in the coverage.

TERENCE SMITH: Democratic challenger Bill Bradley enjoyed an early honeymoon with many in the press, only to see his style and manner come under attack.

TERENCE SMITH: In the Bradley example again he was initially perceived as fresh and original and different.

And

now people write he is aloof and distant and excessively private.

JEFF GREENFIELD: Yes.

TERENCE SMITH: It's the same fella.

JEFF GREENFIELD: It is. I think you're on to something there. I think it's what Bertrand Russell once called the congregation of irregular firms. I am firm, you are

stubborn,

he is a pig-headed fool. The same qualities that seem incredibly attractive when a candidate gets in trouble, you look at him in a new light. I think there's that kind of revisionism.

TERENCE SMITH: Tom Rosenstiel, director of the Project for Excellence in Journalism, says the critical scrutiny

of Bill

Bradley increased as he rose in the polls.

TOM ROSENSTIEL: He benefited from a kind of gentleness early on. Then he suffered from becoming very

competitive very quickly, and at that point, something you might call the "oh, my God" factor kicks in, which is "oh my God, this guy could actually win! We need to take him seriously." And then the worm turns, and the press becomes more rugged.

TERENCE SMITH: In recent days, Senator Bradley has been questioned closely about his health, especially after

a story in the Sunday New York Times noted that he might have to undergo anesthesia to correct his irregular heartbeat.

SAM DONALDSON, ABC NEWS: Don't you think some Americans would be a little skittish about the fact that

you would have to go under and have this procedure and have that 25th amendment?

BILL BRADLEY: No, I don't think so. I think that it's a very simple procedure.

TERENCE SMITH: Perhaps. But Karen Brown, news director and anchor of the ABC affiliate in Manchester, New Hampshire, reflected the prevailing skepticism in the

press. KAREN BROWN: Then there's the whole question of his health. I don't personally think that hurt Bill Bradley,

but some might say, I don't know, when push comes to shove, I want somebody that I know is going to be 100% healthy in that Oval Office.

The other GOP candidates

TERENCE SMITH: Judging from the mainstream media coverage, the presidential contest would seem to be a two-man race in each party. But in fact, three other Republicans-- Steve Forbes, Gary Bauer, and Alan Keyes - have been campaigning vigorously, if against long odds. Tom Rosenstiel says it is difficult for news organizations to

cover them as well.

TOM ROSENSTIEL: This is just an inevitable problem of how do you stage a campaign, how do you stage debates, how do you manage coverage in the newspaper? There's only so many inches. One of the glories of the United

States

is that we don't regulate the press. We allow the press to make its own decisions about coverage, and there's enough newspapers and news zealots out there that it sort of averages out.

TERENCE SMITH: At WMUR, which devotes 40 hours a week to local coverage, most of it politics, Karen Brown says her station is taking Steve Forbes seriously.

KAREN BROWN: I think he's a better candidate in the campaign 2000 cycle than he was in the 196 cycle. He learned from that first go-around. He's honed his message. I'm not sure his message is playing as well, the flat tax message, but he is a better candidate, a better campaigner.

TERENCE SMITH: And the performance of the press generally so far in this campaign? CNN's Jeff Greenfield thinks good work has been done, but an old habit has asserted itself.

JEFF GREENFIELD, CNN: Actually, what strikes me is that the besetting sins of political journalists are alive

and

well, and the besetting sin is the absolute, compulsive

need

to say what is going to happen before it happens-- to

predict,

to extrapolate our from a small series of events, and to never learn the lessons of political history, which are humbling to any of us.

TERENCE SMITH: Indeed it is, and more political history will be made tonight.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-2000 18:11:47.00

SUBJECT: Re:

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Jullian- We had suggested some time ago that DOD lead a small, low-key team to monitor implementation of the DADT policy and perhaps develop non-legislative ways to improve the policy itself. This team would include a small number of WH people. DeLeon is now ready to put together this team and start work. It will probably meet several times, as needed.

brian

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Hoag, Jamie" <Jamie.Hoag@mail.house.gov> ("Hoag, Jamie" <Jamie.Hoag@mail.house.gov> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-2000 17:25:38.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Jared Powell (CN=Jared Powell/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

> Jim Garamone
> American Forces Press Service
>
> WASHINGTON -- DoD has approved service plans to train
> military personnel in the intricacies of the "don't ask,
> don't tell, don't harass" homosexual policy.
>
> Service members will receive training in the policy at all
> levels of professional military training. They will also
> receive periodic "refresher" training at their units.
>
> The top civilians and uniformed members of each service
> have also issued strong statements highlighting Defense
> Secretary William Cohen's addition of "don't harass" to the
> policy. The statements also stress the need for commanders
> to apply the policy fairly.
>
> DoD spokesman Ken Bacon also announced the number of
> discharges under the "don't ask, don't tell, don't harass"
> policy dropped in fiscal 1999. A total of 1,034 service
> members were discharged in fiscal 1999 down from 1,145 in
> fiscal 1998. Bacon said about 83.5 percent of the
> discharges were statement cases -- those where service
> members went to their commanders and declared their
> homosexuality.
>
> Defense officials said the training is standard through the
> services. There are "cultural" differences in the way the
> services present the training, but the main points are the
> same, said Rear Adm. Craig Quigley, deputy assistant
> secretary of defense for public affairs.
>
> The training will continue at recruit training and in at
> officer entry training. It will expand to all levels of NCO
> and officer professional military education. For Army
> enlisted personnel, for example, this means the "don't ask,
> don't tell, don't harass" policy will be covered at basic
> training, at the Primary Leadership Development Course, and
> at the basic, advanced and Senior NCO academies.
>

> Air Force officers, for example, already receive training
> prior to commissioning. Now they will also receive "don't
> ask, don't tell, don't harass" training at Squadron Officer
> School, Air Command and Staff College and the Air War
> College.
>
> In addition, service members selected as commanders will
> receive specialized training, as will judge advocate
> general personnel.
>
> Finally, all personnel in all services will receive yearly
> "refresher" training in the policy, Bacon said.
>
> "The idea here is to make the training more uniform, to
> make sure that it's uniform, and to first stress that this
> policy is part of a nondiscrimination policy in the
> military," Bacon said. "It's to make sure that everybody
> understands exactly what the policy is and what it isn't,
> what it allows and doesn't allow, and to make sure that
> this is being communicated uniformly throughout every
> service."
>
> In some cases, the training requirement tells commanders
> how much time to spend on each section of the policy, Bacon
> said.
>
> The "don't harass" portion of the training will be stressed
> at first. "If a service member comes to the commander and
> says, 'I'm being threatened or harassed because people
> suspect or allege that I am gay,' ... the commander's
> responsibility is to investigate the threat," said Frank
> Rush, deputy undersecretary of defense for planning.
>
> If there has been a threat or harassment, the commander
> must take appropriate action against those who threaten or
> harass. "Because [the harassment] not only violates the
> specific direction from the Department of Defense and from
> the services, it's not conducive to good order and
> discipline for any service member for any reason not to
> treat other service members with dignity and respect," Rush
> said.
>
> In December Cohen asked the DoD Inspector General to
> examine the climate at installations regarding the "don't
> ask, don't tell, don't harass" policy. Bacon said DoD IG
> teams are making progress in their review.
>
> "The IG's people are currently surveying 38 bases at home
> and abroad," Bacon said. "They've created a very long
> questionnaire, which they are then giving to a random bunch
> of people. The first base they went to, the random bunch of
> people included a four-star general, so they are getting a
> sampling of people from all ranks.
>

> "They are asking questions about how well the policy is
> understood at all levels in the military, from E-1 up to O-
> 10," he continued. "They are also asking how well the
> policy is implemented and trying to get a sense of the
> general climate under the 'don't ask, don't tell, don't
> harass' policy throughout the military."
>
> The IG report is due out in March.
>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-2000 15:04:19.00

SUBJECT: Re: AP Story DADT guidelines

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

OK. What times did you give Hans -- so I can hold them.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-2000 14:39:18.00

SUBJECT: Re: AP Story DADT guidelines

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Not a bad story. Did you get back to Brian about hosting a meeting prior to our meeting with DOD?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-2000 17:40:10.00

SUBJECT: Re: AP Story DADT guidelines

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

just waiting on scheduling Hans....

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-2000 14:04:43.00

SUBJECT: AP Story DADT guidelines

TO: David B. Peterman (CN=David B. Peterman/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: lisa m. brown (CN=lisa m. brown/O=ovp@ovp [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: roseanne m. hill (CN=roseanne m. hill/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:

ASSOCIATED PRESS, February 1, 2000

Cohen OKs Training on Gays Policy

By ROBERT BURNS

WASHINGTON (AP) - For the first time, the nation's military services have written guidelines to ensure that the Pentagon's ``don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays is implemented fairly and uniformly.

Defense Secretary William Cohen said Tuesday he has approved new training programs for each of the services, including guidelines for investigating harassment or threats against individuals based on allegations of homosexuality.

As a matter of policy, commanders are not to use complaints of such harassment or threats as a reason to investigate the complaining person but is supposed to investigate the source of the threat or harassment.

``These plans make it very clear ... that there is no room for harassment

or threats in the military," Cohen said in a written statement.

The Pentagon also announced Tuesday the number of discharges from the military in the fiscal year ended last Sept. 30 fell to 1,034 from 1,145 in the year-earlier period. Spokesman Kenneth Bacon said 83.5 percent of discharges resulted from statements by service members that they were homosexual.

Under the Clinton administration's policy, gays may serve in the military as long as they keep their sexual orientation to themselves. If they state that they are homosexual, they are supposed to be removed from the service.

Cohen instructed the services to develop new training guidelines last December amid widening criticism that administration policy on gays in the military was not working. The criticism sharpened after a court-martial in which an Army private was convicted of murdering a gay soldier harassed with the knowledge of his superiors. President Clinton called the Pentagon's implementation of the administration policy "out of whack."

Cohen also asked each of the service's top civilian and uniformed leaders to issue statements to their troops reinforcing the policy against harassment of gays.

In a joint statement, Air Force Secretary F. Whitten Peters and the Air Force chief of staff, Gen. Michael Ryan, said, "Harassment, threats or ridicule of individuals or groups based upon their real or perceived differences, including sexual orientation, have no place in the United States Air Force and will not be tolerated."

The Army's statement said, "We expect commanders at every level to take appropriate action to prevent harassment of or threats against any member of our Army."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-FEB-2000 15:02:49.00

SUBJECT: Re: AP Story DADT guidelines

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Yes. I am trying to coordinate Han's schedule. Also, I would like to have you do a budget conference call with the gay and lesbian specialty press. Dag Vega is setting it up...we will also have Sandy Thurman doing the AIDS budget stuff. The call is probably mon or tues.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-2000 12:57:43.00

SUBJECT: Mtg of DADT policy implementation group

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

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

CC: lisa m. brown (CN=lisa m. brown/O=ovp@ovp [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: johannes a. binnendijk (CN=johannes a. binnendijk/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/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: david b. peterman (CN=david b. peterman/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: matt gobush (CN=matt gobush/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])
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

TEXT:
Monday, February 7th, 3:00 pm. Room 117

Sometime next week, DOD will be convening a working group on DADT. The WH has been asked to participate in this group.

I would like for us to discuss how we want to work together with the DOD DADT working group, determine what issues we would like to address and decide who should represent the WH.

We can also review our list of draft recommendations to further improve implementation of the policy.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Erik North <erik.north@ey.com> (Erik North <erik.north@ey.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-2000 21:13:05.00

SUBJECT: RE: Better sit down for this -- I'm moving in . . . <-- Attachment History Removed

TO: AnthonyA@utanet.com (AnthonyA@utanet.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Matthew L. Bennett (CN=Matthew L. Bennett/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: ken_colwell@yahoo.com (ken_colwell@yahoo.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: rogan.kersh@yale.edu (rogan.kersh@yale.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: nyy1999wsc@yahoo.com (nyy1999wsc@yahoo.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: DCaputo@nrdc.org (DCaputo@nrdc.org [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: s7w@sdmayor.sannet.gov (s7w@sdmayor.sannet.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: clfoote@harvard.edu (clfoote@harvard.edu [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Rob.Eure@wsj.com (Rob.Eure@wsj.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: GARRP@PerkinsCoie.com (GARRP@PerkinsCoie.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Dwight.Holton@usdoj.gov (Dwight.Holton@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Don't ask; Don't tell; Don't pursue.

--Les Aspin

Subject: RE: Better sit down for this -- I'm moving in . . .

Are you...coming out on us here, Dew? Via email? How impersonal! Have you and your "friend" John registered any place? You must really be relieved!

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

From: Dwight Holton [mailto:Dwight.Holton@usdoj.gov]

Sent: Monday, January 31, 2000 6:19 PM

To: AnthonyA@utanet.com; DCaputo@nrdc.org; GARRP@PerkinsCoie.com;

nyyl999wsc@yahoo.com; Rob.Eure@wsj.com; rogan.kersh@yale.edu

Cc: clfoote@harvard.edu; dwight.holton@usdoj.gov; erik.north@ey.com;

ken_colwell@yahoo.com; Matthew_L._Bennett@who.eop.gov;

s7w@sdmayor.sannet.gov

Subject: Better sit down for this -- I'm moving in . . .

Sensitivity: Personal

. . . with my friend John Kroger. My new address is

189 Carleton Ave.

Brooklyn, New York.

Phone number: 917-968-6082.

D

Note: The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Thank you. Ernst & Young LLP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-2000 11:06:18.00

SUBJECT: potus

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Gay rights advocay groups were thrilled this week when Secretary Cohen finally announced training plans for the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. The advocates were especially pleased that the leadership of the service branches made official statements condemning harassment.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan M. Young (CN=Jonathan M. Young/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-2000 11:11:18.00

SUBJECT: potus

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

just paste this in gay lesbian outreach, I'll deal with headline later.

----- Forwarded by Jonathan M. Young/WHO/EOP on
02/04/2000 11:10 AM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter

02/04/2000 11:06:06 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Jonathan M. Young/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: potus

Gay rights advocay groups were thrilled this week when Secretary Cohen finally announced training plans for the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy. The advocates were especially pleased that the leadership of the service branches made official statements condemning harassment.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-2000 16:55:30.00

SUBJECT: Re: EDITORIAL ON DADT TRAINING GUIDELINES

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Not the greatest endorsement in the world, but the good news is
that it treats the guidelines to be a significant step forward.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-2000 14:22:27.00

SUBJECT: Re: Mtg of DADT policy implementation group

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I'll be there!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-FEB-2000 12:39:37.00

SUBJECT: EDITORIAL ON DADT TRAINING GUIDELINES

TO: David B. Peterman (CN=David B. Peterman/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: david b. peterman (CN=david b. peterman/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: matt gobush (CN=matt gobush/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: lisa m. brown (CN=lisa m. brown/O=ovp@ovp [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: johannes a. binnendijk (CN=johannes a. binnendijk/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

San Francisco Examiner, February 3, 2000

P. O. Box 7260, San Francisco, CA, 94120

(Fax 415-512-1264) (E-MAIL: letters@examiner.com)

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

Pentagon sensitivity training

Examiner Editorial Writer

At last the Defense Department has ordered all members of the armed services to be trained not to harass gays in their ranks. The idea of making

such basic behavioral instruction a general requirement comes five years after the ambiguous "don't ask, don't tell" policy was put in place by

President Clinton.

That policy ? to let gays serve in the military if they keep quiet about their orientation and are not found engaging in homosexual acts ? does not come close to honoring these Americans' equal rights when it comes to wearing the nation's uniform. In some cases the "don't tell" rule made gays even more vulnerable to malicious commentary on their sexuality by anti-gay colleagues. Gays who complained of harassment could be kicked out of the service for acknowledging their orientation, while harassers went unpunished.

Officials were shocked last year by the ultimate in homophobic violence, the baseball-bat murder of suspected gay Pvt. Barry Winchell at Fort Campbell, Ky., by Pvt. Calvin Glover, now serving a life sentence. Clinton himself was disturbed by the case, and it has prompted Secretary of Defense William Cohen to order new training against harassment of gays, and to write military commanders that such threats and harassment will not be tolerated.

It's about time such elementary instruction in acceptable behavior became general in the services, where troops are barraged with all kinds of self-evident advice, such as avoiding V.D. by not picking up sexual partners in seedy bars.

Justice for gays in the military is still a ways off, but perhaps more humane treatment is a closer possibility.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-FEB-2000 13:29:56.00

SUBJECT: Re: Mtg of DADT policy implementation group

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I agree. Lets see if we can pull our group together sometime early next week. Hans

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-FEB-2000 16:46:34.00

SUBJECT: Re:

TO: David B. Peterman (CN=David B. Peterman/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: lisa m. brown (CN=lisa m. brown/O=ovp@ovp [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: roseanne m. hill (CN=roseanne m. hill/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Thanks for putting together the policy recommendations. Here are the latest editorials on the DADT training plans.

Detroit News, February 7, 2000

615 W. Lafayette, Detroit, MI, 48226

(Fax 313-222-6417) (E-MAIL: Letters@detnews.com)

(<http://detnews.com/>)

DEB PRICE: Time to plan gay integration of military

The U.S. military ban on openly gay soldiers will be lifted. That ?s inevitable. Discrimination that violates the very ideals that our armed forces are supposed to defend simply won ?t be allowed to continue forever. Yet it would be naive to think that lifting the un-American ban won ?t cause any trouble.

How can we minimize the disruption?

With public support for gay military people steadily rising, that ?s the question all of us who believe in a strong national defense should be

asking.

A Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll released Jan. 28 found overwhelming voter support — 74 percent to 22 percent — for gays in the military. Most civilians — 56 percent versus 37 percent — favor letting gay people serve openly, according to a new report by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, an academic think tank focused on the military.

“The trend in public opinion may be irreversible. So, the wise military leader looks at this and says, OK, we can either do this on our terms, or the terms can be dictated to us. Let us get out front and craft a policy that would be the least disruptive to military effectiveness,” observes Duke University political scientist Peter Feaver, co-author of a 1,100-page Triangle Institute study of gaps between civilian and military attitudes on many issues.

The six-year-old “don’t ask, don’t tell” law really is the first step toward ending the ban because it established the right of gay Americans to serve — though only in silence. And, in an overdue but critical milestone on

Feb. 1, Defense Secretary William Cohen ordered every service member — from general to private — to attend training sessions stressing that anti-gay slurs and harassment are forbidden, and that violators will be punished.

Neither Feaver nor his report takes a position on the ban. But he and his fellow researchers offered me valuable insights into how lifting it could

be done as smoothly as possible:

Opposition to the ban would need to be even stronger, cross party lines in Congress and include some of the military’s most ardent allies, they said.

That would help the military brass not feel the change was being shoved down

its throat. A strict new code of behavior would need to apply to everyone, gay and straight alike, but not attempt to change anti-gay attitudes.

Commanders would need to demonstrate zero tolerance for anti-gay violence and harassment.

The Feaver team also noted:

• Team spirit: Service members would need to be taught that anti-gay behavior threatens unit cohesion — and could put the victimizer and the entire unit at risk.

• Do unto others: Some straight male soldiers who fear lifting the ban are afraid they would receive the kind of inappropriate advances many men make toward women. “When they think of being on the receiving end of that, they really get freaked out,” says Feaver colleague Laura Miller, a military sociologist at the University of California at Los Angeles. As the fearful soldiers see men and women working together without sexual harassment, they may be less afraid of openly gay men.

• Mission possible: The Joint Chiefs would need to be wooed. “It can’t just be ordered. There has to be an effort to make them understand what is driving the policy,” says Feaver co-author Richard Kohn, a military historian at University of North Carolina. “The military has to reflect the

attitudes
of the society it serves. ?

? Quitters: Twenty-seven percent of rising officers told Feaver ?s team they would leave if gays serve openly. But on a list of nine possible reasons to leave, lifting the ban ranked only sixth. Higher choices included less ?sense of fulfillment ? (68 percent) and ?too much time ? away from my family (39 percent). It ?s unlikely most of the 27 percent would leave. ?
For some, this is a way of voting, ? of just signaling opposition, Miller says.

