

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: slate8-errors+stone_cf+a1.eop.gov@bounce.exactis.com@INET@LNGTWY (slate8-errors+stone_cf+a1.eop.gov@bounce.exactis.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-DEC-1999 15:33:38.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS QUIZ: Thurs., Dec. 16, 1999

TO: Charles F. Stone@EOP (Charles F. Stone@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

SLATE NEWS QUIZ: Thurs., Dec. 16, 1999

--news quiz: Thursday's Question (No. 355) "Top Eleven List"

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

SHOP ONLINE THIS HOLIDAY SEASON AND BENEFIT YOUR FAVORITE CHARITY

Get your holiday shopping done at GreaterGood.com and 5 percent to 15 percent of the sale benefits your charity of choice. With over 70 leading e-tailers including: Amazon, eToys, jcrew, officemax and cooking.com. Check out daily specials here: http://giftreminder.msn.com/msnlink/slate_store.asp or go to <http://www.greatergood.com> to learn how to benefit your charity of choice each time you shop.

news quiz

Thursday's Question (No. 355) "Top Eleven List"

By Randy Cohen

"It suspiciously tracks the Ten Commandments," says ACLU lawyer Kenneth Falk about the 11 rules the Scott County, Ind., School District intends to post in every classroom. Name one of these "Common Precepts to Promote a Virtuous and Civil School Community."

Deadline for e-mail submissions, Sunday., 5 p.m. ET.
[mailto: newsquiz@slate.com](mailto:newsquiz@slate.com)

Wednesday's Question (No. 354) "You're a Dead Man, Charlie Brown"

After drawing Peanuts for nearly 50 years, Charles Schulz, 77 and ailing, is putting down his pen. Participants are invited to describe his final strip. (Question courtesy of Jon Delfin.)

READERS' ANSWERS

"Both Schroeder and Peppermint Patty come out of the closet as Schulz admits his 'don't ask, don't tell' policy was a failure."--Ken Novak (Chris Kelly had a similar answer.)

"A cavalcade of guest 'Farewell, Charlie Brown' appearances by Mike Doonesbury, Garfield, Dilbert, Beetle Bailey, Blondie and Dagwood, and the inevitable Regis Philbin."--Gary Frazier

"The whole Peanuts gang bands together and kicks Garfield's sorry ass."--Tim Carvell

"Charlie Brown is wheeled into surgery at Sloan-Kettering. Snoopy muses on what life will be like without the boy with the crooked smile. Back in the surgical unit, the doctors prepare to give Charlie Brown his first round of chemotherapy. Lucy comes running in, and kicks the needle out of the doctors hands."--Larry Amoros

"Charlie Brown wakes up in bed with Suzanne Pleshette and discovers it's all been a horrible dream. Either that or the ASPCA euthanizes Snoopy."--Jon Hotchkiss (similarly, Tim Carvell)

(Go to http://www.slate.com/newsquiz/entries/99-12-16_65233.asp after 4:30 p.m. PT to read more readers' answers.)

RANDY'S WRAP-UP

I liked Peanuts. (It is difficult to be funny in praise of anything, so if you want your little laughs, leave off here and go peruse those newly released medical record with their vivid--a little too vivid--description of the polyps Al Gore doesn't have in his colon. I'll meet you there later. I'll bring the sandwiches.) For 50 years, with impressive economy of line and language, Schulz avoided the dimwitted rhythm of setup/lackluster punch line that defined comic strips and would soon dominate TV sitcoms. Unlike most strips, his was about adults, albeit adults depicted as children. And still more unusual, he was not concerned with the follies and foibles of everyday life, that least interesting comic subject, but something deeper, darker, and less ephemeral. Along with Mad magazine, he provided comedy to my suburban boyhood--Schulz the philosophical and Mad the topical--at just the right intellectual level for a suburban boy. And if he sometimes wandered into whimsy--that alluring comic swamp--and even farther, into mawkish sentimentality with "Happiness Is a Warm Puppy," he more often executed that most difficult comic turn, being simultaneously funny and sweet. Few can. Thurber, Woody Allen, and Mark O'Donnell come to mind. But not many more. I'll miss the strip.

HAPPINESS IS A WARM ANSWER

We can, of course, only speculate. Schulz works about six weeks ahead; the final daily installment will run Jan. 3; the last new Sunday strip will be published Feb. 13.

The first Peanuts appeared Oct., 2, 1950. It now runs in 2,600 newspapers, reaching about 355 million readers daily in 75 countries.

FUN WITH SUBJECTS AND PREDICATES ONGOING EXTRA

Simply by swapping subjects and objects from a pair of actual headlines, you can eliminate the bad news that fills our front pages, and create a happier world, as in these examples using headlines from Excite.com.

* Billy Crystal To Host Chechen Capital Russian Troops Pound Oscars

* U.S. Officials Warn of Saturday Night Live Skit Protest Forces NBC To Shelve West Nile Virus Return

* Polanski Bad for Elderly; Health-Study Philadelphia Water Feted by French Academie

And, while it deviates entirely from the form, there is this holiday cheer:

*Garth Brooks May Retire Next Year

PARTICIPANTS ARE INVITED TO SUBMIT SIMILAR MIX 'N' MATCH PAIRS USING HEADLINES FROM ANY NEWS SOURCE. RESULTS TO RUN NEXT WEEK.

COMMON DENOMINATOR

Peppermint Patty, Marcie: gay.

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

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

The Etymology of "Y2K"

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=12/15/99&idMessage=4203>

Why Global Warming Is Good for Gore

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=12/15/99&idMessage=4195>

Bad Tripp

<http://www.slate.com/Spin/99-12-13/Spin.asp?Show=11/30/99>

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: econ2-errors+stone_cf+a1.eop.gov@bounce.exactis.com@INET@LNGTWY (econ2-errors+stone_cf+a1.eop.gov@bounce.exactis.com@INET@LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-DEC-1999 01:41:37.00

SUBJECT: Politics This Week December 11th - December 17th 1999

TO: Charles F. Stone@EOP (Charles F. Stone@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Welcome to Politics This Week

A summary of the world's main events from The Economist

Also available at <http://www.economist.com>

IN THE ECONOMIST THIS WEEK

A special Christmas issue including: Our admissions of goofs and clangers

*

Why British irony is terribly important * High seas piracy * How the business of parties works * When and why size matters in sports * A survey of the wine industry

Russians vote for a new parliament on December 19th, but ignore the war in Chechnya * Behind the scenes many online retailers are badly run businesses

* How much does Hillary Clinton need Bill? * How to tackle cults in Japan

*

Who is afraid of the Millennium bug? * How to see planets far far away

You can read these articles, and many more, in the free area of The Economist Web Edition, at <http://www.economist.com>. Subscribers get 50 more

new articles each week.

*

Sign up for Politics This Week in web-format, complete with colour charts, photographs and links to top stories on the website.

To receive the free new version of this newsletter, go to http://www.economist.com/tfs/registration_tframeset.html. and click on "Amend your details". (If you are not yet a registered user, click on "Register now".)

*

Golan peace?

- + Peace talks between SYRIA AND ISRAEL started in Washington. Israel was represented by its prime minister, Ehud Barak; Syria by its foreign minister, Farouk Sharaa. Mr Barak was given the Knesset's blessing by a narrow majority but settlers from the Golan Heights, demonstrating against withdrawal, got widespread support.
- + In the power struggle between Sudan's President Omar Bashir and the influential speaker of parliament, Hassan Turabi, the president declared a STATE OF EMERGENCY and dissolved parliament days before it was due to vote on changes to the constitution that would have reduced his powers.
- + Rebel fighters in the west of UGANDA staged a new wave of attacks, forcing the UN to halt deliveries of food to 100,000 displaced people.
- + In its annual report, the UN CHILDREN'S FUND said that 600m children continue to live in poverty.
- + The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa REFUSED AMNESTY for Eugene de Kock, who was jailed for 262 years for several murders.

In from the cold

- + Japan LIFTED SANCTIONS against North Korea, saying food aid and diplomatic ties would resume. They were imposed last year after the country launched a rocket over Japanese territory.
- + Rebels in SRI LANKA, which goes to the polls next week, attacked government military bases in the country's north, capturing three. The government lost huge swathes of territory in fighting last month.
- + PAKISTAN's central bank ordered all funds and property held in the country by the Taliban movement to be seized.
- + Sectarian fighting in Indonesia's MOLUCCA ISLANDS broke out just two days after President Abdurrahman Wahid had appealed for calm.