Lifting the ban on openly gay soldiers is vital to American interests.
And working to minimize the difficulty should be a shared national goal.

? Deb Price ?s column is published on Monday. Write letters to The News at 615 W. Lafayette, Detroit, MI 48226, or fax to (313) 222-6417 or send e-mail to letters@detnews.com

Albany (NY) Times Union, February 7, 2000
645 Albany-Shaker Road, Albany, NY, 12201
(Fax 518-454-5628) (E-Mail: tuleters@timesunion.com)
(<http://www.timesunion.com>)

Editorial: Don't ask, don't harass

The military is finally facing the flaws in the policy on homosexuals

The Pentagon has taken a sensible step to make a muddled policy about gays serving in the military work better.

First it was "Don't ask, don't tell." Then it was "Don't ask, don't tell, don't harass."

This might be called "Don't ask, don't tell, don't harass ? and don't tolerate."

Every member of the service, from the brass to the grunts, will be trained to prevent abuse toward gay soldiers that's still all too rampant. Finally, the Pentagon is sending the signal that harassment of gays won't be ignored.

Five years after "don't ask, don't tell," it's been alarmingly routine for gays to be pressured into acknowledging their homosexuality ? which is supposed to be a private matter ? and thus ending their military careers. The policy that President Clinton admitted was "out of whack" culminated late last year with the conviction of an Army private for murdering Pfc. Barry Winchel in their barracks at Fort Campbell, Ky.

It's a huge leap of faith, of course, to conclude that an hour or so of training would have deterred Mr. Winchel's killer. But anything less than mandatory training throughout the military might well have created an environment where such vicious behavior was all the more likely.

Members of the Navy will be ordered to take immediate steps to protect any gay sailor who's being harassed and to hold those responsible for such abuse accountable. In the Army, soldiers will be reminded that reporting anti-gay harassment won't lead to any investigation of the whistle-blowers.

In time, though, the military might find that it needs to take a tougher stand, in fact. The welcome step toward training could be undermined by statements like this one by Navy Cmdr. Greg Smith: "This hasn't quite risen to the level of annual sexual harassment training, but it's clearly

important."

Indeed harassment of gays in the military is every bit as serious as harassment of a heterosexual nature. Gays should be able to serve, honorably and effectively, in the military just like anyone else.

If only their comrades would come away from their training with that essential message.

Boston Globe, February 7, 2000

Box 2378, Boston, MA, 02107

(Fax 617-929-2098) (E-MAIL: letter@globe.com)

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

EDITORIAL: Enforcing 'don't harass'

"Don't ask, don't tell" ? the policy to protect gays in the military

?

is six years old, but it is only now being backed by an effort to do widespread, uniform training.

The plan, announced by the US Department of Defense this week, is impressive: The military will train all personnel within a year. Because it

comes so late, however, this training must be excellent ? promoting change and making up for lost time.

Even with "Don't ask, don't tell" in place, there have been thousands of cases of gay service members being wrongly investigated and harassed physically and verbally, including death threats. Women who have reported sexual harassment have been labeled lesbians and faced dismissal actions. Ideally, training would make military personnel feel safer reporting all kinds of harassment.

A more heinous sign of the policy's failure came last summer at Fort Campbell in Kentucky, where Private First Class Barry Winchell was beaten to

death with a bat by Calvin Glover, a soldier who spent weeks harassing Winchell because he was gay.

In December, Secretary of Defense William Cohen added "don't harass" to

the policy. Following up on this, the training will emphasize that when a service member reports harassment, the goal should be to investigate the harassment, not the sexual orientation of the soldier. Officers and recruits

alike will receive the training, with periodic refresher sessions. For the training to be effective, military leaders must be committed to it, explains

Michelle Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

That means everything from confronting those who snicker during training sessions to stressing basics. While "don't ask," sounds like a simple directive, in 1998 the defense network documented hundreds of cases in which

service members were directly asked if they were gay.

Monitoring the training process and its outcomes will be essential. Otherwise the effort will amount to little more than good intentions.

The military should not be hindered by wasted, discriminatory fights among its own members. It has more important battles to fight.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-2000 14:06:40.00

SUBJECT: FW: [lgbt-politics] DEB PRICE: Time to plan gay integration of m ilitary

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, February 08, 2000 12:58 AM

To: lgbt-politics@egroups.com; queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu

Subject: [lgbt-politics] DEB PRICE: Time to plan gay integration of military

Detroit News, February 7, 2000
(<http://detnews.com/>)

DEB PRICE: Time to plan gay integration of military

The U.S. military ban on openly gay soldiers will be lifted. That's inevitable. Discrimination that violates the very ideals that our armed forces are supposed to defend simply won't be allowed to continue forever. Yet it would be naive to think that lifting the un-American ban won't cause any trouble.

How can we minimize the disruption?

With public support for gay military people steadily rising, that's the question all of us who believe in a strong national defense should be asking.

A Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll released Jan. 28 found overwhelming voter support -- 74 percent to 22 percent -- for gays in the military.

Most

civilians -- 56 percent versus 37 percent -- favor letting gay people serve openly, according to a new report by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, an academic think tank focused on the military.

"The trend in public opinion may be irreversible. So, the wise military

leader looks at this and says, OK, we can either do this on our terms, or the

terms can be dictated to us. Let's get out front and craft a policy that would be the least disruptive to military effectiveness," observes Duke University political scientist Peter Feaver, co-author of a 1,100-page Triangle Institute study of gaps between civilian and military attitudes on many issues.

The six-year-old "don't ask, don't tell" law really is the first step toward ending the ban because it established the right of gay Americans to serve -- though only in silence. And, in an overdue but critical milestone on

Feb. 1, Defense Secretary William Cohen ordered every service member "from general to private " to attend training sessions stressing that anti-gay slurs and harassment are forbidden, and that violators will be punished.

Neither Feaver nor his report takes a position on the ban. But he and his fellow researchers offered me valuable insights into how lifting it could be done as smoothly as possible:

Opposition to the ban would need to be even stronger, cross party lines in Congress and include some of the military's most ardent allies, they said.

That would help the military brass not feel the change was being shoved down its throat. A strict new code of behavior would need to apply to everyone, gay and straight alike, but not attempt to change anti-gay attitudes. Commanders would need to demonstrate zero tolerance for anti-gay violence and harassment.

The Feaver team also noted:

- * Team spirit: Service members would need to be taught that anti-gay behavior threatens unit cohesion -- and could put the victimizer and the entire unit and its mission at risk.

- * Do unto others: Some straight male soldiers who fear lifting the ban are afraid they would receive the kind of inappropriate advances many men make toward women. "When they think of being on the receiving end of that, they really get freaked out," says Feaver colleague Laura Miller, a military sociologist at the University of California at Los Angeles. As the fearful soldiers see men and women working together without sexual harassment, they may be less afraid of openly gay men.

- * Mission possible: The Joint Chiefs would need to be wooed. "It can't just be ordered. There has to be an effort to make them understand what is driving the policy," says Feaver co-author Richard Kohn, a military historian at University of North Carolina. "The military has to reflect the attitudes of the society it serves."

- * Quitters: Twenty-seven percent of rising officers told Feaver's team they would leave if gays serve openly. But on a list of nine possible reasons to leave, lifting the ban ranked only sixth. Higher choices included less "sense of fulfillment" (68 percent) and "too much time" away from my family (39 percent). It's unlikely most of the 27 percent would leave. "For

some, this is a way of voting," of just signaling opposition, Miller says.

Lifting the ban on openly gay soldiers is vital to American interests. And working to minimize the difficulty should be a shared national goal.

- * Deb Price's column is published on Monday. Write letters to The News at 615 W. Lafayette, Detroit, MI 48226, or fax to (313) 222-6417 or send e-mail to letters@detnews.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."

To Submit a Newsclipping or Press Release, send it to the moderator at:
lgbt-politics@eGroups.com

To Unsubscribe, send a blank message to:
lgbt-politics-unsubscribe@eGroups.com

Finding a sweetheart is hard work. Shopping for one shouldn't be.

Click here for Valentine Surprises!
http://click.egroups.com/1/1181/4/_/332436/_/949991743/

eGroups.com home: <http://www.egroups.com/group/lgbt-politics>
<http://www.egroups.com> - Simplifying group communications

- 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: [lgbt-politics] DEB PRICE: Time to plan gay integration of military

</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2000 12:58 AM

To: lgbt-politics@egroups.com; queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu</F
ONT>

Subject: [lgbt-politics] DEB PRICE: Time to plan gay integrati
on of

military

</P>

<P>Detroit News, February 7, 2000

(http://detnews.com/)
</P>

<P>DEB PRICE: Time to plan gay integration of military
>

 The U.S. military ban on openly gay soldier
s will be lifted. That's

inevitable. Discrimination that violates the very ideals
that our armed

forces are supposed to defend simply won't be allowed to conti
nue forever.

Yet it would be naive to think that lifting the un-American ba
n won't cause

any trouble.

 How can we minimize the disruption?

 With public support for gay military people
steadily rising, that's the

question all of us who believe in a strong national defense sh
ould be asking.

 A Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll released Jan. 28 fou
nd overwhelming

voter support -- 74 percent to 22 percent -- for gays in the m
ilitary. Most

civilians -- 56 percent versus 37 percent -- favor letting gay
people serve

openly, according to a new report by the Triangle Institute fo
r Security

Studies, an academic think tank focused on the military.
>

 "The trend in public opinion may be ir
reversible. So, the wise military

leader looks at this and says, OK, we can either do this on ou
r terms, or the

terms can be dictated to us. Let's get out front and cra
ft a policy that

would be the least disruptive to military effectiveness,"
observes Duke

University political scientist Peter Feaver, co-author of a 1,
100-page

Triangle Institute study of gaps between civilian and military
attitudes on

many issues.

 The six-year-old "don't ask, don't tel
l" law really is the first step

toward ending the ban because it established the right of gay
Americans to

serve -- though only in silence. And, in an overdue but
critical milestone on

Feb. 1, Defense Secretary William Cohen ordered every service
member "from

general to private " to attend training sessions stressin
g that anti-gay

slurs and harassment are forbidden, and that violators will be punished.

 Neither Feaver nor his report takes a position on the ban. But he and

his fellow researchers offered me valuable insights into how lifting it could

be done as smoothly as possible:

 Opposition to the ban would need to be even stronger, cross party lines

in Congress and include some of the military's most ardent allies, they said.

 That would help the military brass not feel the change was as being shoved down

its throat. A strict new code of behavior would need to apply to everyone,

gay and straight alike, but not attempt to change anti-gay attitudes.

Commanders would need to demonstrate zero tolerance for anti-gay violence and

harassment.

 The Feaver team also noted:

 * Team spirit: Service members would need to be taught that anti-gay

behavior threatens unit cohesion -- and could put the victimizer and the

entire unit and its mission at risk.

 * Do unto others: Some straight male soldiers who fear lifting the ban

are afraid they would receive the kind of inappropriate advances many men

make toward women. "When they think of being on the receiving end of that,

they really get freaked out," says Feaver colleague Laura Miller, a military

sociologist at the University of California at Los Angeles.&nb sp; As the fearful

soldiers see men and women working together without sexual harassment, they

may be less afraid of openly gay men.

 * Mission possible: The Joint Chiefs would need to be wooed. "It can't

just be ordered. There has to be an effort to make them understand what is

driving the policy," says Feaver co-author Richard Kohn, a military historian

at University of North Carolina. "The military has to reflect the attitudes

of the society it serves."

 * Quitters: Twenty-seven percent of resigning officers told Feaver's team

they would leave if gays serve openly. But on a list of nine possible

reasons to leave, lifting the ban ranked only sixth. Higher choices included

less "sense of fulfillment" (68 percent) and "too much time" away from my

family (39 percent). It's unlikely most of the 27 percent would leave. "For

some, this is a way of voting," of just signaling opposition, Miller says.

 Lifting the ban on openly gay soldiers is vital to American interests.

And working to minimize the difficulty should be a shared national goal.

 * Deb Price's column is published on Monday. Write letters to The News

at 615 W. Lafayette, Detroit, MI 48226, or fax to (313) 222-6417 or send

e-mail to letters@detnews.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."
</P>

<P>-----

To Submit a Newsclipping or Press Release, send it to the moderator at: lgbt-politics@eGroups.com
</P>

<P>To Unsubscribe, send a blank message to: lgbt-politics-unsubscribe@eGroups.com
</P>

<P>-----

Finding a sweetheart is hard work. Shopping for one shouldn't be.
</P>

<P>Click here for Valentine Surprises!

http://click.egroups.com/1/1181/4/_/332436/_/949991743/

</P>

<P>eGroups.com home: http://www.egroups.com/group/lgbt-politics

http://www.egroups.com - Simplifying group communications
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-2000 13:04:14.00

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

TO: Sondra L. Seba (CN=Sondra L. Seba/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP on
02/08/2000 01:04 PM -----

Elizabeth J. Potter
01/14/2000 03:24:19 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
Subject: Re: Don't Ask/Don't Tell

Here is the final.
Message Copied

To: _____
david b. peterman/nsc/eop@eop
elizabeth j. potter/who/eop@eop
johannes a. binnendijk/nsc/eop@eop
betsy pimentel/nsc/eop@eop
mary b. derosa/nsc/eop@eop
laura s. marcus/who/eop@eop
matt gobush/nsc/eop@eop
beth nolan/who/eop@eop
william marshall/who/eop@eop
karen tramontano/who/eop@eop

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D41]ARMS23972064S.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

PRESS GUIDANCE
1/14/2000
"Don't Ask, Don't Tell"

Jointly prepared by White House Counsel, NSC and OPL

Section A: Britain and NATO

1.) What do you think of the fact that the UK is going to allow gays and lesbians to serve openly in their armed forces?

- That is the position the President advocated for the U.S. military in 1993. It's consistent with the policy that the President pressed for in 1992-93. A future Congress should consider where Europe is headed.

2.) What do you think of Britain's Department of Defense's new code of social conduct affecting gays in the military?

- As I understand it, the code sets standards for proper social interaction between the diverse mix of individuals serving in the military. These standards, much like we have in our own military, will help commanders maintain good order and discipline within their units.

3.) What do you think of the European Court of Human Rights ruling (which led to Britain's change in policy) that the ban on gays serving openly in the military violated the fundamental human right to privacy?

- The European Court's opinion is setting out a standard of equality and human rights that is something we should study and learn from. It's consistent with the policy that the President pressed for in 1992-93. A future Congress should consider where Europe is headed.

4.) Is there a possibility that the US Supreme Court will overturn the DADT law as a ban on human rights similar to the European Court?

- I'm not sure what the Supreme Court would do, but I don't think this is primarily a legal matter. Here in the United States, it's a question of what makes sense for military readiness and what is fair to gays and lesbians who have served honorably in the military services for a long time.

5.) Most NATO countries now allow homosexuals to serve openly in their militaries. Will the effectiveness of joint NATO maneuvers be threatened because of DOD's fear of diminished military unit cohesion with NATO forces who allow gays in the military?

- I am confident that different policies on this issue will not hinder joint NATO maneuvers or any other NATO action.

SECTION B: ON THE BARRY WINCHELL TRIAL AND DOD'S RESPONSE

Background: The trial of Army Specialist Justin R. Fisher concluded this weekend at Fort Campbell. This is the second court martial stemming from the death of Private First Class Barry Winchell, who was allegedly killed because of his homosexuality. Private Calvin Glover was convicted of murder in a previous court martial. Specialist Fisher was the roommate of Private Winchell and was convicted of obstructing justice, making false statements, and providing alcohol to a minor.

1.) What do you think of DOD's response to the trial at Ft. Campbell.?

- I'm not going to comment about the verdict or sentence in any particular case. This case is in the military justice system, and the legal process is ongoing.
- As a general matter, both the President and the Secretary of Defense have said in the clearest terms that harassment of people based on sexual orientation -- or race and gender for that matter -- is strictly prohibited.
- The Department of Defense is taking a number of actions to review implementation of this policy. The Inspector General of the Department of Defense is conducting an investigation of compliance with our Don't Ask/Don't Tell/Don't Harass policy, and the Army IG is conducting a separate one at Fort Campbell. We are determined to prevent service members from being harassed."

2.) This case raises questions about the safety of servicemen and women on U.S. bases. At Ft. Campbell, for example, underage drinking allegedly contributed to the violence that claimed Private Winchell's life. Are you concerned? If so, what are you willing to do to improve safety?

- Of course, the safety and security of our servicemen and women on our military installations is a paramount concern.

- The Army has committed to review compliance with policies and procedures that protect the health, safety, and security of its soldiers at Ft. Campbell.
- Specifically, the commanding general at Fort Campbell has asked the Army Inspector General to review whether there were violations of the Department of Defense Homosexual Conduct Policy in the events at Fort Campbell.
- Beyond reviewing the Homosexual Conduct Policy, Fort Campbell will also undertake a review of compliance with applicable policies, procedures and regulations.
- I strongly support any measures that improve the safety of our soldiers.

3.) Doesn't this verdict further demonstrate that your "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding gays in the military does not work?

- As I have said before, our policy has not had a chance to work because it has not been fully implemented. I am committed to improving implementation of the existing policy rather than changing the statute passed by Congress in 1993.
- Secretary Cohen has already taken a number of steps to improve policy implementation, to include a DOD Inspector General review of the environment at military bases as it relates to the homosexual policy and specific tasking to the services on updated training programs. I refer you to DOD for details.

Section C: Presidential Primary

Background: The Human Rights Campaign, a national Gay and Lesbian equal rights group, is going to air an ad campaign starting this Sunday as a response to the Republican ads against the VP's earlier statements.

1.) What do you think of Vice President Gore's statement on the role of the Joint Chiefs?

- He's made clear that he would want the candid advice of Members of the Joint Chiefs, but that he would expect them to support the policy that the Commander in Chief decided. That is the traditional and appropriate relationship between the President and the Joint Chiefs and certainly the one that this President has followed.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Mendoza, Severino Mr USACFSC" <mendozas@hoffman-cfsc.army.mil> ("Mendoza, Severino Mr USACFSC" <mendozas@hoffman-cfsc.army.mil> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-FEB-2000 08:43:08.00

SUBJECT: FW: MilitaryReport.com February 10, 2000 Issue

TO: "'Susan C. Kellerman'" <Skellerman@worldbank.org> ("'Susan C. Kellerman'" <Skellerman@worldbank.org> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: 'mhealy2' <mhealy2@csc.com> ('mhealy2' <mhealy2@csc.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James M. Reagan (CN=James M. Reagan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "'Eric.Mendoza'" <Eric.Mendoza@GSA.GOV> ("'Eric.Mendoza'" <Eric.Mendoza@GSA.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "'Ramona C. LaGundo'" <lmw@brainerd.net> ("'Ramona C. LaGundo'" <lmw@brainerd.net> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "'Mendoza, Jane E.'" <JMendoza@FDIC.gov> ("'Mendoza, Jane E.'" <JMendoza@FDIC.gov> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: 'Frances FM Mendoza' <MENDOZAF@NDU.EDU> ('Frances FM Mendoza' <MENDOZAF@NDU.EDU> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Glasgow, Melitta Ms USACFSC

> Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2000 4:29 PM

> To: CFSC-All Members; CFSC-HSO General Managers

> Cc: Curran, Sandy Mrs USACFSC; 'Gary, Peter Q., , CPMS'

> Subject: FW: MilitaryReport.com February 10, 2000 Issue

>

> FYI

>

> Melitta Glasgow

>

>

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: MilitaryReport [SMTP:military@emailpubs.com]

> <mailto:[SMTP:military@emailpubs.com]>

> Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2000 1:57 PM

> To: military@emailpubs.com

> Subject: MilitaryReport.com February 10, 2000 Issue

>

> MilitaryReport.com

> The Military Community's

> Only FREE Weekly Email Newsletter

>

> Thursday February 10, 2000

>

> 2001 BUDGET GOES TO CAPITOL HILL

> On February 7, 2000 the president sent his proposed fiscal

> 2001 budget to Congress. The budget calls for a 3.7%

> military pay hike, paralleling the raise proposed for

> federal civilians. The budget also proposes eliminating

> out-of-pocket expenses for off-post housing over time, and

> fixing the military health system. Overall, the defense

> budget request was \$291.1 billion, a \$13.5 billion

> increase over the actual fiscal 2000 defense authorization.

> The budget asks for \$85.3 billion for the Air Force,

> \$70.6 billion for the Army, \$91.7 billion for the Navy and

> Marine Corps and \$43.5 billion for defensewide spending.

> The focus of this year's budget will be housing and

> medical care for service members. BAH currently covers

> about 81% of off base housing costs. The goal is to

> eliminate out of pocket expenses by 2005. DOD also wants

> to address medical access issues for both service members

> and retirees through a number of changes to the healthcare

> system.

>

> PROJECTED DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FOR 2001

> DoD has proposed \$60.3 billion for procurement for fiscal

> 2001, with the Air Force's share \$21 billion, the Army's

> \$10.4 billion, the Navy's and Marine's \$26.6 billion and

> with \$2.3 billion for defensewide procurement. The

> procurement amount is designed to meet the services' needs

> for modernization of major weapon systems and for

> preserving technological superiority in the future. The

> budget also calls for two more rounds of base closures and

> realignments in fiscal 2003 and 2005, projected to save

> \$3 billion annually once implemented. The requested

> military construction budget is \$8 billion to fund over

> 300 major construction projects at more than 225 locations

> worldwide.

>

> 2001 RESERVE COMPONENTS BUDGET

> Also contained in the FY 2001 budget is a request for

> \$23.9 billion for reserve component personnel, O&M,

> procurement, and military construction accounts. This is

> part of the continued modernization of the reserves to

> give them greater capabilities across a broad range of

> operations, and to continue the integration of active-duty

> and reserve components. The budget also contains plans for

> reserve component support to civil authorities for

> domestic needs involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

> The budget also funds other reserve programs including the

- > Department's Civil Military Programs, the National Guard
- > ChalleNGe program, the DoD STARBASE Program, and the
- > Innovative Readiness Training Program.

>

> POST BASE-CLOSURE HELP

- > With two new rounds of base closures called for in the
- > budget proposal that just went to Congress, more service
- > members and civilian employees may find themselves looking
- > for help under the Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP).
- > HAP is a DoD program administered by the Army Corps of
- > Engineers' Relocation Services Branch that helps
- > homeowners after base closures by letting the government
- > buy homes from military and civilian DoD employees who
- > work at bases that are closing. In many cases homeowners
- > must sell their houses at a loss, if they can even find a
- > buyer. For those who cannot find a buyer, under HAP the
- > government will step in and buy homes at 75 percent of
- > their value or pay off the mortgage, whichever is greater.
- > Homeowners who sell at a loss can have part of their loss
- > reimbursed by the government. The program is currently
- > used at 18 Defense bases with more likely to be added.
- > Qualification for HAP is not automatic for the area around
- > a base scheduled to be closed. The area must meet certain
- > criteria to be so designated. The HAP website is
- > <http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/cespk-re/hap/hapmain.html>.

>

> CITIZENSHIP FROM MILITARY SERVICE

- > Members of the service seeking U.S. citizenship based upon
- > completion of three years of honorable active duty
- > military service may have an easier time of it. INS,
- > working with DoD and the Services, has simplified the
- > application process for citizenship based upon military
- > service. The goal is to make the process take only three
- > to four months as compared to old timeframe of 18-24
- > months. The new process will require greater involvement
- > of the services to meet the new timeframe. Already, the
- > Navy has issued a memorandum outlining steps to implement
- > this new program. Service members interested in this
- > program should check with their individual branch for more
- > information.

>

> DOD MEETS MOST PERFORMANCE GOALS

- > DoD recently released its first annual performance report,
- > required under the Government Performance and Results Act.
- > DoD claimed a 70% success rate, meeting 29 of the 41 goals
- > in the report. The report was presented to Congress as
- > part of Defense Secretary Cohen's annual report to
- > Congress. The 41 goals fell into two categories. The
- > first, "Shape the international security environment and
- > respond to crises" had 19 goals, 12 of which were met. The
- > second category, Prepare for the future by modernizing the
- > military and the department's infrastructure" had 22
- > categories, 17 of which were met. The complete performance
- > report is Appendix I to Cohen's report to Congress,

> available at <http://www.dtic.mil/execsec/adr2000/>.

>

> CIVILIAN FRAMES FOR ARMY GLASSES

> The Army is phasing in servicewide a program, called Frame
> of Choice, now in operation in Europe, allowing soldiers
> to choose a civilian-style frame for one of their two
> pairs of military-issue glasses. Eligible participants are
> active-duty personnel, reserve components on active duty
> (other than training) and National Guard members on a
> "call" longer than 30 days (not including training). The
> program does not include military retirees. The available
> frames are unisex and come in various wire-rim styles and
> colors. Soldiers will be entitled to one pair of FOC
> glasses per year.

>

> AIR FORCE ISSUES IDT PROCEDURES

> The 2000 National Defense Authorization Act authorized
> federal civil service employees, who were also reservists
> to use military leave to perform inactive duty for
> training (IDT). The change was effective on October 5, 1999
> when the law was signed by the president, but Air Force
> reservists could not take initial advantage of the change
> because procedures were not established. Late in January,
> the Air Force Reserve Command finalized procedures,
> allowing reservists to request adjustments to their leave
> account retroactive to October 5, 1999. Each fiscal year,
> federal employees accrue 15 days of military leave for
> active duty, active duty for training or inactive duty for
> training. The rules for taking military leave for IDTs are
> the same as for active duty for training.

>

> "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL" TRAINING

> The modified DoD policy with regard to homosexuals in the
> services, the so-called "don't ask, don't tell, don't
> harass" policy, will be spelled out by means of initial
> and yearly refresher training at all levels of the
> military and will be standard through the services. The
> training will be conducted at recruit training and officer
> entry training and will expand to all levels of NCO and
> officer professional military education. Service members
> selected as commanders will receive specialized training,
> as will judge advocate general personnel. The goal is to
> have uniform training across the services emphasizing that
> the policy is part of a nondiscrimination policy in the
> military. The Army's Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff
> for Personnel has directed that all soldiers will receive
> the training by April 10.

>

> LEGALLY SPEAKING

> (General legal discussions for the military community-
> by the Law Firm of Shaw, Bransford, Veilleux & Roth)
> The February 1999 collision of the destroyer Arthur W.
> Radford with a Saudi cargo ship off the Virginia Capes
> provides an important lesson on the personal exposure to

> commanders and supervisors who must rely upon
> inexperienced and under trained personnel to perform their
> mission. The captain of the Arthur W. Radford, who had
> only been with the ship for about 100 days, was promptly
> relieved of his command after the collision and has
> received a punitive letter of reprimand for unwillful
> dereliction of duty. Three other officers on the ship have
> also been disciplined for their actions relating to the
> collision. Additionally, the captain has had to testify
> recently in the civil court case between the United States
> Government and the Saudi shipping company over who was at
> fault for the collision. During his testimony, the captain
> had to admit that basic watchstanding skills of his
> inexperienced officers and crew were not up to par, that
> the ship's overall organization was poor and that the crew
> was lacking in the reporting of material and significant
> events. He also had to testify that his commanders were
> well aware of the ship's readiness problems. However, the
> United States contends in court that the Saudi ship was
> responsible for the accident because the Arthur W. Radford
> had the right of way. Despite this argument and the fact
> that the captain had not received a reasonable opportunity
> to correct the deficiencies of his crew before being
> deployed, the Navy has opted to punish him for the
> incident.

>
> This MilitaryReport.com is sponsored by Wright & Co.

> -----
> Complaints against military managers are increasing at an
> alarming rate. Allegations of harassment, discrimination or
> misconduct on the job can destroy your career and bankrupt
> you. Defending yourself could cost \$50,000 or more. Damages
> could potentially greatly exceed that amount. The military
> will not cover these personal expenses but Wright & Co.'s
> Professional Liability Insurance for Military Managers can.
> Don't risk losing everything you've worked for throughout
> your whole military career. Click on the link below for
> more information or call 1(800) 424-9801 today.

>
> <http://www.wrightandco.com/cseba/csebapage34.htm>.

>
> -----

>
> MilitaryReport.com
> Publisher: Thomas F. Youngblood
> Associate Publisher: John D. Whitney
> Subscriptions Director: Susan A. Pabst
> A Publication of MR Group, LLC
> A Veteran-Owned Small Business

>
> Editorial questions: editor@militaryreport.com
> Subscriptions questions: subscriptions@militaryreport.com
> Website: <http://www.militaryreport.com>

>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-FEB-2000 09:03:07.00

SUBJECT: LATEST Harris polling data on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" -- helpful to us, friends

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

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

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

TO: "yandylove@aol.com" <yandylove@aol.com> ("yandylove@aol.com" <yandylove@aol.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "dhattaway@gorennet.com" <dhattaway@gorennet.com> ("dhattaway@gorennet.com" <dhattaway@gorennet.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
The Harris Poll Election 2000

A Call To Attention on Gays in the Military:

Is it Time to Revise 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell?'

-- 46% of the Public Oppose 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Policy --

-- 48% of Public Favor Allowing Gays to Serve Openly in Military --

ROCHESTER, N.Y., Feb. 15 /PRNewswire/ -- Where do we go from "Don't Ask, Don't Tell?" That's what the civilian and military leadership of the country needs to figure out based on the public's opinion of the current policy toward homosexuals in the military. Overall, 46% of the public opposes the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, 34% favor the policy and 20% are still undecided.

When asked to choose among three possible policies towards gays in the military, 48% of the public favor allowing gays to serve openly in the military. In addition, 18% support allowing gays to serve if they keep their homosexuality a secret, the same number (18%) favor prohibiting gays from

serving in the military at all, and 16% are undecided. Thus, while a plurality favors open service by gays in the military, there is not a clear majority public opinion on this issue yet.

These are among the important results of a Harris Interactive Election 2000 national survey of 5,460 respondents conducted from January 19th to January 26th. The survey was conducted using the Internet and Harris Interactive's Internet panel of over 5 million cooperative respondents.

Further review of the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy and support for future policy options shows a diverse field of opinions. (See Table 3) Among those who oppose the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, the vast majority (78%) favor a more lenient policy that would allow gays to serve openly. At the same time, 5% who oppose the current policy would support a similar policy that allows gays to serve if they keep their sexual orientation a secret. However, there are some who oppose the current policy (12%) but favor a more stringent policy that would bar all gays from the military. Even more surprising, of those who favor the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, 35% actually support a more stringent policy of prohibiting all gays from serving in the military. They may be willing to support "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" because they recognize that a more restrictive policy may be unobtainable. In addition, 39% of those who favor the current policy would support a policy similar to "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and 16% would support a policy that allows gays to serve openly.

Taking political party into consideration, there are also some surprises. Contrary to what one might expect, almost one-third (32%) of Republicans favor allowing gays to serve openly in the military. However, 31% favor banning gays from serving in the military at all while 21% support a plan similar to the current policy.

Democrats are slightly more cohesive in their support for open military service for gays with 61% supporting it, 19% supporting a policy that allows gays to serve if they keep their homosexuality a secret, and 7% supporting the banning of gays from all military service. Independents, tend to fall in between the two parties, with 48% supporting open service, 13% backing service if their homosexuality is kept secret, and 19% in favor of banning gays from all military service.

Gender and race/ethnicity also influence positions on this issue. Women are much more supportive of gays and lesbians openly serving in the military than men, with 56% of women and 38% of men supporting open service for gays. In addition, men are almost three times as likely as women (28% vs. 10%) to

say gays should not be allowed to serve in the military at all.

Race/ethnicity also has an interesting effect on support for gays in the military. While Hispanics wholeheartedly support gays serving openly in the military, Blacks are more divided in their views. While 64% of Hispanics and 42% of Blacks support gays serving openly in the military, slightly more than one-third (36%) of Blacks indicate that they are not sure which policy for gays in the military they support. Given the history of the civil rights movement within the black community, it will be interesting to see on which side of the fence Blacks fall on this policy issue.

Among Whites, almost half (48%) of respondents support open service for gays in the military. In addition, 20% favor gays being prohibited from serving in the military at all, and 18% favor allowing gays to serve if they conceal their sexual orientation. (See Table 2)

So, what does this mean for the military, the presidential contenders, and the parties?

First, it means the presidential candidates and the parties must build party platforms that consider the varied opinions of their members. Second, it means that any future policy must recognize the fact that society has changed over the past decade in its attitude towards gays and as a result the country is more supportive of gays serving in the military. Third, the military must also weigh the impact of its policy on its members and future recruits. Thus, developing a new policy on gays in the military will be a difficult balancing act for everyone involved.

TABLE 1

FAVOR OR OPPOSE "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"

Base: All Respondents

The current policy on gays in the military is called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." This means the military can no longer ask personnel whether or not they are homosexual. If any personnel say they are homosexual or it has been found that they engage in homosexual activity, they will be discharged from the military. Do you favor or oppose this policy?

All	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic		
Favor		34	42	28	36	20	28

Oppose 46 43 49 47 43 49

Not Sure 20 15 24 17 37 23

All Republican DemocratIndependent

Favor 34 45 30 28

Oppose 46 39 52 46

Not Sure 20 17 18 26

Table 2

Potential Policies Toward Homosexuals In The Military

Base: All Respondents

Which of the following statements best describes your Views on this issue?

All Male Female White Black
Hispanic

Gays and lesbians

should be allowed

to service openly in

the military

48 38 56 48 42 64

Gays and lesbians

should be allowed

to serve in the

military

only if they keep

their homosexuality

a secret	18	21	16	18	15	18
----------	----	----	----	----	----	----

Gays and lesbians

should not

be allowed to

serve in the

military at all	18	28	10	20	8	6
-----------------	----	----	----	----	---	---

Not Sure	16	13	18	14	36	12
----------	----	----	----	----	----	----

All						
Republicans	Democrats	Independents				

Gays and lesbians

should be allowed

to service openly

in the military	48	32	61	48
-----------------	----	----	----	----

Gays and lesbians

should be allowed

to serve in the

military only if

they keep their

homosexuality a secret 18 21 19 13

Gays and lesbians

should not be

allowed to serve

in the military

at all 18 31 7 19

Not Sure 16 16 12 20

Table 3

Support For "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Compared To

Potential Policies Toward Homosexuals In The Military

Base: All Respondents

All Favor Oppose Not Sure

Gays and lesbians

should be allowed

to service openly

in the military 48 16 78 34

Gays and lesbians

should be allowed

to serve in the

military only if

they keep their

homosexuality a

secret 18 39 5 14

Gays and lesbians

should not be

allowed to serve

in the military

at all 18 35 12 4

Not Sure 16 11 5 48

Methodology

This Harris Interactive Election 2000 study was conducted between January 19th and January 26th with a national sample of 10,928 respondents from the Harris Interactive Inc. panel of Internet users. Data for this release is based on a random sub-sample of 5,460 respondents. Data were weighted by age, sex, education, income, race/ethnicity, and region as well as propensity to

be
online, a composite of several factors, in order to generalize the results
to
the national population.

In theory, with a sample of this size and after weighting the data, one
can say with 95 percent certainty that the results have a statistical
precision of plus or minus 3 percentage points of what they would be if the
entire adult population of the United States had been polled with complete
accuracy. Unfortunately, there are several other possible sources of error
in
all polls or surveys that are probably more serious than theoretical
calculations of sampling error. They include question wording and question
order, non-response, and screening (e.g., for likely voters). It is
difficult
or impossible to quantify the errors that may result from these factors.

These statements conform to the principles of disclosure of the National
Council on Public Polls.

About Harris Interactive

Harris Interactive (Nasdaq: HPOL) is a leading market research and polling
firm, using Internet-based and traditional methodologies to provide its
clients with information about the views, experiences and attitudes of
people
worldwide. Known for its Harris Poll, Harris Interactive has over 40 years
experience in providing its clients with market research and polling
services,
including custom research, multi-client research, service bureau research
and
customer relationship services. Harris Interactive conducts its Internet
research using its Internet database of more than 5.3 million online
panelists
and its proprietary technology. For more information about Harris
Interactive,
please visit the corporate Web site at <http://www.harrisinteractive.com>.

Safe Harbor Statement

This media release includes statements that may constitute forward-looking
information. Harris Interactive cautions you that these forward-looking
statements are subject to risks and uncertainties that could cause actual
results to differ materially from those discussed. Additional detailed
information concerning a number of factors that could cause actual results
to
differ is readily available in the "Risk Factors" section of our
Prospectus,
dated December 6, 1999 and filed with the Securities and Exchange
Commission
pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933.

SOURCE Harris Interactive

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-FEB-2000 20:04:48.00

SUBJECT: foreign tocs

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

POTUS Q&A FOR PRESS CONFERENCE (FOREIGN)

February 16, 2000

GENERAL

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

LEBANON

IRAN

IRAQ

KOSOVO

INDONESIA

COLOMBIA

AUSTRIA

NORTHERN IRELAND

CUBA BOY

RUSSIA/CHECHNYA

INDIA-PAKISTAN

DON'T ASK/DON'T TELL

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-FEB-2000 10:16:11.00

SUBJECT: On-line DADT poll: still no plurality

TO: David B. Peterman (CN=David B. Peterman/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: lisa m. brown (CN=lisa m. brown/O=ovp@ovp [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: roseanne m. hill (CN=roseanne m. hill/OU=nsc/O=eop@eop [NSC])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Harris Poll Election 2000

A Call To Attention on Gays in the Military:

Is it Time to Revise 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'?

-- 46% of the Public Oppose 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' Policy --

-- 48% of Public Favor Allowing Gays to Serve Openly in Military --

ROCHESTER, N.Y., Feb. 15 /PRNewswire/ -- Where do we go from "Don't Ask, Don't Tell?" That's what the civilian and military leadership of the country needs to figure out based on the public's opinion of the current policy toward homosexuals in the military. Overall, 46% of the public opposes the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, 34% favor the policy and 20% are still

undecided.

When asked to choose among three possible policies towards gays in the military, 48% of the public favor allowing gays to serve openly in the military. In addition, 18% support allowing gays to serve if they keep their homosexuality a secret, the same number (18%) favor prohibiting gays from serving in the military at all, and 16% are undecided. Thus, while a plurality favors open service by gays in the military, there is not a clear majority public opinion on this issue yet.

These are among the important results of a Harris Interactive Election 2000 national survey of 5,460 respondents conducted from January 19th to January 26th. The survey was conducted using the Internet and Harris Interactive's Internet panel of over 5 million cooperative respondents.

Further review of the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy and support for future policy options shows a diverse field of opinions. (See Table 3) Among those who oppose the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, the vast majority (78%) favor a more lenient policy that would allow gays to serve openly. At the same time, 5% who oppose the current policy would support a similar policy that allows gays to serve if they keep their sexual orientation a secret. However, there are some who oppose the current policy (12%) but favor a more stringent policy that would bar all gays from the military.

Even more surprising, of those who favor the current "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, 35% actually support a more stringent policy of prohibiting all gays from serving in the military. They may be willing to support "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" because they recognize that a more restrictive policy may be unobtainable. In addition, 39% of those who favor the current policy would support a policy similar to "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and 16% would support a policy that allows gays to serve openly.

Taking political party into consideration, there are also some surprises. Contrary to what one might expect, almost one-third (32%) of Republicans favor allowing gays to serve openly in the military. However, 31% favor banning gays from serving in the military at all while 21% support a plan similar to the current policy.

Democrats are slightly more cohesive in their support for open military service for gays with 61% supporting it, 19% supporting a policy that allows gays to serve if they keep their homosexuality a secret, and 7% supporting the banning of gays from all military service. Independents, tend to fall in between the two parties, with 48% supporting open service, 13% backing service if their homosexuality is kept secret, and 19% in favor of banning gays from all military service.