Don't agree

- + In his sharpest break yet with Bill Clinton's policies, Vice-President AL GORE, who is running for the Democratic presidential nomination, said Mr Clinton's "Don't ask, don't tell" policy, designed to ease the way for homosexuals in the armed forces, had not worked. Hillary Clinton, just days before, had told her husband the same thing. It was also her sharpest break with him, at least in public.
- + It was announced that nearly 100 people had been EXECUTED in America this year, the highest number since 1951. The latest execution had been delayed for a week while the inmate, who had tried to commit suicide, was nursed back to health.

- + A circuit court in Memphis, Tennessee, ruling in a civil lawsuit brought by the family of MARTIN LUTHER KING, found that King's assassination in 1968 had been the work of mobsters and "several government agencies", not of James Earl Ray.
- + Canada's federal government published a bill aimed at making QUEBEC'S SECESSION harder by defining the procedures any future referendum would have to follow to be considered binding. Quebec's separatist provincial government promised its own counter-law affirming its right to self-determination.
- + Joaquin Lavin, a conservative, did unexpectedly well in CHILE'S PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, winning 47.5% of the vote, only slightly less than the 48% won by Ricardo Lagos of the ruling centre-left coalition. The two will contest a run-off next month.
- + PANAMA formally took control of its canal under the terms of a 1977 treaty with America, at a ceremony attended by Mexico's president, Spain's king and former President Jimmy Carter, but not by any senior American officials.
- + A remote naval base close to Colombia's border with Panama was attacked by FARC GUERRILLAS. They were reported to have killed 45 marines and two others, in the most serious defeat for the armed forces this year.
- + Fernando de la Rúa took office as ARGENTINA'S NEW PRESIDENT, promising a crackdown on corruption and tough fiscal measures to balance Argentina's budget.

Join the club

- + Leaders of the 15-strong EUROPEAN UNION agreed in Helsinki that another seven countries -- Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania, Slovakia and Turkey -- should be recognised as candidates to join the club, along with the six already in the queue: Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia. Despite pleas from other countries in the Union, France refused to lift its ban against British beef, while Britain refused to agree to an EU-wide tax on savings.
- + The German government and industrial groups, negotiating with Jewish lobbies and class-action lawyers, agreed to set up a DM10 billion (\$5.2 billion) compensation fund for NAZI-ERA SLAVE LABOURERS.
- + After protests from western governments, the Russian army extended its deadline to civilians in Grozny, the CHECHEN capital, who had been told to get out by December 11th or risk death in a Russian onslaught. But the Russian army, which has now taken all the main towns in lowland Chechnya, bar Grozny, looked poised for a major attack on the capital.
- + The European Commission's president, ROMANO PRODI, said he would sue media for alleging that he had had improper business dealings in Italy in the 1980s, before he became prime minister.

+ Radu Vasile, ROMANIA's reforming prime minister, who had led a four-party coalition of the centre-right, was forced to resign.

*

ADVERTISEMENT

FREE SHIPPING ON ANY ORDER OVER \$50 FROM WINE.COM
Wine.com, the premier online source for great wine and gourmet gifts, has a great holiday shopping deal for ECONOMIST subscribers! Through December 31, 1999, receive FREE standard shipping on orders of \$50 or more! Click below.

http://www.wine.com/home.jsplink_from=econofseudora=autourl

*

CUSTOMER SERVICE

To stop receiving this newsletter, please send an e-mail with "unsubscribe" in the subject line to politics-off@lists.economist.com

If you are a registered user at The Economist website, you can sign up for or cancel the text and html versions of this newsletter or change your e-mail address by amending your details at:
http://www.economist.com/tfs/registration_tfframeset.html

If you would like to advise us of a new e-mail address and are not registered at The Economist website, please send an e-mail with your request to: economist-newsletters@lists.economist.com

*

This message was powered by [Exactis.com](http://www.Exactis.com)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 07:54:51.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Thurs., Jan. 6, 2000

TO: fernald@post.harvard.edu (fernald@post.harvard.edu [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Thurs., Jan. 6, 2000

--today's papers: Cogito Ergonomics

--international papers: Stormy Weather

today's papers

Cogito Ergonomics

By Eric Roston

The USA Today leads with the INS's decision to return six-year-old Elian Gonzalez to his father in Cuba by Jan. 14. All other papers front the story. The Washington Post goes with Labor Secretary Alexis Herman's backpedaling on an OSHA directive making employers responsible for safety and health violations in employees' home offices. The Wall Street Journal tops its World-Wide box with yesterday's Democratic presidential debate at the University of New Hampshire. The NYT goes local, and off-leads the uncertain status of fighting between Russians and Chechens in Grozny. The LAT, which leads with the governor's State of the State address, off-leads Gonzalez and reefer the Labor Department story.