Gender and race/ethnicity also influence positions on this issue. Women are much more supportive of gays and lesbians openly serving in the military than men, with 56% of women and 38% of men supporting open service for gays. In addition, men are almost three times as likely as women (28% vs. 10%) to say gays should not be allowed to serve in the military at all.

Race/ethnicity also has an interesting effect on support for gays in the military. While Hispanics wholeheartedly support gays serving openly in the military, Blacks are more divided in their views. While 64% of Hispanics and 42% of Blacks support gays serving openly in the military, slightly more than one-third (36%) of Blacks indicate that they are not sure which policy for gays in the military they support. Given the history of the civil rights movement within the black community, it will be interesting to see on which side of the fence Blacks fall on this policy issue.

Among Whites, almost half (48%) of respondents support open service for gays in the military. In addition, 20% favor gays being prohibited from serving in the military at all, and 18% favor allowing gays to serve if they conceal their sexual orientation. (See Table 2)

So, what does this mean for the military, the presidential contenders, and the parties?

First, it means the presidential candidates and the parties must build party platforms that consider the varied opinions of their members. Second, it means that any future policy must recognize the fact that society has changed over the past decade in its attitude towards gays and as a result the country is more supportive of gays serving in the military. Third, the military must also weigh the impact of its policy on its members and future recruits. Thus, developing a new policy on gays in the military will be a difficult balancing act for everyone involved.

TABLE 1

FAVOR OR OPPOSE "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"

Base: All Respondents

The current policy on gays in the military is called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell." This means the military can no longer ask personnel whether or not they are homosexual. If any personnel say they are homosexual or it has been found that they engage in homosexual activity, they will be discharged from the military. Do you favor or oppose this policy?

All	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic
-----	------	--------	-------	-------	----------

Favor

34	42	28	36	20	28
----	----	----	----	----	----

Oppose

46	43	49	47	43	49
----	----	----	----	----	----

Not Sure

20	15	24	17	37	23
----	----	----	----	----	----

All	Republican	Democrat	Independent
-----	------------	----------	-------------

Favor

34	45	30	28
----	----	----	----

Oppose

46	39	52	46
----	----	----	----

Not Sure

20	17	18	26
----	----	----	----

Table 2

Potential Policies Toward Homosexuals In The Military

Base: All Respondents

Which of the following statements best describes your Views on this issue?

All	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic
-----	------	--------	-------	-------	----------

Gays and lesbians should be allowed to service openly in the military

48	38	56	48	42	64
----	----	----	----	----	----

Gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve in the military only if they keep their homosexuality a secret

18	21	16	18	15	18
----	----	----	----	----	----

Gays and lesbians should not be allowed to serve in the military at all

18	28	10	20	8	6
----	----	----	----	---	---

Not Sure

16	13	18	14	36	12
----	----	----	----	----	----

All Republicans Democrats Independents

Gays and lesbians should be allowed to service openly in the military

48	32	61	48
----	----	----	----

Gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve in the military only if they keep their homosexuality a secret

18	21	19	13
----	----	----	----

Gays and lesbians should not be allowed to serve in the military at all

18	31	7	19
----	----	---	----

Not Sure

16	16	12	20
----	----	----	----

Table 3

Support For "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Compared To

Potential Policies Toward Homosexuals In The Military

Base: All Respondents

All Favor Oppose Not Sure

Gays and lesbians should be allowed to service openly in the military

48 16 78 34

Gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve in the military only if they
keep their
homosexuality a secret

18 39 5 14

Gays and lesbians should not be allowed to serve in the military at all

18 35 12 4

Not Sure

16 11 5 48

Methodology

This Harris Interactive Election 2000 study was conducted between January 19th and January 26th with a national sample of 10,928 respondents from the Harris Interactive Inc. panel of Internet users. Data for this release is based on a random sub-sample of 5,460 respondents. Data were weighted by age, sex, education, income, race/ethnicity, and region as well as propensity to be online, a composite of several factors, in order to generalize the results to the national population.

In theory, with a sample of this size and after weighting the data, one can say with 95 percent certainty that the results have a statistical precision of plus or minus 3 percentage points of what they would be if the entire adult population of the United States had been polled with complete accuracy. Unfortunately, there are several other possible sources of error in all polls or surveys that are probably more serious than theoretical calculations of sampling error. They include question wording and question order, non-response, and screening (e.g., for likely voters). It is difficult or impossible to quantify the errors that may result from these factors.

These statements conform to the principles of disclosure of the National Council on Public Polls.

About Harris Interactive

Harris Interactive (Nasdaq: HPOL) is a leading market research and polling firm, using Internet-based and traditional methodologies to provide its clients with information about the views, experiences and attitudes of people worldwide. Known for its Harris Poll, Harris Interactive has over 40 years experience in providing its clients with market research and polling services, including custom research, multi-client research, service bureau research and customer relationship services. Harris Interactive conducts its Internet research using its Internet database of more than 5.3 million online panelists and its proprietary technology. For more information about Harris Interactive, please visit the corporate Web site at <http://www.harrisinteractive.com>.

Safe Harbor Statement

This media release includes statements that may constitute forward-looking information. Harris Interactive cautions you that these forward-looking statements are subject to risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from those discussed. Additional detailed information concerning a number of factors that could cause actual results to differ is readily available in the "Risk Factors" section of our Prospectus, dated December 6, 1999 and filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933.

SOURCE Harris Interactive

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-FEB-2000 09:56:22.00

SUBJECT: more info on pre-brief agenda

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Echaveste (CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (CN=John Podesta/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Mona K. Sutphen (CN=Mona K. Sutphen/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Lindsay R. Drewel (CN=Lindsay R. Drewel/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sharon V. Storey (CN=Sharon V. Storey/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Cathy R. Mays (CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sheila K. Moretz (CN=Sheila K. Moretz/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Pre-Brief Agenda

POTUS Press Conference

February 16, 2000

Foreign Policy) 10:05) 10:30 am

Northern Ireland

Kosovo

Middle East (peace process, Lebanon)

NMDI

Austria

Cuba Boy

Don't Ask, Don't Tell

India/Pakistan

Russia

Colombia

Economic/Trade) 10:40) 11:10 am

China WTO/NTR (with Foreign Policy Team)

Trade

Oil

Internet

Security, Taxes, Privacy

Social Security

Tax Cuts, Marriage Penalty

H1-B

Bankruptcy

Domestic Policy) 11:20) 11:40 am

Medicare (with Economic Team)

PBOR

Gun Crimes

Gene Therapy

Counsel) 11:50) 12:10 pm

Federal Death Penalty (with Domestic Policy Team)

Leahy Proposal

Judges

FEC

Miscellaneous) E-Mail, Arkansas

Politics and Wrap-Up 12:20) 12:50 pm

Top Ten

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-FEB-2000 08:58:03.00

SUBJECT: Gore GLBT Record on website today

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

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

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

TEXT:
VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE
WORKING TO END DISCRIMINATION
AGAINST GAYS AND LESBIANS

"It is time for all Americans to recognize that the issues that face gays and lesbians in this country are not narrow, special interests, they are matters of basic human and civil rights."

- Vice President Al Gore, the first vice president to speak at a gay rights event.

FIGHTING HATE CRIMES

Fighting to Pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act. Vice President Al

Gore has been a tireless advocate for passage of this legislation, calling on "Congress to come together in one voice on this issue. I urge them to stand together against intolerance, against prejudice, and against violent and senseless bigotry and pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act."

The HCPA would expand the definition of hate crimes to include those based on sexual orientation, gender or disability and allow for the prosecution of those crimes under federal law.

Working for New Initiatives to Fight Hate Crimes. The

Vice President

spoke at the first White House Conference on Hate

Crimes

in 1997,

supporting the Administration's initiatives to get

tough

on hate crimes.

These initiatives included approximately 50 added FBI

agents and federal

prosecutors to enforce hate crimes laws, improved data

collection on

hate crimes, and new outreach programs to educate the

public -

especially youth - about hate crimes.

Stepping Up the Fight Against Hate Crimes. Vice

President Gore

worked to encourage enactment of the Administration's

1994 Crime Bill,

which included provisions to combat hate crimes. The

Act

incorporated

the Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act, which

increased

sentences for hate crimes by about one-third.

Fighting Harassment In Schools Based on Sexual

Orientation. At

the White House Conference on School Violence held in

1998, the

Clinton-Gore Administration called for ending

discrimination against

students based on their sexual orientation and ordered

the Department

of Education to enhance their enforcement of

anti-discrimination and

harassment rules. In response, the Department of

Education published a

landmark guide, entitled Protecting Students from

Harassment and Hate

Crimes, to help educators in developing strategies to

protect all

students, including gays and lesbians, from harassment

and violence.

FIGHTING FOR FAIRNESS IN THE WORKPLACE

In Favor of Eliminating the Ban on Gays in the

Military.

In the early

days of the Clinton-Gore Administration, Vice President

Al Gore was a

forceful voice in support of lifting the ban on gays in

the military.

Elizabeth Drew wrote that, "At a meeting on Wednesday night, July 14, in the President's study in the residence, the issue was argued bitterly.

Gore insisted that the President shouldn't compromise, that it was a matter of principle. The President should just lift the ban, Gore argued, even though he was sure to be overridden by the Congress." Gore has stated that the "Don't Ask Don't Tell" policy has not worked, and as president, he would eliminate it.

Ending Discrimination on Sexual Orientation in the Federal Government. In 1998, the Administration signed an Executive Order to update equal employment rules within the federal government, by prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation. The order provides a uniform policy for the Federal government to prohibit employment discrimination based on sexual orientation in the federal civilian workforce. As a result of this executive order the U.S. government is now the largest employer-with more than 1.8 million employees-to have a non-discrimination policy based on sexual orientation in the workplace.

Working to Establish Fairness in the Workplace. Vice President Gore, along with the Administration, has called upon Congress to pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to extend employment protection to gays and lesbians throughout the American workforce. Gore understands that in 39 states today, it is entirely legal to fire an individual simply because they are lesbian or gay. Although the bill eventually died in Congress in 1997, it was reintroduced in 1999 and Vice President Gore has been a vocal supporter for the final passage of the legislation.

Administration Appointments Show Leadership in Diversity

and
example of
well-qualified
Executive branch.
praised the
implementation of
criteria based on
employment or
employees in the federal government.

Inclusivity. The Administration has become a leading example of inclusiveness and diversity by appointing more than 150 openly gay men and lesbians to the Judicial and Executive branch. Elizabeth Birch, of the Human Rights Campaign, has praised the Administration for their efforts, including the implementation of non-discrimination policies, and the elimination of criteria based on sexual orientation in determining security risks for employment or employees in the federal government.

June 29,
Luxembourg.
in
our nation's
conservative
nomination for months in
"recess appointment"
sending a clear
representing America's
interests overseas.

Historic Appointment of James Hormel as Ambassador. On June 29, 1999 James Hormel was sworn in as U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. Hormel, the first openly gay United States Ambassador in our nation's history, was first nominated in October 1997. Several conservative Republican Senators originally blocked Hormel's nomination for months in the Senate. The Administration then relied on its "recess appointment" power provided by the Constitution to appoint Hormel - sending a clear signal that sexual orientation is no barrier to representing America's interests overseas.

FIGHTING AIDS AND CARING FOR THOSE AFFECTED

White House.
Vice President
office deals with
interdepartmental activities dealing with AIDS/HIV.

Established An Office of National AIDS Policy at the White House. In the Administration's first year the President and Vice President established an Office of National AIDS Policy. The office deals with policy issues concerning AIDS and the co-ordination of interdepartmental activities dealing with AIDS/HIV.

Increased Funding for AIDS Related-Programs. Since the beginning of the Administration, funding assistance to help provide for the purchase of HIV/AIDS drugs has increased by 854 percent.

funding increases
of more than 292 percent in funds for medications

In addition, the Ryan White CARE Act has seen funding increases of more than 292 percent in funds for medications

serving

low-income individuals. Overall funding for

AIDS-related programs

has increased by more than 122 percent during this Administration.

Al Gore has

Aggressively Fighting HIV/AIDS. As Vice President,

worked with scientists and pharmaceutical

companies

to find ways

of overcoming obstacles in the development of

therapies, vaccines

and other research to make significant inroads in

fighting the AIDS

epidemic.

The

Leading Initiatives to Develop an AIDS Vaccine.

for AIDS vaccine

Administration created the first dedicated center

research and mobilized public and private sectors

contributions,

including scientists, physicians and

pharmaceutical

companies, to

join together to maximize this commitment and find

a vaccine

within ten years.

and

Convened the First White House Conference on HIV

the first

AIDS. In December of 1995, the Administration held

Conference

White House Conference on HIV and AIDS. The

activists from

brought together more than 250 scientists and AIDS

issues.

more than 37 states to formally address AIDS/HIV

an original

Original Cosponsor of the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act. As a U.S. Senator, Al Gore was

Resources

Emergency

cosponsor of the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS

quality and

Act of 1990. This Act provided grants to improve the

availability of AIDS treatment.

1996, Vice

Helping Present the AIDS Memorial Quilt. In October

President Al Gore participated in the viewing of the

AIDS Memorial quilt
in Washington. He and his wife Tipper appeared on stage
to personally
honor and to read the names of individuals who have
lost
their lives to
AIDS.

WORKING FOR ACCESS TO QUALITY HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Ensuring Medicaid and Social Security Coverage for
People Living
with HIV and AIDS. The Administration fought for
legislation to
preserve the Medicaid guarantee of coverage. More than
50 percent of
those living with AIDS, and more than 90 percent of
children with AIDS,
rely on Medicaid coverage for their health insurance.
The Administration,
which called for the legislation in 1997, supported the
passage of this
legislation that allows individuals with AIDS to return
to work-without
fearing the loss of their federal health benefits.

Expanding Social Security Disability Insurance
Coverage. The
Administration also revised Social Security
Disability Insurance
eligibility rules, increasing the number of
individuals who are HIV
positive and eligible for Social Security
benefits.

Banned Insurance Discrimination Based on AIDS/HIV. The
Administration fought for and signed the
Kennedy-Kassebaum Health
Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. The Act
banned insurance
companies from discriminating against people living
with
HIV and AIDS

Working to Improve Health Care Services for Lesbians.
In
January,
a panel commissioned by the National Institutes of
Health and the
Federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
issued a report
calling for research into ways to improve lesbians'
access to health care

services. Lesbian leaders, such as Dr. Jocelyn White,
co-editor in chief
of The Journal of the Gay and Lesbian Medical
Association, have praised
the report, calling it a "wonderful resource."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-FEB-2000 18:16:49.00

SUBJECT: Re: greetings

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The news conference went exceptionally well. About 20 reporters on the line.

The VP said as President he would establish a national commission to explore

ways to eliminate disparities between same sex couples and straight couples--all 1,100+, he said. And he said he expected one of the recommendations to be domestic partnership benefits for federal employees.

Caught us all by surprise. Gay press wanted to know why he wouldn't press Clinton just to sign an executive order now. Deborah Glick and I said we would not want to repeat the same mistake of 1993 with gays in the military,

i.e., leaping before studying an issue and figuring out the best way to accomplish it. Congressional mood is probably not right at this time, either.

Let me know if you have other questions.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-FEB-2000 09:07:28.00

SUBJECT: Gore GLBT Record on Gays in Military Service (updated)

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

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

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

CC: "yandylove@aol.com" <yandylove@aol.com> ("yandylove@aol.com" <yandylove@aol.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Gays in the Military ("Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue")

Gore has concluded that the "Don't Ask Don't Tell" policy has not worked, and as President, he would seek to eliminate it.

Al Gore in the ABC News Interview with Diane Sawyer (June 1999)

DIANE SAWYER: Would you like to see that ["Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy] changed, and basically free expression take place? Would you make it a priority?"

GORE: I'd like to see the policy implemented differently. I don't think there's been enough compassion in that policy.

SAWYER: So not taking a stand yet on pushing for full disclosure?

GORE: Well, I would want to work with the military on the issue, but I would want to bring about changes in the way it's being implemented.

Al Gore in the Advocate (September 1999)

"I would implement the policy with more compassion. I don't think the changes in the military policy are working the way they were intended to work. I would try to change that by working with military leaders to bring about an implementation strategy that's fairer."

Bill Bradley in the Advocate (October 1999)

"I have grave doubts that it ["Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy] can work. I voted for the Boxer Amendment [which would have liberalized the policy] in 1993. I think we ought to get to a time when gays can serve in the military. We need talented people. There is no reason why we can't ultimately get there."

How would you overcome the opposition?

"The timing and method of how I would do that would have to be left to me."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-FEB-2000 09:14:46.00

SUBJECT: GOP Debate, February 15, 2000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CNN GOP Debate

South Carolina Republican Debate

LARRY KING, HOST: Tonight, a crucial debate for the three remaining Republican presidential candidates. Joining me in South Carolina, site of Saturday's GOP primary, Senator John McCain of Arizona; former Reagan administration official, Ambassador Alan Keyes; and Texas Governor George W. Bush. They're next on a special edition of "LARRY KING LIVE: Election 2000." This is the South Carolina Republican debate.

Good evening. A couple of notes before we start. We're at Seawell's Banquet Center here in Columbia, South Carolina, the capital of this state. This event tonight is sponsored by BIPEC. That's the South Carolina Business and Industry Political Education Committee. This is the second such event they've held. They held one four years ago.

We are live, as you can tell. There is an audience here of people enjoying it.

We have asked them to remain attentive so that you can listen to everything our guests say.

A couple of other notes -- this is going to be a free-wheeling debate. If one guest wishes to comment on what another says after they finish, they can.

We're going to cover as many subjects as we can for the next 90 minutes.

There will be only two commercial breaks at 9:30 Eastern Time, the bottom of the hour, a two-minute break, and at 10 o'clock Eastern Time, a two-minute break.

And one personal note: If I cough a little, forgive me. I've got a scratchy throat tonight.

We'll start with Governor Bush. Since we're being seen all over the world -- we're on CNN International -- what area of American international policy would you change immediately as president?

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (R-TX), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE:
Our relationship with China. The current president has called the relationship with China a strategic partnership. I believe our relationship needs to be redefined as one as competitor. Competitors can find areas of agreement, but we must make it clear to the Chinese that we don't appreciate any attempt to spread weapons of mass destruction around the world, that we don't appreciate any threats to our friends and allies in the Far East. This president is one who went to China and ignored our friends and allies in Tokyo and Seoul. He sent a chilling signal about the definition of friendship.

When I become the president, I'm going to strengthen our alliances in the Far East. I'm going to work with the Russians to get rid of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty so we can bring certainty into an uncertain part of the world, and that's the Far East as well.

We must say to people in that part of the world, Don't

threaten our friends.

Don't threaten our allies. So I'm going to change the relationship.

KING: And you're going to let them know.

BUSH: Of course I'm going to let them know. That's what a president does;
a president let's them know.

KING: Ambassador Keyes, what would you change?

ALAN KEYES (R), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: I think the first thing I'd want to do is to restore respect for the national sovereignty of this country.

KING: By...

KEYES: I was very much in disagreement with our entry into the World Trade Organization. I think we gave away a portion of our sovereignty that we should never have surrendered to an unrepresentative body that can make decisions according to that treaty that would have direct affect on the lives of Americans.

It violates the fundamental principle of our way of life. No legislation without representation -- representative government. I want to see us withdraw from the World Trade Organization and put our approach to trade back on a footing that maximizes the results that we get for the American people.

I'm not interested in protectionism or withdrawal from the world. But I do think, if you happen to be the sponsors of the most lucrative market in the world, that folks ought to be paying a premium price to enter this market, or else giving us something concrete in return that's of tangible benefit to the whole American people, not just to a handful of international corporations.

KING: Senator?

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R-AZ), PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE: China is obviously a place where this -- one of the signal

failures of this
administration. Although there are certainly many
failures throughout the
world.

But I would also look very -- revise our policies
concerning these rogue
states: Iraq, Libya, North Korea - those countries that
continue to try to
acquire weapons of mass destruction and the means to
deliver them. As
long...

KING: And you'd do what?

MCCAIN: I'd institute a policy that I call "rogue state
rollback." I would
arm, train, equip, both from without and from within,
forces that would
eventually overthrow the governments and install free
and democratically
elected governments.