Officially, the INS judged the case based on law and research, but anonymous officials told the NYT that the administration did not want to damage relations with Cuba when it is trying to forge new contacts there. Justice Department officials indicated they would oppose threatened legal moves by Gonzalez' angry relatives, who are hosting the boy in Miami. No decision has been made on how Elian will be reunited with his father: The INS offered to bring Juan Gonzalez to the States to pick the boy up, but Gonzalez has said it's the Americans' responsibility to bring him home. Gonzalez senior may be under pressure from the Cuban government, the LAT and Post report.

Each story carries President Clinton's boast that his administration has kept the boy's plight "out of politics," but the

two Times dispute that statement. Castro, whose name isn't even mentioned in the Post, is treated with kid gloves in the NYT. Only the LAT reports that Castro has called the situation an abduction. Elian has been roped into someone else's game: He is the center of an "international tug of war" in the WP lede and a front-page LAT caption, and the "center of a political tug-of-war" in the USAT. The NYT turns him into "the central object in a tug-of-war." How can the situation almost unanimously be a political "tug of war" if so little is mentioned of who's tugging on the other end?

A flurry of calls between Labor and the White House resulted in Herman recanting the home office directive, the Post reports. The confusion shows that telecommuting has changed the workplace so, that traditional rules and regulations may no longer apply--or perhaps no one's sure how to apply them. Withdrawing the directive, which first made news Tuesday, may not affect the policy behind it. Almost 20 million people in the US work at home.

The NYT and WP front the S.E.C.'s filing of a civil suit against stock guru Yun Soo Oh Park, "Tokyo Joe" of Internet fame. Park, accused of committing four counts of fraud, is said to have advised followers to buy certain stocks, which he then sold on the sly as their orders lifted the stocks' prices. In 1998, he allegedly accepted 100,000 shares in a cigar maker and Boca Raton deli-owner; in return, he is said to have recommended the stock to his customers, without revealing his relationship to the company. The S.E.C.'s complaint is its most aggressive move yet against an Internet stock wiz.

The NYT, Post (in their business sections), and WSJ report that Amazon.com Inc.'s fourth-quarter revenue, \$650 million, failed to match analysts' "whisper number," which in some circles doubled earlier, published estimates of \$500 million. Stockholders were not impressed: investors beat the stock down 15 percent, lowering its market capitalization by \$4 billion, to \$24 billion.

Coverage of the fourth Bradley-Gore debate is pot luck. The NYT and WSJ dwell on both candidates' strengthening of earlier statements defending gays in the military. The Post summarizes the debate topics as "guns, health, ability" in its headline and mentions Sen. Edward Kennedy's endorsement of Gore in its subhead. The WSJ highlights in its World-Wide column (as opposed to its story) Bradley's accusation that Gore contorted his health care plan by claiming it would hurt minorities. According to the LAT, the debate centered on who might be a stronger president. A NYT front-pager reports that McCain, in the midst of a fight against the power of money in politics, twice in the past couple months urged the FCC to act on an issue that would benefit a major contributor to his campaign.

Chechens claim to have seized a village southwest of Grozny; Russians said the fighters fled the capital in desperation. NYT Moscow bureau chief Michael Gordon reports from North Ossetia, a Russian republic west of Chechnya: "It is impossible to verify

either side's claims since the Russian military has not taken reporters to Chechnya for three days."

Dept. of Misplaced Rhetorical Imagery: In light of last year's school shootings, the LAT lead headline is somewhat startling: "[Governor] Davis Issues a Call to Arms for Better Teachers, Schools." Coincidentally, New York Governor George Pataki, in the NYT lead, outlined changes in practices for recruiting teachers, saying that "right now, Colin Powell can't teach in the New York schools that he grew up in." The LAT story explains that Davis used images of warfare in his State of the State speech to drum up enthusiasm for hiring and training new teachers. The "war for the future," he said, "will be fought school to school, classroom to classroom, desk to desk." Today's Papers knows what he means, but had hoped imagery of classroom warfare might be left in the past.

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

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

Is George W. Bush a "Weak" Governor?

<http://www.slate.com/Code/explainer/explainer.asp?Show=1/5/00&idMessage=4307>

The Case for Placebos

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-03/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

The Week/The Spin: Elian Nation

<http://www.slate.com/Spin/00-01-03/Spin.asp?Show=11/30/99>

international papers

Stormy Weather

By Alexander Chancellor

Several European papers led Wednesday with the stock market declines in the United States and Europe that were partially based on expectations of interest-rate hikes. In an editorial Wednesday on the reappointment of Alan Greenspan as chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, the Financial Times of London said that the move will

reassure investors but questioned whether it is also "the best news

for the long-term management of the US economy." The FT said, [T]o appoint any individual for a fourth term risks over-personalising the institution of the Federal Reserve Bank, and could discourage a

more open debate about policy." La Repubblica of Rome ran a front-page comment Wednesday comparing the reappointment of Greenspan to the Italian peasant tradition of carrying in procession a statue of the Holy Protector to placate the weather. "Yesterday Bill Clinton raised the blessed icon of Alan Greenspan in the world's central square against the sudden and furious storm that is sweeping through the stock markets," it said.

The French papers were more concerned with the real storm that caused huge damage in France in the past week. Le Figaro of Paris led its front page Wednesday with an estimate that the storm will cost the French economy between 60 billion and 70 billion French francs, about 3 percent of the state budget. However, the paper said it could also have positive effects on France's economic growth. According to a report in the Times of London, the storm brought down 270 million trees in France, ranging from 18th-century

oaks in Paris gardens to entire plantations in the Vosges Mountains. The French historian Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie was reported as saying that France's vast woodlands had suffered nothing comparable since detailed records began in the reign of Louis XIV--"Since 1660 at least, there has been no phenomenon on such a vast scale."

In an editorial Wednesday, Le Monde celebrated the first anniversary of the euro, the single European currency. "The event was historic," the paper said. "For the first time, 11 nations agreed to renounce their monetary sovereignty and to share it. Anti-European militants, American experts, and speculators of all kinds had explained for years that the project was impossible. One year later, they must admit they were wrong: the euro exists, it has established itself as one of the world's great currencies and, better still, it has kept most of its promises."

In a gloomy editorial Wednesday, the Moscow Times attacked the legacy of former President Boris Yeltsin and questioned the merits of his successor, Vladimir Putin. "Everyone talks about the Yeltsin

years as the reform years," the paper said. "But the fact is, there

is not a single major reform that was not begun by [former Soviet leader Mikhail] Gorbachev and at least slightly tarnished or rolled

back under Yeltsin. And now, with this less-than-heroic departure--immunity from prosecution tightly in hand--Yeltsin has sealed it that way. Yeltsin's legacy will be like Yeltsin himself, particularly during his second term: inarticulate, confused, self-absorbed, weak."

On Putin, the Moscow Times said there is "a shocking amount of wishful thinking masquerading as analysis." It said his record so far is "dispiriting." He did nothing about scandals at the FSB (the

successor agency to the KGB) when he was its director, and "[a]s prime minister, his only claim to fame has been to seize upon a truly bad situation in Chechnya as an excuse to wage an imperial war, one that punishes civilians in the name of protecting them." In an interview Monday with La Stampa of Turin, Mikhail Gorbachev said Putin would do anything for victory in Chechnya, whatever the cost in human lives. "Putin knows better than anybody that in the event of defeat--or simply of no victory--his position could rapidly deteriorate," Gorbachev said. "So he will do everything to win, at any cost, and whatever the number of deaths." Gorbachev added that Putin is part of the Yeltsin "oligarchy" and will not carry out the reforms that the West hoped for. "The regime will not

change, there will be no fight against corruption," he said. "Above all, the interests and privileges of the oligarchy will be protected."

During World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed to Winston Churchill that Gen. Charles de Gaulle be ousted as leader of the Free French movement and fobbed off with the governorship of

Madagascar, according to a report in the Times of London Wednesday.