As long as Saddam Hussein is in power, I am convinced
that he will pose a
threat to our security. "The New York Times" reported
just a few days ago
that administration officials worry that Saddam Hussein
continues to develop
weapons of mass destruction.

Congress passed a law a couple of years ago, called the
Iraqi Liberation
Act; the administration has done nothing. We should help
them with arms,
training, equipment, radio and a broad variety of ways.
Until those
governments are overthrown, they will pose a threat to
U.S. national
security.

KING: The governor mentioned nuclear. Are you in favor
of the
continuation of abandonment of nuclear weapons around
the world now?

KEYES: Well, I think we ought to put -- where nuclear
weapons are
concerned, we have put our own strategic safety first. I
think it is very
important that we take the anti-missile defense treaty
and set it aside in order
to rapidly develop and deploy an anti-missile defense
for the United States.

I think it has been a travesty that this administration
has stood in the
schoolhouse door, dragged its feet, acted as if we were
suppose to thank
them when they were even willing to talk about this
vital necessity for our
national security.

No, it's time we gave the American people and the allies
of this country the
assurance that can come from our superior technology,
make use of it to
secure ourselves against rogue states and their
missiles, as well as against the
communist Chinese threat that this administration has
contributed to.

KING: Do you agree with him?

BUSH: Well, I agree. I think one of the things we
Republicans stand for is to
use our technologies in research and development to the
point where we can
bring certainty into an uncertain world. All three of us
agree that the
president has drug his feet on the development of an
anti-ballistic missile
system.

All three of us understand, just like I understand, that
this nation must not
retreat, but can lead the world to peace. I do believe
there's an area where
we can work with Russia in the post-Cold War era. And
that's to work with
them to dismantle strategic and tactical nuclear
warheads. It's called
Nunn-Lugar. And when I'm the president, I'm going to
continue to fund
Nunn-Lugar, to make sure that we work with the Russians
to bring certainty
into that part of the world. You see, the Russians have
got to understand the
post-Cold War era is one where we need to cooperate to
bring peace. And,
as John mentioned, and rightly so, we must convince them
as well, not to
spread weapons of mass destruction.

KING: Senator, would you meet with -- assuming Mr. Putin
is elected in
March, would you want to meet with him as a candidate?
Other candidates

have gone overseas while running for office, or right before the campaign...

MCCAIN: I'm not sure that would be necessary. It might be an interesting experience, because I know what's going on in Russia. So do an a whole lot of my friends.

KING: But you don't know...

MCCAIN: But the fact is -- well, we know that he was an apparatchik. We know that he was a member of the KGB. We know that he came to power because of the military brutality and massacre that's been taking place in Russia today -- I mean in Chechnya today. We know that he worked a deal with Yeltsin, so that Yeltsin would have immunity, and he would be assured of the presidency, rather than basically a contested -- I'm very concerned about Mr. Putin. I'm afraid Mr. Putin might be one of those who wants to make the trains run on time.

So, yes, I would meet with him as a candidate, but I think that what I would really like to do is send a message to Mr. Putin, that we expect certain behavior out of the Russians, and particularly what's going in Chechnya today, a cessation of that brutality.

And that is a very important strategic part of the world for us.

KING: Would you meet with him?

KEYES: No, I wouldn't. And I think in fact it would be vital now, and during the course of the campaign, and also in the first months of an administration to make it clear that we were determined to work against the mobocracy, and the mafia that has taken over in Russia. And that we are going to seek to work at all levels with those folks who are actually seeking to establish real self- government, that respects basic human rights and that is also going to take an approach that removes power from the hands of those

who basically have been using it for criminal purposes.

KING: Would you meet with him?

BUSH: I don't know. Probably not. In the...

KING: Wouldn't you want to meet with the leader?

BUSH: Maybe, but I'm going to be trying to win the election.

KING: No, I mean after you get -- this is after the nomination.

BUSH: Oh, after the nomination.

KING: I was asking, if you are the candidate, would you want to?

BUSH: Well, I intend to try to win the nomination in the fall as well. If he came over and knocked on I imagine any of our doors, we would open it and listen to the guy.

Here's the question though and the verdict on Mr. Putin is out. And it's this:

Will he reject the politics inside of Russia that has allowed folks to siphon off aid? Will he stand up to the corruption inside that country? Will he welcome rule of law? Will he welcome the marketplace and the great freedoms of the marketplace? That's the question for Mr. Putin.

KING: How will you know without talking to him?

MCCAIN: That's not encouraging when he cut a deal with the communists rather than the reformers in order to consolidate his power. KEYES: I think we're also going to have to be clearer certainly that the Clinton administration has been, that a good relationship with the United States is conditioned on this kind of respect for basic human rights and the requirements of the people. We shouldn't be transferring capital and doing all kinds of things that send a message of business as usual to a regime that hasn't yet shown itself willing to show respect for these basics.

BUSH: Let me say one other thing. This current administration has been sending all kinds of signals confirming Mr. Putin.

We don't know enough about him. We don't know enough about this person.

America must be diligent and firm. We must expect there to be a market evolution in these countries. We understand freedom. We understand freedom, and there are some who want to isolate our nation. We must reject isolationism, because freedom's our greatest export.

KEYES: See, but there is one problem, though, and I would have to distinguish myself in one respect, because if we're going to talk that way, then I think we ought to apply it to China as well. And sending a business-as-usual signal by continuing most favored nation status is wrong. We ought to take the reins of that policy back in our hands and condition each element of the trade relationship on their willingness to respect the basic requirements of decency and of our values and interests.

KING: Senator, you concerned about Austria?

MCCAIN: I'm concerned. A guy who's name was Adolf Schicklgruber was born there, was a corporal in the German army in World War I, and obviously caused us great problems.

But this was a free and fair election, Larry. This was a free and fair election by a sophisticated electorate.

KING: Hitler was elected in a free election. Well, he won a majority of -- and appointed democratically.

MCCAIN: I was going to say, there's -- your interpretation of history. But the point is that this was a free and fair election. We have to watch it, we have to pay close attention to what's happening in the middle of Europe in what is viewed by most people as one of the most sophisticated countries in

Europe. Obviously we need to keep an eye on it.

But I don't think the United States of America right now is prepared to

overturn a free and fair election. And I'll tell you what: When the European Union started weighing in, they got a negative reaction from the Austrian people and gained more support for this guy than he otherwise would have had.

KING: Governor, in what occasion could you describe where you would use arms?

BUSH: When it's in our national strategic interests. Europe is in our national strategic interests. The Far East is in our national strategic interests. Our own hemisphere is in our national strategic interests. The Middle East -- protecting Israel is in our national strategic interests.

And I'll give you one clear example in our own hemisphere. If, for whatever reason, somebody tries to block passage through the Panama Canal, as president of the United States I will make sure the Panama Canal remains open for trade.

It's in our interests to have a hemisphere that is peaceful and open for trade.

KING: What if it wasn't? What if it was a moral question, Senator?

MCCAIN: I just want to say, it's not that simple. It's not that simple because we are driven by Wilsonian principles as well as others. There are times when our principles and our values are so offended that we have to do what we can to resolve a terrible situation.

If Rwanda again became a scene of horrible genocide, if there was a way that the United States could stop that and beneficially affect the situation -- by the way, we couldn't in Haiti. We spent -- sent 20,000 troops and spent \$2 billion. Haiti is arguably worse off.

Obviously, it's the last resort. But we can never say that a nation driven by Judeo-Christian principles will only intervene where our interests are threatened because we also have values. And those values are very important...

KEYES: But our -- but our, I think our...

MCCAIN: You know, I'm not interrupting you, Alan.

So I think that it's important that we always have some complex challenges as to where we must intervene. Because sometimes we find that if genocide is allowed, the consequences of inaction later on in history are far more severe.

KEYES: Well, several things are true. One, I think we need to end the Clinton policy of interventionism on behalf of all kinds of globalist ideas and interests that are of not direct relevance to our interest or to our values. And I frankly think that Kosovo was an example of that.

I also think we ought to avoid interventions that are based essentially on exaggerated propaganda, and that set the threshold of atrocity so low that, in point of fact, other nations could use that threshold as an excuse to disrupt the peace of the world -- let me finish -- by going into other countries in their region on the same excuse.

We should be very careful not to become practitioners of aggression, even in the name of good purposes. I think, basically, we've got to send a message to the rest of the world, that we will not be stepping in to intervene in the affairs of other countries on any kind of routine basis, unless the level of atrocity is so clear, that it justifies violating that principle of non-aggression, for the sake of which we have sacrificed tens of thousands of American lives.

And I think it would be irresponsible to do what

Clinton, in fact, has done,
and take us on a road of interventionism that sets that
threshold so low that I
think it's a threat to peace.

BUSH: Yes, I think there needs to be a clear statement
of when and if we'll
commit troops. I worry about Rwanda. I didn't like what
went on in
Rwanda. But I don't think we should commit troops to
Rwanda. Nor do I
think we ought to try to be the peacekeepers all around
the world. I intend
to tell our allies that America will help make the
peace, but you get to put
troops on the ground to keep warring parties apart.

One of the reasons we have such low morale in the
military today, is
because we're over-deployed and under-trained. If you
talk to the men and
women who wear our uniform, who are married, they're
constantly being
separated as a result of deployments all around the
world. We've got to be
very careful about when and if we commit our troops.

KEYES: Well, we can still deal...

KING: Let John add.

MCCAIN: Obviously we have too much deployment. We should
have our
troops coming home from Bosnia. We shouldn't have gone
into Kosovo --
or shouldn't have stumbled into Kosovo. There was no
need to intervene
there. But look, there's only one superpower, and that's
the United States of
America.

And there will be times when the superpower has to do
things that other
nations don't have to do. And I am convinced that the
best way to prevent
the loss of blood certainly -- certainly the lessons of
the last century showed
us is that there may be times when we have to come in
early so that we will
prevent a recurrence of what happened with the rise of
Nazi Germany...

KEYES: I think...

MCCAIN: ... which is a classic example of that.

KEYES: I think that what we have to avoid, however, is taking a unilateral approach in these sorts of matters that encourage other countries to shrink from their responsibilities, not to develop their capability and potential, and not to take responsibility for policing their regions of the world. They should not expect that the United States is going to come in and substitute for their responsibility. And if we encourage them to believe that that's going to be the case, we actually destabilize situations, we don't help them.

KING: Move to another area. Sort of a man on the sidelines. We'll ask you. Do you think this has been a dirty campaign, Alan?

KEYES: Well, frankly, I haven't given their campaign a thought.

KING: Not a thought.

KEYES: I will confess, I spend too much time speaking about the moral crisis of this country, the priority that this nation needs to address, to get back...

KING: So, you have no...

KEYES: ... to its basic moral principles. I have a positive message of my own. I concentrate on that message because I think it's of vital importance to this country.

I frankly believe that you spend all this time beating up on somebody else because you don't have that much to say yourself. I have too much to say of a positive nature about the future of this country to worry about beating up on my opponents except when specific issues require that we call attention to differences.

All right, Governor, what do you make of all these past two weeks, the charges and countercharges? You go and then the senator.

BUSH: Well, it's kind of politics. And John and I shook hands and we said we weren't going to run ads and I kind of smiled my way through the early primaries and got defined. I'm not going to let it happen again. And we shook hands and unfortunately he ran an ad that equated me to Bill Clinton -- he questioned my trustworthiness.

KING: Are you saying he broke the agreement with you?

BUSH: Well, I'm just saying, you can disagree on issues, we'll debate issues, but whatever you do, don't equate my integrity and trustworthiness to Bill Clinton. That's about as low a blow as you can give in a Republican primary.

KING: And that's...

(APPLAUSE) And that's what -- and that's what -- and that's what got you mad to sort of fight back?

BUSH: Well, I stand by my ads. I stand...

KING: You wouldn't change any?

BUSH: No. I stand by what I'm trying to do. I mean, when the man says that I'm spending all the surplus on tax cuts and it's not true, I'm going to define what reality is.

KING: Senator McCain, did you break a promise?

MCCAIN: Well, let me tell you what happened. There was an ad run against me, we ran a counter-ad in New Hampshire, Governor Bush took the ad down. And then I was beat up very badly by all of his surrogates, called Clinton, called Clinton-lite, called every -- a hypocrite. I mean, you've seen...

KING: In New Hampshire?

MCCAIN: No, here in South Carolina. You've seen it -- turn on the radio, turn on the television, and unfortunately now pick up the telephone and you'll hear a negative attack against John McCain.

But let me tell you what really went over the line.
Governor Bush had an
event, and he paid of it, and standing -- and stood next
to a spokesman for a
fringe veterans' group. That fringe veteran said that
John McCain had
abandoned the veterans.

Now, I don't know if you can understand this, George,
but that really hurts,
that really hurts.

And so five United States senators, Vietnam veterans,
heroes, some of them
really incredible heroes, wrote George a letter and
said, Apologize, you
should be ashamed...

BUSH: Let me speak to that.

MCCAIN: You should be ashamed. Now if you want...

KING: Is he responsible for what someone else says?

MCCAIN: Well, this same man -- he stood next to him, it
was his event.
This same man had attacked his father viciously.

BUSH: Yes, he did. Let me speak to that. Let me speak to
that.

KING: All right.

MCCAIN: So I'd be glad to tell you the rest of the
story, if you'd let me,
when it's appropriate.

KING: Well, let him respond on that point.

BUSH: Let me -- let me answer that. MCCAIN: You should
be ashamed --
you should be ashamed of sponsoring an event with that
man there whop
had attacked your own father.

BUSH: Let me say something, John. Let me finish. Let me
finish.

John, I believe that you served our country nobly. And
I've said it over and
over again. That man wasn't speaking for me. He may have
a dispute with
you...

MCCAIN: He was at your event.

BUSH: Let me finish please, please.

MCCAIN: He's listed as your (inaudible)

BUSH: Let me finish. Let me finish.

KING: All right, let him finish.

BUSH: The man was not speaking for me. If you want to know my opinion about you, John, you served our country admirably and strongly, and I'm proud of your record, just like you are.

And I don't appreciate what he said about my dad, either. But let me say something, if you're going to be -- hold me responsible for what people for me say, I'm going to do the same for you. And let me give you one example.

Warren Rudman, the man who you had as your campaign man in New Hampshire, said about the Christian Coalition that they're bigots. He talked about the Christian Coalition in a way that was incredibly strong. I know you don't believe that, do you?

MCCAIN: George, he's entitled to his opinion on that issue.

BUSH: Well, so is this man.

MCCAIN: You paid for an event...

BUSH: So is this man.

(APPLAUSE)

MCCAIN: You paid for your...

KING: Please don't...

MCCAIN: You paid for an event...

BUSH: John.

MCCAIN: You paid for an event and stood next to a person. And when you were asked if you would repudiate him, you said, no.

BUSH: No. John, what I said -- what I said -- let me say what I said.

MCCAIN: So, let me tell you what happened -- let me tell you what happened after that effectively.

KING: But I want Alan to give me one thing.

If you have surrogate making a speech for you today, are you responsible for what he says?

KEYES: Larry, I'm sorry. I really am sitting here wondering, because I said we were going out to 202 countries, and is this kind of pointless squabbling really what we want them to see?

We're talking about electing the...

(APPLAUSE)

... president of the United States.

KING: But it happened.

KEYES: But it -- happened or not happened, and I don't know whether this is the influence of the media corrupting our process or whether it's that personal ambition becomes a substitute for our real focus on substance. But it seems to me we've got a lot more important things.

We have got a country that has abandoned it's most profound and fundamental principle. Killing babies in the womb every day is a contradiction...

KING: I'm going to get to that.

KEYES: ... of the Declaration of Independence. We have got a country with an income tax system that enslaves its people and...

KING: I'm going to get to that.

KEYES: ... and needs to put that back in their hands.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: I'm going to get to that.

(LAUGHTER)

KEYES: We have got a school system that needs to be put
back into the
hands of parents.

(LAUGHTER) And all I'm sitting here listening to is
these two guys go on
about their ads.

KINGS: I'm going...

BUSH: Because he asked about it. That's because he
asked... KEYES: I
know you did...

(APPLAUSE)

KING: The question...

(APPLAUSE)

KEYES: It seems to me -- it seems -- let their ad people
get in the back
room and fight it out, and let the American people hear
what they've got to
hear about the issues...

KING: I'm going to...

BUSH: Let's discuss the issues. Let's the discuss the
issues.

KING: All right -- that's what -- all right.

MCCAIN: Let me just finish up, OK?

(LAUGHTER)

So, so...

KING: And hope for...

MCCAIN: ... so here's what happened. We ran an ad that
was a response
ad. At a town hall meeting a mother stood up and she
said, "Senator
McCain, my son was 13 last year. We had a lot of trouble
of explaining
things to him that went on in Washington." She said,
"Now he's 14. He's told
me not long ago, 'John McCain is my hero.' He's the man

I want to be like.

"Well, last night he came into her room," she said, "and he had tears in his eyes because he had answered the phone and the phone call, even though he told the caller that he was 14, said, 'Do you know that John McCain is a liar, and a thief and cheat?'"

Well, that night I called my people together. I said, Take down our response ad.

We're running nothing but a positive campaign from now on. I committed to that, I promise that.

KING: Now, are you saying that...

MCCAIN: I hope George...

KING: ... George...

MCCAIN: Let me just say...

(CROSSTALK)

(APPLAUSE)

KING: Are you saying that Governor Bush was responsible for that call?

MCCAIN: I don't know who was responsible for it. But I know that the attacks go on.

BUSH: Let me just say one thing.

MCCAIN: I know that the attacks go on.

BUSH: Let me say one thing about all this business, John.

MCCAIN: I told you I pulled them all down.

BUSH: You didn't pull this ad.

MCCAIN: Yes, I did.

BUSH: This had ended up in a man's windshield yesterday...

MCCAIN: Yes, I...

BUSH: ... that questions my -- this is an attack piece.

MCCAIN: That is not by my campaign.

BUSH: Well, it says, "paid for by John McCain."

(LAUGHTER)

MCCAIN: It is not by my campaign. BUSH: John...

MCCAIN: That's not -- that is not by my campaign.

BUSH: Well, then somebody's putting stuff up.

MCCAIN: I pulled them off.

BUSH: I agree with you.

MCCAIN: But you're putting out stuff that is
unbelievable, George, and it's
got to stop.

BUSH: I find that...

MCCAIN: And your ads have got to stop.

KING: Are you going to -- well, let me put...

MCCAIN: My ads have all stopped.

KING: I'm going to end this now. Are you going to pull
anything that you
now have on?

BUSH: I'm going to stand by what I'm putting on TV. And
what I put on TV
was looking in that camera and saying, You can disagree
with me on issues,
John, but do not question -- do not question my
trustworthiness and do not
compare me to Bill Clinton.

KING: And are you -- you've changed your ads already.

MCCAIN: We've pulled all ours down. There's nothing
negative on the air
and we have insisted that there not be a mean point.

KING: Would you disclaim what Rudman said if he said...

MCCAIN: The phone calls...

KING: ... that you don't agree with that?

MCCAIN: His phone calls...

KING: Do you disclaim what the veteran said if he said
it?

MCCAIN: I think...

BUSH: This man -- this man served our country well.

MCCAIN: I did not abandon the veterans. You should
have...

(CROSSTALK)

BUSH: That's right, we didn't abandon the veterans.

MCCAIN: You should have repudiated your guy...

BUSH: I stood up there at that press conference and
said, John, you're a
man who served our country well.

KEYES: But this is the problem; once it starts, it's
almost impossible to end
and why?

KING: I'm leaving it now.

(LAUGHTER)

KEYES: No. No, I don't mean it that way, though.

MCCAIN: It's ended.

KEYES: No, I don't mean it that way. I mean it in the
first place, you know?
And I think it's time we began to ask ourselves...

KING: (inaudible) said that.

KEYES: ... why it is that these campaigns degenerate
into this kind of stuff,
and I think I know why it is.

KING: Which...