The paper was reporting on secret wartime documents just released by the British Public Record Office. They show that neither Roosevelt nor Churchill could stand de Gaulle. In a May 1943 "personal and most secret" memo to Churchill, Roosevelt called de Gaulle's attitude "well-nigh intolerable" and accused him of stirring up vicious propaganda in North Africa and attempting to cause strife between the Arabs and the Jews in Algiers. When visiting Washington, Churchill fired off a series of telegrams to his government colleagues in London, proposing in one of them that de Gaulle be "eliminated" as a political force. He called the general a "vain and even malignant man," and added, "He hates England and has left a trail of Anglophobia behind everywhere." Roosevelt was a little kinder. "De Gaulle may be an honest man, but

he has the messianic complex," he wrote.

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

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

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

SLATE offers a variety of e-mail delivery services that enable you to get your favorite SLATE articles delivered right to your in-box.

Go to <http://www.slate.com/Code/Reg3/emailservices.asp> to see what's available.

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anne W. Bovaird (CN=Anne W. Bovaird/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 14:58:24.00

SUBJECT: remarks of the President and Mrs. Clinton from their residence in Chappaqua, NY

TO: Rachel_Samuels@ios.doi.gov (Rachel_Samuels@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GStreett@doc.gov (GStreett@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ben.Handford@sba.gov (Ben.Handford@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christi A. Schneeberger (CN=Christi A. Schneeberger/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fantasia_kari@ustr.gov (fantasia_kari@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger_J._Chiang@hud.gov (Roger_J._Chiang@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: robert.nickerson@ssa.gov@inet (robert.nickerson@ssa.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose.Vazquez@ost.dot.gov (Jose.Vazquez@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary_Beth.Schultheis@usda.gov (Mary_Beth.Schultheis@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cortez.corina@epamail.epa.gov (cortez.corina@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: beth.newburger@gsa.gov (beth.newburger@gsa.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: AronsohnPS@state.gov@inet (AronsohnPS@state.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: michelle.a.smith@do.treas.gov (michelle.a.smith@do.treas.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terry_Bish@ios.doi.gov (Terry_Bish@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa.Cutler@hq.doe.gov (Lisa.Cutler@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: george.haddow@fema.gov (george.haddow@fema.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phil.Gambino@ssa.gov (Phil.Gambino@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James.Holleyx@mail.va.gov (James.Holleyx@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David_Frank@ed.gov (David_Frank@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hwaddell@dol.gov (hwaddell@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffery T. Christiansen (CN=Jeffery T. Christiansen/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maxie.Hollingsworth@sba.gov (Maxie.Hollingsworth@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon.P.Jennings@usdoj.gov (Jon.P.Jennings@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin.Paschal@usda.gov (Justin.Paschal@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brenda.daniels@ost.dot.gov (brenda.daniels@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: elisabeth.steele@fema.gov (elisabeth.steele@fema.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bsmith@ustr.gov (bsmith@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ryan M. Morse (CN=Ryan M. Morse/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ruskc@fca.gov (ruskc@fca.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: berkowsky.pamela@osd.pentagon.mil (berkowsky.pamela@osd.pentagon.mil [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: allison_balderston@ed.gov (allison_balderston@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: patrick_mcdermott@ed.gov (patrick_mcdermott@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rwerbel@os.dhhs.gov (rwerbel@os.dhhs.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gardenswartz-craig@dol.gov@inet (gardenswartz-craig@dol.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tbish@ios.doi.gov@INET (tbish@ios.doi.gov@INET [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: dblank1@doc.gov (dblank1@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jdoyle@doc.gov (jdoyle@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mike.Derian@usda.gov@inet (Mike.Derian@usda.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LeeAnn.Inadomi@hq.doe.gov (LeeAnn.Inadomi@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: maria.fernandez@mail.va.gov (maria.fernandez@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: janice.joyner@mail.va.gov (janice.joyner@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert L. Nabors (CN=Robert L. Nabors/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mehunker@opm.gov (mehunker@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet L. Crist (CN=Janet L. Crist/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: leamond_nancy@ustr.gov (leamond_nancy@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lmshein@opm.gov (lmshein@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon_J._Cowan@hud.gov (Jon_J._Cowan@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: satterfield-lee@dol.gov (satterfield-lee@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gfrazier@usda.gov (gfrazier@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Stroud.Lindsay@epamail.epa.gov (Stroud.Lindsay@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brudolph@usaid.gov (brudolph@usaid.