KEYES: I think it's because people are trying so hard to
be all things to all
people that they refuse to stand forthrightly and make
it clear on each given
issue where they stand in a principled way and simply
speak the truth and let
the chips fall. And so they get into this spitting

match over who did what to
whom, as distraction from the lack of substance in their
own campaigns.

I think people need to start thinking about whether this
is the kind of
spectacle that actually characterizes a serious
political process, because I
don't think it does.

KING: Today you announced a campaign reform program.

BUSH: Yes, I did.

KING: You said that you'd been announcing it in other
pieces throughout the
past couple of months, but the first time you formulated
it as a plan today.

BUSH: Well, actually, I first laid it out last summer --
a lot of it. Would you
like me to go through it?

KING: No, but one of the networks...

BUSH: Well, why can't I ...

KING: Oh no, no, I'm sorry, of you can go through it.
No, what I mean is,
one of the networks reported...

BUSH: It's a great plan.

KING: ... that this is the first time you've used the
term "campaign finance
reform".

BUSH: Well, that's not true. I started talking about
campaign finance reform
last summer. And I said the following things: We ought
to ban corporate soft
money, and we ought to ban labor union soft money. We
ought to make
sure though, that labor bosses cannot spend union
members' money without
their permission. It's big difference between what I
believe and John
believes.

Thirdly, we should not allow federal candidates to take
money from one
campaign and roll it over into another campaign. That
ought to be a reform.

And fifthly, what I said -- or fourthly, what I said...

(LAUGHTER)

KING: I lost count.

BUSH: Because you were listening so closely.

KING: Too closely.

BUSH: Yes, too closely -- was that members of the United States Congress should not be allowed to raise money, when there's a legislative session -- that members should not be allowed to raise money from federal lobbyists during a session. KING: On the corporate end, about unions giving against the will of the member, should stockholders have the right to say whether a corporation can give?

BUSH: No, Corporations should not be giving at all.

KING: Period?

BUSH: There should be a ban on corporate soft money.

KING: You should agree with that, right?

MCCAIN: Of course not, because there's a \$1 billion...

KING: But today you called it a joke.

MCCAIN: Yes, there's a \$1 billion loophole in it.

KING: Which is?

MCCAIN: And it's called individual contributions. Mr. Bernard Schwartz, who is the head of Loral Corporation, gave \$1 million individually to the Clinton-Gore campaign in 1996. A series of events then took place. The transfer of technology to China that allowed them to improve the tech -- their missile accuracy.

KING: Are you saying under his plan you could do that?

MCCAIN: Under his plan, Mr. Schwartz could walk down there and give that \$1 million check tomorrow. And that's the reason why this is...

BUSH: (inaudible) you can't give...

MCCAIN: Yes, you -- he can give...

BUSH: John, there's a \$1,000 limit.

MCCAIN: He can give \$1,000 to the RNC, the DNC or anybody else.

(CROSSTALK)

BUSH: This is called the First Amendment, John.

MCCAIN: That's what it's all about.

KING: One at a time. One at a time.

MCCAIN: That's what it's all about. KEYES: Let me speak to this whole

issue, because these folks sit here, two politicians, arguing about whether or not the people or the United States should have under the First Amendment the right peaceable to assemble and seek to petition the government and seek redress of their grievances.

I believe that all this talk where the politicians come in and say -- think about this, they're going to control our ability to fund those processes through which we control their activities. And by controlling our funding, I presume they will utterly destroy our First Amendment right.

There should be no such regulation by politicians of what we the people can do in our own political process.

KING: But the Supreme Court ruled they could.

KEYES: All of this -- all of this...

KING: But the Supreme Court ruled...

KEYES: Frankly, the Supreme Court has ruled Roe v. Wade and a lot of other stuff...

KING: Well, wait a minute, is the...

KEYES: ... and as president of the United States -- excuse me...

KING: Hold it..

KEYES: ... as president of the United States I will -- I
will sit in an office
that is co-equal with the Supreme Court, in which I will
have an equal
responsibility with the court for the interpretation of
the Constitution.

KING: Do you -- wait a minute. Do you agree that the
court has the final
word?

KEYES: Let me finish.

KING: You don't think that...

KEYES: The Constitution doesn't say that. Let me finish.

KING: The court is not the final word?

KEYES: Let me finish, Larry. I think that it's very
simple on campaign
finance reform. Instead of saying that because these
politicians can't act with
integrity, we must give up our rights, Let the ones who
don't have the
integrity give up their offices.

And let's have a system that's very simple. No dollar
vote without a ballot
vote. Only individuals capable of voting...

KING: You share that view?

BUSH: Yes, absolutely.

KEYES: Publicize -- let me finish, though. Publicize it
immediately...

KING: Well, Alan.

KEYES: ... so that people will know what's what and have
no limits
whatsoever on the freedoms of the people of this
country.

KING: But you would limit. You just said you would
limit.

BUSH: No, I said that under the First Amendment...

KING: No unions.

BUSH: That's corporate -- that's money where people have
no say, what
he's saying. No corporate...

KEYES: No unions, no corporate money, no foreign money.
No dollar vote
without a ballot vote.

BUSH: We have -- the great thing about this country is,
individuals should
be the participants in democracy. The ultimate extension
of some of these
campaign funding reform plans out of Washington, D.C.,
will mean that the
people who decide who the candidates are and who the
victors are will be
the press. I'm sure you're looking forward to that
opportunity.

KING: If I gave you \$1 million, don't you have to take
my phone call?

MCCAIN: Sure. Ask any -- ask any...

KING: Don't you owe me something?

BUSH: Not necessarily. But let me say something.

KING: No.

MCCAIN: ... ask any ex-senator, Larry. Ask any
ex-senator, they'll tell
you, they'll tell you.

(LAUGHTER)

BUSH: One of the things that we need to do -- one of the
things we need to
do is to have full disclosure; is to let the sun shine
in; is to let everybody
know who's giving to whom. I have done that in this
campaign. I put it on the
Internet, who gave to whom. I've got a lot of
contributors. My average
contribution, by the way, is about \$350 per person.

And I want you to know and I want you to know who's
given because I
don't want to hid anything.

So, this business about limiting individuals' capacity
to put ads on the air --
for example, I don't like some of the ads running about

me. I don't like them
at all.

We have the pro-abortion people running ads on me. I
didn't like it. But it's
their right in America to do so. This is America.

KING: Well, let me take a break. We'll come back. This
is a two-minute
break. There will be only one other break and that's in
another half-hour.
We'll reintroduce the candidates, like if you don't know
them.

When we come back, we will get into other issues,
including abortion, other
key domestic issues as well.

This is a LARRY KING LIVE election special.

Don't go away.

(APPLAUSE)

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: The primary is this Saturday. This is the BIPEC
debate at Seawell's
Banquet Center, in Columbia, South Carolina. And our
guests are Alan
Keyes, the former ambassador; Governor George W. Bush,
the governor of
Texas; and Senator John McCain, the Republican senator
from Texas...

MCCAIN: Arizona.

KING: From Arizona.

MCCAIN: All right, thank you.

KING: I moved you over.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: One state over.

MCCAIN: I don't think I'm allowed in Texas.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: True. Even a goof helps, when you want to have
laughs.

OK, you say today that you're the reformer, you're the outsider. Yet 38 senators support you, 175 congressmen, and 26 governors. That's not establishment?

BUSH: Well, let's start with the governors. Those who know me best support me.

KING: But isn't that establishment?

BUSH: Let me finish. I've worked with the governors. They know me well. They know I can lead. These are citizens that care about the future of the country. They've stood up and said, We know the man's record, we know his capacity to bring people together, we know his record of reform in the state of Texas has had great results for our citizens, and we want him to be the leader.

And you mentioned the United States senators. Thirty-eight have endorsed my candidacy, for which I'm grateful. These are citizens from all around the world -- all around the country, including one from South Carolina, named Strom Thurmond. They took a look at the three of us, and decided that I ought to be the leader. They're looking for a fresh voice from outside. They want somebody to provide leadership. And that's why they supported me.

You know, I got defined early on as the insider. And I kept telling people my ZIP code is Austin, Texas. That's where I made my stake. That's where I've developed my reputation, and that's where those results are coming from. And John and Alan both have got Washington, D.C., addresses -- well, Maryland I guess.

And so I -- anyway...

KING: OK, fair answer. He said he's still a reformer, he's still an outsider. They support him because they like him.

MCCAIN: Well, it's fair to say that I did not win, again

this year, Miss

Congeniality in the United States Senate. So I have to admit that to you.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: You're not popular in the Senate.

MCCAIN: No, because I've taken on the iron triangle -- special interests, money, and legislation -- which we've been grid locked by in Washington, D.C. We've taken government away from the people.

And young people are being turned off in droves. And the fact is that I've been involved in lobbying gift -- lobbying ban, gift ban, line-item veto. I've attacked pork-barrel spending and wasteful spending, which is now worse than it's ever been.

In fact, George said that he would have -- he supported and would have signed a bill, Citizens Against Government Waste -- it was the worst, most wasteful spending bill in history. And I fought against it. And I didn't make a lot of friends, because I point out these pork-barrel spendings, these wasteful spendings.

KING: So...

MCCAIN: And I'll fight for reform until the last breath I draw so that we can get the American people back connected with their government.

I'm trying to change this party to bring it into the 21st century as a reform party in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt.

KING: Alan?

KEYES: I find it so fascinating, we talk about outsiders. I was so far outside this process at one point that the last cycle when we held this debate I wasn't allowed to participate in it.

KING: Here?

KEYES: I think that's pretty far outside. That's right,

here. And in Atlanta
and elsewhere as well. The only reason I'm sitting here
right now is because
I articulate better than most anybody in this country
what's on the heart of
real Republicans and real conservatives around the
country, and because I
have been out there, not fighting in Washington, but
fighting at the grass
roots, as head, for instance, of Citizens Against
Government Waste, where
you value the praise, I did the work.

And so the point being that for both of these gentlemen,
who have all the
advantages, sit at the apex of a system that supports
them in every way,
darlings of the media, the person who's out there...

(LAUGHTER)

Excuse me, the person who is out there striving at the
grass roots right now
to organize folks because of what they have in their
heart, not what I have in
my pocket, is Alan Keyes, and reaching folks to such a
degree that
everybody, even your supporters, acknowledge that the
person who
presents the Republican message best is sitting here,
not sitting there.

And it's about time we asked ourselves...

KING: Then why aren't you -- why aren't you doing
better?

KEYES: Why? The question I asked. Why on Earth don't we
want to send
our best person to face Al Gore and Bill Bradley,
instead of sending folks
into the debate, the half-hearted, the unconvicted, the
folks who in point of
fact can't make our case as well and effectively as we
should make it?

KING: How do you respond to that?

BUSH: Well, I respond to it. I put my record on the line
in Texas. It's the
second-biggest electoral state in the union. It's an
important state. You better
be able to carry Texas in order to become the president.
And the people in

my state gave me a chance to be the governor for the first time to hold four-year -- consecutive year terms. I mean, I put my reputation out there. I'm a results-oriented person.

I want to say two things. One, I'm not the darling of the media.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: And number two.

BUSH: And number two, it's a fundamental question. And this is the question: Who can go to Washington with an agenda that's positive and hopeful and optimistic and convince people to follow? Who can gather up support necessary? Who is it that's got the capacity to stand up in the halls of Congress and say, "Follow me"? Who has had the experience necessary to earn the will of the people?

KING: And you're saying that John doesn't.

BUSH: Well, I'm saying -- well, I'm saying -- of the three of us here, I've had the experience and the results that prove I can do so. These are good men, don't get me wrong. But I've been there. I've been there.

I look forward to saying to those United States senators, Here's a fresh perspective.

KING: Well, if you have trouble getting along with them, doesn't he have a point?

MCCAIN: I've had 234 major pieces of legislation and amendments passed when I've been in the United States Senate and Congress. One of the most successful records, whether it be in the area of reform, whether it be in the important issues of telecommunications, such as it be Y2K product liability, whether it be Internet tax moratorium, or whether it be in every major foreign policy issue that has confronted this country. My credentials are well

know.

But I'll tell you what, the Republican Party has lost its way. They have selected an establishment candidate. I don't blame them for doing that. But they lost the last two presidential elections.

They lost the last two congressional elections. And unless we open up this party, unless we do what I did in New Hampshire, and that's get thousands and thousands of young people out to register to vote Republican, unless we get independents, reconstitute the old Reagan Democrats -- I'm being criticized now because Democrats may like me.

I want to reconstitute that governing coalition. I can do it. I can lead and I have had experience in a lot of ways that will...

KEYES: I think -- I think that what we did last time we ran experience last time and it really worked well in terms of the result.

I would love to take both of these records and sit them in an empty chair in a debate against Al Gore and see who wins.

I think that we've got to remember that what you can do to stand before the American people, articulate what's on their heart, how it relates to the great principles of this country, and how we have to address those principles in order to enter the next century with the confidence that as a decent people we will retain our liberty, not keep handing it off to the government, that's the challenge we face, in a year, by the way, when -- if the spokesman of the Republican Party isn't able to meet the moral challenge of this nation's life, we will lose the election because that's where the Democrats are vulnerable.

KING: Are you questioning the moral -- are you questioning the moral challenge of...

KEYES: I question their ability to articulate on the moral issues of our time, a clear and passionate and convicted case that can

persuade and move the
people of this country. And if you can't do it, by the
way, in this election
year, economy booming, world relatively at peace, if we
don't go out and
attack that moral flank exposed by Bill Clinton's lying,
perfidy,
oath-breaking, and utter shameless betrayal of our moral
heritage, we will
lose and we will deserve to lose.

KING: Let's take a moral issue...

BUSH: Let me say one thing about this. This is a really
important part of the
debate. This is the fundamental issue that Republicans
and independents in
this state are going to have to look at: Who can lead?
Who can lead?

KING: Morally.

BUSH: With all due respect.

KING: Are you talking morally?

BUSH: Well, morally -- any of us at this table can
perform better than
William Jefferson Clinton -- any of us will bring honor
to the office.

(APPLAUSE)

But the fundamental question is, when we talk education,
for example, who's
got a record? Who's got a record of reform...

KING: And he...

BUSH: Let me finish.

KING: His question was a moral question.

BUSH: Well, that's part of it, no question about it.
Part of it is to bring honor
and dignity to the office and all three of us will do
that. All three of us will do
that.

But part of it as well is to earn the creditability of
the American people, so
like when we talk about education, who is it that has
reformed the system?
Who has got tangible results and can say that our test

scores amongst

African-American students or Hispanic students are up?

Who's vision is it

that is improving a lot of people? Because, you see, if

we don't educate our

children, it's unlikely that the American dream will be

able to touch every

willing heart. That's my record.

KING: Are you saying education, Governor, is a moral issue?

BUSH: Well, I'm saying education is an incredibly important issue and if we

don't educate our children, we're going to have real moral problems.

MCCAIN: Could I make a quick comment? Look, the job that I want to

take is to inspire a generation of young Americans to

commit themselves to

causes greater than their self-interest; that's what the

great presidents in

history have been able to do.

On election day in New Hampshire, thousands of young people went out,

registered Republican and voted and voted for me. Cindy

and I got on a

plane, arrived at the airport in Greenville at 3:00 a.m.

There were 800

college students out there.

Now, I'll admit there was not a mosh pit, but there was certainly an

enthusiastic group of young Americans out there. And

that's the enthusiasm

we're generating and that's what inspirational

leadership is all about and I can

do that.

KEYES: Two things. I would have to say from -- what would I -- first,

Senator McCain, you've served these youngsters enough

beer. I suppose

they'll look really enthusiastic.

(LAUGHTER)

I frankly, I frankly ...

MCCAIN: You know, that's quite a commentary on those young people.

KEYES: Yes, it's quite a commentary on them. But it's quite a commentary on those who would take young folks, some of them not even of age, and serve them beer. But leave that aside.

KING: Are you saying he served beer to minors?

KEYES: Well, look, he -- he did not do this.

KING: OK.

KEYES: I presume his campaign did. But second point though, let's take an example of leadership -- leadership in this campaign. We had a controversy over Bob Jones University and its policies, right?

KING: Right.

KEYES: Now it seems to me, when you have a problem like that, does leadership consist of going into Bob Jones University, where serious questions, in fact, do exist about religious bigotry and racial bigotry -- going in, taking the applause, risking nothing, because you refuse to raise the issues? That's what G.W. Bush did.

Or does it consist of getting on your high horse, refusing to go talk to good-hearted Christian people, because you believed a bunch of prejudicial slanders in the press, and then staying away -- not even carrying a message of integrity to them?

Or does it consist, in fact, in going in, carrying a message of truth and integrity about this country's moral principles, and then looking them in the eye and saying, "I'm a black Roman Catholic Christian, married to an Indian-American woman. And if you can't deal with the demons of racial bigotry, and religious bigotry, and cast them out, you'll accomplish no good for this country"?

KING: Why...

KEYES: Which is the better leader? You tell me. KING: Why didn't you

speaking against bigotry at Bob Jones?

BUSH: I was asked the question, do I support his policy of no interracial dating? I said, Of course not. Of course not. My little brother, Jeb, the governor of Florida married a girl named Columba, from Mexico -- a fabulous part of our family, a great person.

So please don't insinuate, in any shape -- way, shape or form, that I support...

KING: But they couldn't date...

BUSH: Well, that's fine, but I walked in and talked about how our conservative cause must be compassionate. That's what I've talked about. I talked about how the principles of conservatism can lift the spirit of America, how we can improve people's lives, that's what I've talked about.

KEYES: In your...

BUSH: That's what I talked -- you didn't hear my speech.

KEYES: In your speech, sir, you said nothing about the religious bigotry and racial bigotry...

BUSH: I -- I talked...

KEYES: ... that had in fact to be dealt with. On and "if asked" basis, these questions are not enough. What I did was look folks in the eye and tell them: I'm willing to lose every vote over the issue of defending young babes in the womb, and I'm willing to lose every vote over the issue of standing with integrity against religious and racial bigotry.

KING: You did not speak...

KEYES: What votes have these folks been willing to risk to stand for any principle?

KING: Don't dominate, Alan.

John.

MCCAIN: Well, Alan, I've been taking a few risks in my life and I'm proud of those risks. Some of them are proudest points of my life.

Look, I was not invited to attend Bob Jones. I understand that it's a fine academic school. If I had been invited I would have gone and I would have started by saying, as I have gone to other places that people are not in favor of me, and I would have said, Look, what you're doing in this ban on interracial dating is stupid, it's idiotic and it is incredibly cruel to many people. I also happen to have an adoptive daughter who's from Bangladesh, and I don't think that she should be subjected to those kinds of things. In fact, I will stand up and fight against those. And so, look...

KING: But you would have gone and said that, but you weren't invited.

MCCAIN: If I'd have been -- if I'd have been invited, of course, because you've got to bring the message to get these people up into the modern times.

KING: And you said you went -- you went to deliver a message.

BUSH: I did.

KING: OK. Why didn't you then go to the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay group who you don't agree with, to deliver a message to them?

BUSH: I've got gay supporters. I don't ask their sexual orientation, though.

KING: But I mean why didn't you speak, then, before that group?

BUSH: Well, they had made a commitment to John McCain.

KING: Oh.

BUSH: And...

KING: But they invited you.

BUSH: Well, (inaudible) wanted to come down and speak.

And so...

MCCAIN: I have no -- no knowledge that they have made a commitment to my campaign.

BUSH: Well, I thought they raised money for you.

MCCAIN: It doesn't mean...

BUSH: It doesn't matter. Let's talk about that issue. Each person needs to be judged with their heart and soul. I don't ask the question what somebody's sexual orientation is. I don't ask the question.

KING: So if you have gays working for you, that's fine. And you don't have a problem. You'd appoint gays in the Cabinet, et cetera.

BUSH: Well, I'm not going to ask what their sexual orientation is.

KING: Oh, so you wouldn't know.

BUSH: I'm going to appoint conservative people in the Cabinet. It's none of my business what somebody's -- now when somebody makes it my business, like on gay marriage, I'm going to stand up and say I don't support gay marriage. I support marriage between men and women.

KING: So if a state were voting on gay marriage, you would suggest to that state not to approve it?

BUSH: The state can do what they want to do. Don't try to trap me in this state's issue like you're trying to get me into.

KING: You just did. You have an opinion.

(LAUGHTER)

BUSH: I have an opinion.

KING: Do you have...

BUSH: In my state of Texas, if we tried to have gay

marriage, I would
campaign against it.

KING: If your state of Texas then proposed the
Confederate flag, you
would campaign against it?

BUSH: We've got the Lone Star flag flying over Texas.
Let's talk about that
issue.

KING: We're going to move that. Are you offended?
MCCAIN: Before we
leave that issue, can I say -- look, I met with the Log
Cabin Republicans. I
think Republicans and presidents should meet with every
group. We should
meet with every group of people. They don't have to
agree or disagree.

And to say somehow that some people are excluded from
our party who
identify themselves as Republicans -- I disagree with
the Log Cabin
Republicans on gay marriages, on the "don't ask/don't
tell," on a broad
variety of issues. But I agree with them on a stronger
defense, lower taxes,
less regulation. So we're in agreement on some issues.

And I, as president of the United States, and I as the
nominee of my party,
will meet with -- and not necessarily agree with,
everyone in the Republican
Party.

KING: Do you -- the senator's had a little less time, so
I want to hear him
out. Do you agree -- as Barry Goldwater, who you
succeeded in the
Senate, I believe, told me once that there are gays at
Normandy?

There are gays on Bataan?

MCCAIN: I'm sure that all that is true.

KING: Why do you sort of...

MCCAIN: ... but the fact is -- but the fact is that
those gays were people, as
is today in the military, "don't-ask, don't-tell"
situation. I strongly support that
policy. I think that George does as well.

KING: Have there...

MCCAIN: When you have people like General Colin Powell,
General
Norman Schwarzkopf, our most respected military leaders
who tell us that
that's the policy that works, that that's the best way
we can have the finest
army in the world -- which we don't for other reasons --
then I have to
support a policy that the most respected people in
America would support.

KING: Do you disagree?

KEYES: Well, several things. It's a whole lot easier to
go meet with
homosexuals when, as Senator McCain said in a meeting
the other day, "I
understand you believe homosexuality is not a sin." If
you believe it is a sin,
then going and meeting with sinners and identifying
yourself in that way when
you're educating your children to think otherwise is a
little harder for you.

KING: But you...

KEYES: Now, I understand that that is -- let me finish.
I understand that
that's an issue of conscience and I'm not trying to
dictate it to anybody and
wouldn't try to dictate. But we are living in a society
today where there is the
use of coercive government power to try to prevent
people from speaking
out and acting according to their religious view on this
particular issue; trying
to define hate- crimes in such a way that Biblical
beliefs are going to become
incitement to hatred. A lot of the Christian folks in
this country understand
what's going on, but apparently these two gentlemen
don't.

The other thing that I would have to say, the
"don't-ask, don't-tell" policy is
typical of the Clinton administration. It is a
dishonest, shameful, dishonorable
policy that winks and nods at gay folks to get them into
the military, leaves
the regulations on the books so that people in
authority, if they come into

information that somebody has violated those regulations, don't know whether they should or should not enforce them.

KING: What would be your policy?

KEYES: What happens in a military when you have regulations on the books that you selectively enforce in a way that shows favoritism? You undermine cohesion, morale, respect for authority...

KING: All right. Let's...

KEYES: ... and honesty. Military people should be "what you see is what you get," not "don't ask, don't tell."

BUSH: The role of the commander in chief is to clearly define what the mission of the military is. The mission of the military is to fight and be able to win war, and therefore prevent war from happening in the first place.

The commander in chief must let the general officers understand what the goal is and ask the general officers to prepare a military of high morale and high standing, capable of meeting that mission. And the senator is right.

Generals came together and said, This is the best way for us to prepare our military for the mission. And that's what's important to understand as the commander in chief.

It is. That's what's important for the commander in chief, Alan.

KEYES: I think it's a little disingenuous. The rest of us...

BUSH: Nothing is disingenuous.

KEYES: Let me finish. I just said a little disingenuous to pretend...

(LAUGHTER)

Hold it -- that the generals came together and begged for this policy, when we good and well know that it was a policy imposed by the political forces

in this society...

KING: Well, let me put this way, what would...

KEYES: ... to turn the military into an arena of sexual experimentation and the people...

KING: ... what would your policy be?

KEYES: ... who are in charge politically didn't have the guts to stand up and defend their military against...

KING: All right, you're getting -- hold it.

KEYES: ... pressures. That's what happened.

BUSH: You're getting repetitive.

KEYES: That's what happened.

KING: What would your policy be?

KEYES: I would return to the ban on homosexual activity in the military.

KING: Ban?

KEYES: Return to the ban. It's the only policy consistent with both the integrity of the military, the effort to limit sexual tension throughout the military, and the need to have a policy that can be clearly understood and rigorously enforced.

KING: Why is that wrong?

MCCAIN: I don't mind being criticized by Alan Keyes. It's getting to be a regular kind of routine in these debates. But I really do question his comments about our military leaders.

General Colin Powell is one the finest men I've ever known in my life.

And to somehow infer that General Colin Powell was coerced, or forced to adopt a policy that he didn't believe in is a great disservice to one of the greatest men in the history of this country.

KEYES: Who -- excuse me...

KING: By the way, since we...

KEYES: ... a point of personal privilege, it is not
factually on the record --
you go back and take a look. Those military leaders did
not favor this policy
in the beginning. They were brought to favor it after
political leadership failed
to stand up in their defense.

KING: Is he going to be -- either of you -- the
secretary of state -- Colin
Powell?

MCCAIN: Sure.

KING: Sure?

MCCAIN: That's one thing I'm sure we'll agree on.

KING: Your secretary of state, too?

BUSH: I'm not telling.

KING: It's definite that you're saying yes?

MCCAIN: Oh, he'd be marvelous.

BUSH: Oh, he's a great man, no question about it. But
one of the things we
shouldn't be doing, right here on the eve of the South
Carolina primary, is
speculating out loud on who we're going to pick.

KING: Why?

BUSH: Well, because it's -- listen, we're talking about
philosophy. You
know, we go to one state and so-and-so is going to be in
the Cabinet, you
know, and go to another state and name somebody else.
That's kind of --
that cheapens the process. What we need to do is get
elected on principles
and issues.

MCCAIN: There's a few outstanding men I've had the
chance to know in
my life. He can serve anywhere he wants to in my
administration. BUSH:
He's a great man, no question about that.

MCCAIN: Anywhere he wants. He's the 800-pound gorilla.

BUSH: How about your administration?

KING: All right, Alan.

KEYES: Well, let me just say, I think I'm going to wait and see. The kind of folks who are putting together the Keyes campaign will be offering an entirely different perspective on our politics, because all of them come from the grass roots of this country, and speak for its heart.

KING: Ten years ago -- sorry, eight years ago on this program, I asked Vice President Quayle what he would do in the terrible instance that his daughter needed an abortion. He's very pro-life. And he said, Well, he'd try to talk her out of it. And he would go with her to the clinic. And hold her hand and love her.

BUSH: Yes. I'm not...

KING: Would you?

BUSH: I'm not going to drag my daughter into the discussions. I don't...

KING: What do you mean? All right, your niece.

BUSH: No, I'm not dragging personal. Look, you want my views on abortion, I'll give you my views on abortion.

KING: Should...

BUSH: I believe the next president should set this goal for America: Every child, born and unborn, protected in law and welcomed into life. That's what the next president ought to do. The president -- and the question is which one of us can lead America to appreciate life.

The political questions around abortion are these, and this is one that's going to differentiate us from the Democrat nominee, for example, is I will sign a ban on partial-birth abortion. All three of us will sign a ban on partial-birth

abortion. Vice President Gore, if he's the nominee, will sit there and justify partial-birth abortion. I don't know how he can justify partial-birth abortion.

A leader is someone that brings people together and understand the power of adoption. John is a loving adoptive parent, that's a -- it's a loving act, it's a loving alternative to abortion.

A leader is someone who brings people together, both Republicans and Democrats in my state, to pass a parental notification law, a parental notification law that will reduce abortions in the state of Texas.

KING: Should the woman be punished, John?

MCCAIN: No.

KING: She starts the crime.

MCCAIN: George, do you believe in the exemption in abortion, case of abortion, for rape, incest and life of the mother?

BUSH: Yes, I do. I do. MCCAIN: Then, you know, it's interesting, you were talking about printed material that's mailed out. Here's one that says that George W. Bush supports the pro-life plank. The pro-life plank...

BUSH: I do.

MCCAIN: Yes. So in other words...

BUSH: Yes...

MCCAIN: ... your position is that you believe there's an exemption for rape, incest and the life of the mother, but you want the platform that you're supposed to be leading to have no exemption.

BUSH: Yes, but...

MCCAIN: Help me out there, will you?

BUSH: I will, I will.

MCCAIN: Thank you.

BUSH: The platform talks about -- it doesn't talk about what specifically should be in the constitutional amendment. That's...

MCCAIN: It doesn't have...

BUSH: No...

MCCAIN: ... the exemptions in it.

BUSH: Please let me finish, John.

MCCAIN: And you know that very well.

BUSH: John, let me finish, let me finish. The platform speaks about a constitutional amendment.

It doesn't refer to how that constitutional amendment ought to be defined. It does not...

MCCAIN: If you read...

BUSH: John...

MCCAIN: ... the platform, it has no exceptions.

BUSH: John, I think we need to keep the platform the way it is. This is a pro-life party. We need to...

MCCAIN: Then, you were...

BUSH: May I finish, please?

MCCAIN: ... contradictory...

BUSH: May I finish, please?

MCCAIN: ... you were contradictory in... KING: All right.

BUSH: Please. We need to be a pro-life party. We need to say, "life is precious" and that's what our platform refers to. And that's why we need to leave it the same.

Now, I fully recognize good people can disagree on this issue. But the fundamental question amongst the Republicans is which one of us has got the

capacity to lead our nation to understand the value of
life; those of living,
those yet unborn, and those elderly in America who are
subject to
physician-assisted suicides, for example?

KING: Alan, you say a life is a life, period, right?

KEYES: No. First of all, I think that's a perfect
illustration; this discussion of
the problem we've got in the party. One individual who
doesn't really accept
the pro-life position of the party, and another who says
he accepts it, but
then takes positions that are inconsistent with it, so
when push comes to
shove he won't be able to defend it. And both willing to
take at a personal
level a position that will destroy you in debate against
the Democrats.

When Al Gore stands there or Bill Bradley and looks you
in the eye, one of
you or the both of you, and says, Senator McCain, you
said your daughter,
that would be her decision. It would be up to her to
decide, how on Earth
can you represent a party that would take away from
every other American
woman what you would give to your own daughter?

These are folks -- let me finish -- who take a position
that they can't defend
and will then go out and represent us in such a way that
we get defeated by
our opponents. Isn't it time we...

KING: OK. Are we...

KEYES: ... stopped doing this because this doesn't make
any sense?

KING: All right. We owe Senator McCain some time so I'm
going to let him
take the stage.

MCCAIN: I told you this once before, Alan, and I'm sorry
I have to tell you
again; I've seen enough killing in my life, a lot more
than you have. I know --
I know how valuable and precious human life is, and I
will not listen to your
lectures about how I should treat this very important
issue of the sanctity of

human life. So, I hope you'll give me the respect that I
give you and do not
bring, please, my daughter into it.

It's a family decision. Thank you very much.

KEYES: See, but it's a family decision...

(APPLAUSE)

Excuse me. Let's be fair. MCCAIN: Thank you very much.

KEYES: Let's be fair to the American people, Senator.

MCCAIN: Hold it. Thank you very much. Let's leave my
daughter out of it
please.

KEYES: Let's be fair to the American people. You are
taking a position. I'm
a pro-life person. That pro-life position applies to
women who are daughters
and who are wives.

KING: And who are raped.

KEYES: We had better be able to stand before the
American people and
justify what we stand for in applying to my daughter and
your daughter and
everybody's daughter.

KING: I've got to get a break.

KEYES: And if you're not willing to do it, you can't
defend our position.

KING: We've got to get a break. Alan -- Alan, got to get
a break.

We'll be right back with more. We have a half-hour to
go. And by the way,
Jeff Greenfield will moderate a panel talking about what
you're watching.
Don't go away.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

KING: We're back on this special LARRY KING LIVE
election 2000
edition, coming to you from Seawell's Banquet Center in
Columbia, South
Carolina under the auspices of BIPEC, the South Carolina
Business and

Industry Political Education Committee.

Senator McCain, much has been made in these past debates about tax proposals -- yours and George Bush's -- and we know that Alan Keyes is against the tax.

Would you simply for me, what's the essential difference between your's and the governor's?

MCCAIN: We have two surpluses, one that goes into the Social Security trust fund. There's \$2 trillion there. If George Bush or Alan Keyes, or Donald Duck were president of the United States, there would be \$2 trillion in there because that's the payroll tax that people pay. Then we have the other non-Social Security surplus.

I want a balanced approach. A working families tax cut -- Governor Bush has 38 percent of his tax cut go to the wealthiest one percent of Americans -- pay down the debt, Social Security and Medicare.

If we're going to save Social Security, we've got to take a bunch of the non-Social Security surplus, pump it into the Social Security system, because we all know that it's going broke. If we do that, then people can then invest part of their own payroll taxes in investments of their choice.

The difference between Governor Bush's proposal and mine, is that I put a whole lot of money into Social Security, Medicare and paying down the debt. He puts a whole lot of money into tax cuts.

And that's the difference.

KING: And why, before he responds, is reducing the debt more important than a tax cut?

MCCAIN: Because we'd lay this obligation on another generation of young Americans -- \$3.6 trillion. At town hall meeting after town hall meeting, I have average Americans stand up to me and say to me,

Senator McCain, all
these years of running deficits, we've accumulated this
debt. We're paying
more interest -- as much interest, almost, on it as we
are in spending on
national defense. We ought to pay down that debt, and
not saddle the next
generation of young Americans with it.

KING: One of the problems in selling that, though, is
the debt doesn't call
you. The debt doesn't bug you today, right?

MCCAIN: Look...

KING: Right? I mean, it didn't...

MCCAIN: Look, Alan Greenspan just recently said we
shouldn't have these
massive tax cuts like Governor Bush is proposing. We
should pay down the
debt. But working families need the tax cut.

KING: Governor?

MCCAIN: What Alan Greenspan said, is if it's possible to
discipline
Congress to pay down the debt, that's fine. But short of
being able to
discipline Congress -- which I don't think we can do --
that we ought to
have a tax cut. That's exactly what Alan Greenspan said.

Now my plan is this. There is a \$4 trillion projected
surplus. \$2 trillion of it
goes, as John mentioned, to Social Security -- which by
the way, pays down
debt in the Social Security system. We retire \$2
trillion of debt. I spent
about half of that -- the remaining -- on tax cuts, and
half of it as a cushion,
perhaps more debt repayment, perhaps emergency spending.

The difference between our plans is, I know who's money
it is we're dealing
with. We're dealing with the government -- we're dealing
with the people's
money, not the government's money. And I want to give
people their money
back.

And if you're going to have a tax cut, everybody ought
to have a tax cut.
This kind of Washington, D.C., view about targeted tax

cuts is tax cuts
driven by polls and focus groups. If you pay taxes in
America, you ought to
get a tax cut. Under my plan, if you're a family of four
in South Carolina,
making \$50,000, you get 50-percent tax cut. I've reduced
the lower rate
from 15 percent to 10 percent, which does this -- and
this is important.

There are people on the outskirts of poverty, like
single moms who are
working the toughest job in America. If she has two
kids, and making
\$22,000, for every additional dollar she earns, she pays
a higher marginal
rate on her taxes than someone making \$200,000.

You bet I cut the taxes at the top. That encourages
entrepreneurship. What
we Republicans should stand for is growth in the
economy. We ought to
make the pie higher.

BUSH: But I also hear those voices, Larry, I hear those
voices on the
outskirts of poverty. And I've got a plan that says to
her, We're going to
reduce the tolls to the middle class. That's what we're
saying. We reduce
their high marginal rate.

If somebody's working hard, they ought to put more money
in their pocket.
And there's a fundamental difference of opinion.

So my plan saves and strengthens Social Security. It
pays down debt. But it
recognizes the most risky proposition is to leave money
to be spent in
Washington, D.C.

KING: The person making \$1 million a year gets what kind
of reduction?

BUSH: Goes from 39.6 to 33 percent. But by far the
most...

MCCAIN: It's \$50,000.

BUSH: Let me finish please. But by far the vast majority
of my tax cuts go to
the bottom end of the spectrum. And this language about
Governor Bush's
only has tax cuts for the rich, sounds exactly like Al

Gore.

MCCAIN: See, that's what he took offense of when I talked about Bill Clinton.

But let me just make one comment. It's not -- it's not the Washington mentality, it's the grown-up mentality. It's the grown-up mentality that recognizes that we have obligations and we've got to pay them off.

Again -- again, George says that if it come in Washington, Congress might do something about it -- assume it might spend it. Assuming that the president of the United States is a hapless bystander.

Right now Bill Clinton is forcing the Congress of the United States, with threats of veto and shutdown of the government, to spend more money. I, as president of the United States, will force with vetoes and threats of shutdown, the government to pay less. And I believe that's what a president can do...

BUSH: Excuse me. Let me say one thing else. MCCAIN: And I -- if they override my veto, I'll make them famous.

BUSH: (OFF-MIKE) he had a long time.

MCCAIN: Because I can stop it. I won't be a hapless bystander. I won't say Congress will just spend the money.

BUSH: Let me stop

KING: Alan has got to go yet.

BUSH: ... one thing and then he can speak. That shows the difference in mentality. I don't trust Congress, I trust people. And I want to give people their money back. This is a realistic plan that I am going to get done.

And John, you know, grown-up or non-grown-up. You know -- I know that's kind of a line you're trying to come across with.

KING: Pretty good one.

BUSH: No. It's weak.

KING: That sounds pretty good.

BUSH: Weak. Either you trust the people or you trust government. And our Republican Party ought to stand for trusting the people to spend their own money. To give people -- the taxes are the highest they've been since World War II.

Sorry.

KEYES: Don't apologize. Because I actually think that last sentiment is exactly right.

BUSH: Thank you.

KEYES: Don't trust the people, trust the government. The only problem is, if you really...

BUSH: No, trust the people.

KEYES: If you really -- no, if you're going to -- right.

(LAUGHTER)

BUSH: You should trust the people. Yes.

KEYES: Trust the people, yes. If you're going to trust the people then why have this debate in which you have two folks arguing over how they're going to use their gatekeeper role to determine how much of your own money you get to keep? That's what the income tax system does to America.

It is not the system our founding fathers put in place. The system they put in place as compatible with the status of a truly free people, is a system where you go out, you earn \$100, you bring that hundred dollars home, and until you decide what to do with it the government doesn't get a look at it. Let me finish.

KING: And who lights your street lamp?

KEYES: You don't -- let me finish -- you don't wait for the government to -- you don't have to wait for some politician to give you your tax cut. By avoiding expenditures on the taxed items out there you will be able to avoid the tax. Why? Because under that original Constitution the government was funded with tariffs, duties and excise taxes, sales taxes, that you don't pay on your income. And since you don't pay them on your income, by the way, you don't get into this humiliating business of having these politicians arguing over how much of your own money you get to keep and you don't...

KING: Do any of you favor excise taxes?

KEYES: Let me finish. You didn't interrupt their description of their plan, don't interrupt mine.

KING: Yes, because they're owed so time and you're not.

(LAUGHTER)

KEYES: One last question, because it's also true, though...

MCCAIN: How surprising.

KEYES: ... it's also true, you don't have this humiliating business of politicians arguing over how much money you get to keep. And you are also put in a position finally where you control every last dollar of your own money and you have the first use of it. That's what we should be debating over...

KING: We started the...

KEYES: ... they shouldn't have this control they're arguing about.