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: neal.wolin@do.treas.gov (neal.wolin@do.treas.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andy.Solomon@usda.gov@inet (Andy.Solomon@usda.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Helen_Veit (CN=Helen_Veit/OU=WHO/O=GOV@WHO [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa_Macspadden@hud.gov (Lisa_Macspadden@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosemary.Tapp@ost.dot.gov (Rosemary.Tapp@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tiffanie.Hegarty@mail.VA.GOV (Tiffanie.Hegarty@mail.VA.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Courtenay_Miller@ios.doi.gov (Courtenay_Miller@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra L. Via (CN=Sandra L. Via/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jana.Carter@DO.Treas.gov (jana.Carter@DO.Treas.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mluzzatto@doc.gov (mluzzatto@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: michael.coen@fema.gov (michael.coen@fema.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rolf_A._Olson@hud.gov (Rolf_A._Olson@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCHWARZ.DENISE@epamail.epa.gov (SCHWARZ.DENISE@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: howard-elaine@dol.gov@inet (howard-elaine@dol.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl.Montgomery@usdoj.gov (Cheryl.Montgomery@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen_M._Tankel@hud.gov (Stephen_M._Tankel@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HKlasky@ustr.gov (HKlasky@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: carole.florman@usdoj.gov (carole.florman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bob.klear@mail.va.gov (bob.klear@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tim_Ahern@ios.doi.gov (Tim_Ahern@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rubey.Kim@epamail.epa.gov (Rubey.Kim@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brooke.anderson@hq.doe.gov (brooke.anderson@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joan.E.Wainwright@ssa.gov (Joan.E.Wainwright@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John.Hansonx@mail.va.gov (John.Hansonx@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William.Schulz@ost.dot.gov (William.Schulz@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: myron.l.marlin@usdoj.gov (myron.l.marlin@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa.O.Monaco@usdoj.gov (Lisa.O.Monaco@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele.Kreiss@sba.gov (Michele.Kreiss@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: davis.gail@epamail.epa.gov (davis.gail@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: McMahon@fca.gov (McMahon@fca.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ba.rudolph@ost.dot.gov (ba.rudolph@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rhoda_j._glickman@hud.gov (rhoda_j._glickman@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jacquie_m._lawing@hud.gov (jacquie_m._lawing@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kenneth_L_Smith@ios.doi.gov (Kenneth_L_Smith@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: martinez-elizabeth@dol.gov (martinez-elizabeth@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Walter L. Holton (CN=Walter L. Holton/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: debra.silimeo@sba.gov@INET (debra.silimeo@sba.gov@INET [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: michael_n._cohen@hud.gov (michael_n._cohen@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sottenst@os.dhhs.gov (sottenst@os.dhhs.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: valdez-suzanna@dol.gov@inet (valdez-suzanna@dol.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: drossi@ed.gov@INET (drossi@ed.gov@INET [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jdorskind@doc.gov (jdorskind@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ebloom1@doc.gov (ebloom1@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose.Venzor_Jr@usda.gov@inet (Jose.Venzor_Jr@usda.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: maya.seiden@hq.doe.gov (maya.seiden@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: manson.brown@ost.dot.gov (manson.brown@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jcbua@opm.gov (jcbua@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne_Shields@ios.doi.gov (Anne_Shields@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wilson.reid@epamail.epa.gov (wilson.reid@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kris.swedin@sba.gov (kris.swedin@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian.Coyne@ssa.gov (Brian.Coyne@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: leslie_thornton@ed.gov (leslie_thornton@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gary.falle@hq.doe.gov@inet (gary.falle@hq.doe.gov@inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: davidlane@doc.gov (davidlane@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sarah H. Gastfreund (CN=Sarah H. Gastfreund/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP@EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott.Nelson@hq.doe.gov (Scott.Nelson@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie.Wymer@hq.doe.gov (Natalie.Wymer@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Masha.Pastuhov.Pastein@sba.gov (Masha.Pastuhov.Pastein@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sbolivar@opm.gov (sbolivar@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: katherine_lapin@os.doi.gov (katherine_lapin@os.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Veda_J._Lamar@hud.gov (Veda_J._Lamar@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: MONGA.FRANCESCA@epamail.epa.gov (MONGA.FRANCESCA@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
----- Forwarded by Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP on 01/06/2000
02:58 PM -----