KING: I started the tax cut with Senator McCain, this question will be for the governor.

The governor of Illinois, a supporter of yours, has stopped all executions in

his state, discovering that people were freed for not
doing the crime -- they
got out because of DNA.

Can we assume that that's a pretty good idea if DNA is
proving people -- a
lot of people have been released from prison, from
death-row, that you
should curtail executions in Texas?

BUSH: None.

KING: No?

BUSH: No. I've presided over executions in my state. I'm
actually
convinced that everybody who was convicted was guilty of
the crime.

KING: Are you...

BUSH: Let me finish.

KING: ... convinced that everybody on death-row now is
guilty?

BUSH: That we'll adjudicate those cases when they come
up for...

KING: But what if someone isn't?

BUSH: Let me finish. If someone isn't, they should be
put to death.

KING: Well, but...

BUSH: Let me finish. Let me finish. We've had a series
of people executed
in my state. These are people who were found guilty by a
jury of their peers.
These are people who have had full access to the courts
of law. There's no
doubt in my mind that each person who's been executed in
our state was
guilty of the crime committed.

I support the death penalty for this reason: When the
death penalty is
administered in a shift and sure and fair way, it will
save lives. It will save
lives.

KING: Well, let's say an innocent is electrocuted.

BUSH: No one has been executed...

KING: But Illinois knows that...

BUSH: Well, if that's the case, then that's fine for the governor to do what he did. You're asking -- I'm the governor of Texas. I presided... KING: If you found...

BUSH: ... over executions in my state.

KING: If DNA got some people off Texas -- off the death row...

BUSH: Then we would examine every case on death row. But you're asking me...

KING: If we...

BUSH: You're asking me about the people who have been put to death in my state and this...

KING: And you know they all did it.

BUSH: Yes, absolutely.

KING: How do you stand on this?

MCCAIN: Oh, I think that the new technology of DNA would, I think, provoke a review, clearly, of cases that may be questionable, but I certainly wouldn't abandon the death penalty. But if there is evidence that maybe there is some controversy where a DNA, with this new technology, could help authenticate the fact that the person was guilty of the crime committed, there's nothing wrong with that.

But I think it's important that we recognize that the death penalty is an appropriate punishment for some crimes.

KING: Do you agree?

KEYES: I think that's absolutely right.

KING: Even though...

KEYES: I think in fact the death penalty is required if

we're to show proper
respect for life in the morality that we inculcate
through the law.

The law has to be the first educator, and the death
penalty is part of
educating people that there's an absolute line you
shouldn't cross.

KING: All right, hopscotching to some other things, what
do you think about
racial profiling, Governor?

BUSH: Against it.

KING: And if you were president, you would sign that
executive order that
would...

BUSH: I would work with state police authorities to make
sure they don't
racially profile.

MCCAIN: Of course, of course, but let me point out now
that we had some
people come across our -- or try to come across our
border -- that were
terrorists. If you can specifically identify a suspect,
and have the drawing that
-- the description then clearly, you will want to stop
people that fit that
description.

KING: But you don't stop everyone with a turban or a...

MCCAIN: But you don't stop -- you don't stop everybody
just for any
reason. But let's be clear. The security of our borders
was nearly violated a
short time ago, and we have to be far more vigilant than
we've been in the
past.

KING: Alan?

KEYES: I know everybody thinks that this doing some
favor to a racial
group, but if our police and enforcement people have the
experience that a
given crime is disproportionately being committed by
folks from a given
ethnic group, we are now going to pass a law that says
you can't notice that?

I -- I...

KING: But they haven't done the crime yet.

KEYES: Excuse me, no, no. All I'm saying is we're going to pass a law and we're going to enforce a law that says that we can't notice the characteristics of individuals who commit crimes and develop profiles to help folks pursue the solving of crimes based on our experience.

Experience by the way is not prejudice. Prejudice is an opinion you form apart from experience, prior to experience. An opinion formed based on experience is not prejudice. It is judgment. And I think our law enforcement officers ought to be able to...

KING: You wouldn't mind being stopped by a car if there was a high prevalence of...

KEYES: You know the person I would blame for that? If there are black folks out there disproportionately committing certain kinds of crime, my parents raised me to know that I represent the race in every thing I do. And I wish that everybody would take that attitude and stop committing crimes and doing things that bring a bad reputation on to people.

KING: But if you were stopped...

KEYES: That's what I resent.

KING: ... if you were stopped you wouldn't be angry?

KEYES: I just told you who I would be angry at.

BUSH: We had -- we had an advance man of mine, an Hispanic guy in the state -- earlier primary state -- I'm not going to tell you which one -- who got stopped. And he got stopped because he was in the wrong part of town evidently. And I didn't appreciate that.

Now you know, this...

MCCAIN: George is right. Some bad things have happened.

They should
be stopped.

KING: All right. This conservative-liberal thing, are
you saying John McCain
is a liberal?

BUSH: No, I'm not.

KING: Well, you mentioned conservative lie, implying
that he is not...

BUSH: No, I'm not implying anything. John -- John McCain
can define his
own positions, and I'll define mine.

KING: Do you think he is a conservative?

BUSH: Yes. I also think he's a fine man.

KING: Why mention conservative in a race where
everybody's
conservative?

BUSH: Because I'm more conservative on certain issues.

MCCAIN: Because we all...

(LAUGHTER)

... we don't like to go around portraying ourselves as
liberals.

(LAUGHTER)

That's number one.

BUSH: You see, let me say something about all this
business. And you
know -- and I know, your taking umbrage of John, and
arguing. But the
truth of the matter is, what we're trying to do is to
nominate somebody to
end the Clinton era. That's exactly what we're in the
process of doing. Our
objective is to end the Clinton era in Washington, D.C.
And that's what this
primary is all about. And one of us is going to emerge.
One of us is going to
emerge.

And the objective has got to breathe some common sense
and integrity into
Washington, D.C. That's what the primary's all about.

KEYES: That is wonderful, you know.

KING: No, let John go, so we can get squared on time.
John.

MCCAIN: I believe that...

KING: By the way I call you by your first names. Forgive
me, but I know
you all so well, and so long, that sometimes it slips. I
don't say Governor. I
don't say Ambassador. I don't say Senator.

BUSH: We won't hold it against you.

KING: OK, thank you.

(LAUGHTER)

MCCAIN: Please call me Senator.

(LAUGHTER)

Or Your Highness. Look, George Bush is a good man. Alan
Keyes is a
good man. We have some differences of opinion. This
campaign spiraled
down. I want the negativism out of it. The people of
South Carolina deserve
better than what they're getting, and we want to lift up
America, and not tear
down people.

But let me just say, I'm a proud conservative.

I believe that my two opponents are proud conservatives.
But what this is
really all about is articulation of a vision for the
future of this country and how
we'll lead it. No one knows what challenges we face,
both foreign and
domestic, as we go into the next century. And I think
this campaign is all
about vision.

KING: Do you think you've been labeled liberal?

MCCAIN: Well, I've been labeled everything except -- I
think they missed
fascist.

(LAUGHTER)

But this is -- listen, ask observers, this is probably
the nastiest campaign that
people have seen in a long time. But look, I'm enjoying
it. This is a great and
exhilarating experience.

KING: But you are...

BUSH: John, you're...

MCCAIN: I'm Luke Skywalker getting out of the Death
Star.

BUSH: John, if I look...

(CROSSTALK)

BUSH: John, hey John, one thing is...

MCCAIN: I'm having a lot of fun this campaign. And I'm
enjoying it very,
very much.

BUSH: Listen, you're playing the victim here. Wait a
minute. Remember
who called who untrustworthy.

MCCAIN: You remember who made the first ad that said I
was going to
raise taxes by \$40 billion, George.

KEYES: Can I make a substantive remark here?

(LAUGHTER)

I would like -- I would like...

BUSH: Please do. Please do so.

KEYES: Excuse me. The rhetoric sounds good about ending
the Clinton era
and not -- and let everybody be called conservative. But
words have no
meaning if you can apply those words to things so
radically different that they
have no similarities. So let's not disrespect the
language.

And I find it hard to believe one is going to end the Clinton era by
continuing
his policies of "don't ask, don't tell" in the military,
continuing his trade
policies toward the World Trade Organization and China
and so forth and

so on, basically continuing federal domination of education, continuing the income tax system. We have folks calling themselves conservative all over the map who are just going to continue the same junk we get from the Clinton administration.

KING: All right.

KEYES: What's the point of the label?

KING: Does it annoy you that the president's performance rating is high?
Character rating low, performance rating high.

BUSH: It doesn't amaze me.

KING: It doesn't.

BUSH: I mean, it doesn't annoy me, it amazes me. It amazes me.

KING: You mean because people think he's doing a good job amazes you.

BUSH: Yes. It must be the Dow Jones industrial average. There's much more to life than the Dow Jones industrial average.

KING: Two percent unemployment?

BUSH: The Dow Jones industrial average is high, but there's a lot of people wondering whether or not the future in America belongs to them. Our failed schools are creating two societies in this country, and we better have a president to do something about it. And if you're suggesting I'm going to federalize the education system like you have, you don't know my plan, you just don't know my plan.

KING: How do you explain -- how do you explain the performance?

MCCAIN: I explain it because we are in such incredibly prosperous economic times. But there are also polls that show, for example, 54 percent of the American people are suffering from, quote, "Clinton fatigue." And as fast and as far as the vice president wants to run away

from him, there's an
old saying that you might remember about Joe Louis said
about Billy Cohn
(ph), and this is true about Al Gore: He can run, but he
can't hide.

KING: Do you -- all of you, expect a tough race in
November, is that
correct? I mean...

BUSH: Well, let me say one other thing about Clinton.
There's not a lot of
mothers and dads naming their sons Bill Clinton.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: All right, I want to -- I want to -- we've got
about 10 minutes left...

MCCAIN: Jefferson, perhaps.

(LAUGHTER) BUSH: Yes.

KING: We've got about 10 minutes left, and I'm going to
give each of you a
kind of minute and a half to wind things up. So in these
final moments, just
some hopscotching for topics around the world.

Mideast, Jerusalem, should it be the capital of Israel?

BUSH: Yes.

KING: Yes? KEYES: I think we ought to recognize it, yes.

MCCAIN: Immediately. And that'll make the peace process
much simpler.

KING: Simpler?

MCCAIN: Sure. Because as soon as the Palestinians and
others know
exactly where that capital is, then it'll be off the
table.

KING: Should the United States be involved in trying to
settle -- not with
arms -- disputes?

KEYES: Yes, absolutely. We should show that leadership.

KING: We should have been involved in Ireland and
England and...

KEYES: I think it's part of the role we play, given our position in the world, yes. Where we can play it constructively, we ought to do it.

MCCAIN: I give Senator George Mitchell and the Clinton administration credit for a fine job in Northern Ireland.

Not any place else in the world that I can think of. But sure we should.

And again, I want to point out that being made world's number one superpower has great luxuries, it also has great responsibilities and we have to understand those.

KING: Will you...

BUSH: Actually, unfortunately, the Mitchell effort was a good effort but it's falling apart and -- but I think we ought to work to keep the peace. And the danger is is that a president who worries about his standing in the polls will try to impose an American solution. For example, in the Middle East, we can't have that. In order for there to be a real peace, both parties must agree to the terms, they must come to an agreement amongst themselves. And so, the role of the United States is to encourage and to mediate.

KING: Are you saying that as president the polls won't matter? BUSH: They shouldn't matter. I mean, I'm talking about whether or not somebody, you know, is trying to earn a Nobel Peace Prize; and, therefore, take our friends and demand that our friends accept something that's unacceptable to their people. We can't be a -- we can't dictate the terms of the peace and we must lead the process to achieve peace.

KING: Does public opinion count?

MCCAIN: As president of the United States, on a foreign policy issue, I will never take a poll. If in June of 1950, when North Korea attacked South Korea, if Harry Truman had taken a poll, we'd have never

gone; that was an
important chapter in our winning the Cold War.

I will never take a poll. In the most obscene chapter in
recent American
history is the conduct of the Kosovo conflict when the
president of the
United States refused to prepare for ground operations,
refused to have air
power used effectively because he wanted them flying --
he had them flying
at 15,000 feet where they killed innocent civilians
because they were
dropping bombs from such -- in high altitude.

No, I will never, ever take a poll on a matter of
national security.

KEYES: Well, I don't take polls in politics now, so I
certainly wouldn't be
taking polls in foreign policy. But I would say this,
though. I hope that by
that, you don't mean to imply that the president doesn't
have a responsibility
to develop a sound base of political support in this
country for his foreign
policy.

In Vietnam, we learned the horrid results that occur
when you don't have
that kind of presidential leadership.

So polls, no polls -- you do have a responsibility to
represent the American
people, and to persuade them of what you are doing in
foreign policy, and
not to commit them to war unless they support you in it.

KING: We discussed the nuclear question earlier. Are any
of you in favor of
reduction of nuclear arms?

BUSH: Not yet.

KING: No?

BUSH: I want to make sure the Russians comply with SALT.

MCCAIN: No, because we need to continue the triad.
Before we break
one of those legs, we'd better be pretty sure that
they're not necessary. But
we do need to pursue weapons -- we do need to pursue
ballistic defense

systems.

And I want to say, I'm going to call some admirals and
generals over, and
some civilian secretaries over to the White House, and
knock some heads
together. We need more progress on this missile defense
system.

BUSH: Well, it's a failure of leadership in the Clinton
administration. They
just don't want to put something in place.

KING: Tax the Internet?

BUSH: I think we need to keep a moratorium in place. We
don't know what
the world is going to look like three to five years from
now. And I think we
ought to keep the moratorium in place.

KEYES: I'd keep the moratorium in place for a while. But
I also would
forewarn people that commerce on the Internet -- once
the whole thing gets
established, and you have the infrastructure and base
for it, is going to be
taxed. I think it's unfair to lie to folks about that,
because eventually, as
enough commerce moves into that arena, don't tell me the
politicians will
resist it, because they won't.

MCCAIN: As president of the United States, I will veto
any bill that crosses
my desk that reinstitutes the sales tax.

We've got to make it permanent so these people that are
making huge and
massive investments in the Internet will have the
confidence that it won't be
taxed.

Look we can't choke this baby in the cradle. I don't
care about these
governors. We're talking about the engine of
America's...

(LAUGHTER)

... economy. And they ought to understand that. They're
running surpluses.

They ought to get their greedy hands off it so that
American economy can

grow and develop as it should...

BUSH: Are you suggesting that governors are greedy?

(LAUGHTER)

KEYES: It's the not the governors. The governors are speaking for a lot of people out there, working in the non-virtual marketplace who are going to look at it awfully strangely that they're operating a little store in their town and they're going to be taxed, but somebody who goes out to the Internet, once it is established, isn't going to be taxed. I see no grounds for it.

KING: Do you...

KEYES: Once it is established we should treat it like any other business.

BUSH: There should be no access tax on the Internet -- there should be no federal tax on the Internet...

MCCAIN: No state tax...

BUSH: Wait a minute. What we need to do is make sure we understand before we say something like that, that we know where the world is headed. We're just learning and that's why the moratorium is important...

MCCAIN: We've learned enough...

KING: We're close on time. Do you -- do you gentlemen think that inherently that any American is entitled to get a prescription?

BUSH: Inherently any American is entitled?

KING: Yes, in other words that -- entitled. In other words, if someone needs a drug...

BUSH: Inherently, what our elderly need is a modern Medicare plan that will provide prescription drug benefits, just like federal employees get.

KING: Does everybody -- in other words, do you feel

everybody who
needs a prescription should get it?

BUSH: Do I feel that health care ought to be affordable
and accessible?

Yes, I do. But it's not going to be affordable and
accessible if we have an Al
Gore or a Bill Clinton try to nationalize health care.

KEYES: I think you have to be very careful because if
you say that, then
that means that somebody else, whether they're paid or
not, is obliged to
provide that prescription drug.

KING: Yes, but you don't want to let someone die.

KEYES: Excuse me. Excuse me, but that's slave labor,
sir. I think we need a
market-oriented system that is going to provide access
and benefits to all.
And that's what I would work to achieve.

MCCAIN: Every American should have access to health
insurance. But
we've got a big problem in America right now, and that's
seniors who can't
afford prescription drugs. And we've got to address that
right now. And if it
requires a government program, then I'll support a
government program to
do that.

KING: What's going to happen Saturday in Carolina?

BUSH: Right here?

KEYES: We're going to have an election.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: No, I mean, are you going to win?

BUSH: Yes, I am going to win. And the reason why is
because the people
have heard my message. That I'm coming with a message of
-- as a reformer
who's gotten positive results in education, in welfare,
in business growth.

KING: Alan, how're you going to do?

KEYES: It's in God's hands. I have no...

(LAUGHTER)

KING: If he turns you down, do you get mad at him?

KEYES: God doesn't turn you down. He just does the right thing in his way instead of yours.

KING: Senator McCain?

MCCAIN: We're going to do just fine. I think, we're going to do just fine.

KING: What does that mean?

MCCAIN: I think we're probably going to win. I think it's going to be close.

But really, you know, when you talk about reform, the key to reform is getting the government out of the hands of the special interests. And you've got to have a real campaign finance reform plan, not one that leaves a \$1 billion loophole.

KING: We have exactly three and a half minutes left. A minute each. Alan, anything you want to say?

KEYES: Well, I think it's just very important that Republicans go to the polls and vote their heart and conscience. I've been hearing from too many people that they think I say the right things, I represent the right vision for the country, it is the way we ought to go, we need to restore our moral priorities, our allegiance to the principle that our rights come from God and must be exercised with respect for the authority of God, reclaim our liberties, abolish the income tax, get school choice in place in a comprehensive way. And now I ask, You going to vote for me? No.

You never get what you want if you don't vote for what you believe in. If you don't have the guts to vote your conscience, then this country will never get back on the right track.

KING: Governor Bush?

BUSH: Well, I want to thank all my friends here in South Carolina. There have been a lot of folks who have worked hard on my behalf. They've heard my message that if you're sick and tired of the gridlock in Washington, let's bring a leader into Washington, D.C. If your tired of this business about pitting one group of people against another, why don't we have a uniter, not a divider as a leader? If you want somebody who's going to have an agenda that is positive and hopeful and optimistic; a growth agenda for our economy, a peace agenda for the world, an education agenda that refuses to leave children behind, they're hearing that call. They're saying, We want Government Bush.

And so I want to thank the people of this state and I want to ask for the vote. I want you to go out to the polls on my behalf on Saturday and vote for me. And if you're for me, take some friends and neighbors with you.

(LAUGHTER)

KING: Senator McCain?

MCCAIN: I want to thank the people of South Carolina for their wonderful and warm reception, and friendships that we have made here -- the town hall meetings, the trips all around the state have been truly marvelous.

I want to reform the government, obviously. I want to reform education, the military, health care. I can't do that unless we get the government out of the hands of the special interests. Some have come lately to the reform agenda. I've been there for years, and I've been fighting it and we'll win as we've won on other reform issues.

But most of all, I'd like to end up by recounting a story that happened at my 100th town hall meeting in New Hampshire. A lady stood up and she looked me in the eye and she didn't have a question. She said, Senator

McCain, it's vitally important to me that the next president of the United States always tell me the truth. I promise you as president of the United States, based on my life, my principles and the caution of my old dear friends, I will always tell you the truth, no matter what.

KING: You'd take the same oath?

BUSH: Absolutely.

KEYES: Of course.

KING: We want to thank everyone here. The South Carolina Business and Industry Political Education Committee, BIPEC, for putting this thing together in extraordinary circumstances. We want to thank Senator McCain and Ambassador Keyes and Governor Bush. Want to thank Seawell's Banquet Center here in Columbia. Want to urge you to vote on Saturday if you live in South Carolina. There are two big primaries coming next week too: Michigan and Arizona. Please vote there.

Also stay tuned as Jeff Greenfield will moderate a panel following this debate about this debate.

From Columbia, South Carolina, for all the folks here in the room, for our candidates, thank you very much for joining us. I'm Larry King. Good night.

(APPLAUSE)

END