Margaret M. Suntum
01/06/2000 02:57:18 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: remarks of the President and Mrs. Clinton from their
residence in Chappaqua, NY

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Chappaqua, New York)

For Immediate Release

January 6, 2000

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND THE FIRST LADY
TO THE WHITE HOUSE TRAVELING PRESS

Outside Chappaqua Residence
Chappaqua, New York

11:28 A.M. EST

MRS. CLINTON: Good morning!

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everybody.

Q So are you now officially New Yorkers?

THE PRESIDENT: We're here. Let me say to start that we're delighted to be here. We like this house very much and we, at least, have put up all the boxes we brought up here so far. This is the first home we have had since January of 1983, 17 years ago, when we moved back into the Governor's Mansion in Little Rock. So it's exciting. We're seeing some things we haven't seen since we moved to the White House and some things we haven't seen in 17 years.

We've got a table in there that we bought shortly after we got married, in 1975, that we haven't used in a long time. So we've had a lot of fun and I've enjoyed it very much.

MRS. CLINTON: We're glad to have you here this morning because this is a lot of excitement and hard work for us, but we're so pleased that we are finally here and moved in and looking forward to many, many happy days here in the days and months ahead.

THE PRESIDENT: We also want to thank our neighbors who have been long-suffering with all the attention --

MRS. CLINTON: Right.

THE PRESIDENT: -- that the house has received.

MRS. CLINTON: And all of the officials here in Chappaqua and New

Castle and Westchester County, who have been so helpful and cooperative with the Secret Service and the other people who are a part of the President's official duties.

Q Mr. President, will you be shifting your voter registration to New York, so you can vote for a certain Senate candidate?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I've got a particular interest in the election up here next year, so I want to make sure my vote counts. I expect to vote in the election in New York.

Q What did you do last night? What did you do for dinner? Did you have friends in?

MRS. CLINTON: We had friends -- we've had a lot of friends helping us and one of my good friends here who lives nearby came over with her son and brought dinner for us, and then her son helped Bill move some things that needed to be moved. And we had other friends come over who have been helping us. But mostly what we did was unpack boxes, put things up, try to make decisions about where to hang paintings or move furniture and make a long list of all the things we have to do that aren't done yet that are going to have to be tended to.

Q Are you going back to Washington today to do that?

MRS. CLINTON: Yes, we're going back today and we'll be packing up more things and moving more things in the next couple of weeks. So it will be a process. We're not going to be totally moved in and everything in place for a while. But it's a lot of fun for us to be able to do this again, for the first time in such a long time -- because we, of course, worked very hard in the White House and spent an enormous amount of time and effort trying to keep the White House in good shape and do some additional work that needed to be done there, but it's different when you're doing it in your own home.

Q Have you thought any more about a schedule for how often you will both be here?

Q Mrs. Clinton and also Mr. President, the Mayor, as you may have heard a couple of days ago, said that both of you, the Clintons, he said, have been egregious violators of soft money, both in how it's collected and how it's distributed. Your reaction, both of you?

MRS. CLINTON: We're going to talk about our house this morning, which we are very happy about being in, and being New Yorkers. And we'll leave that to another time.

Q Mr. President, are you going to -- we haven't heard from you. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: No. (Laughter.) No, I keep reading all these things. I've not given very much thought to this. I'm going to work very hard on finishing my library and center. And I'm going to devote all my attention to being President. I've got a big agenda this year. We're

going back now, and I have to go back to Shepherdstown this afternoon. But I've had no discussions with anybody about that kind of move. And I was amazed to see that in the paper. No one's even suggested that.

Q Mr. President, last night the Vice President in the debates said that he'll ask military commanders about their feelings on gays serving in the military before appointing people to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Is this litmus test the way it should work?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think the real problem is -- let me go back to what happened, because, as you know, my view was -- and I will restate my view. The Uniform Code of Military Justice prohibits homosexual contacts. So my view was, if someone was willing to take the pledge to observe the Uniform Code of Military Justice, they shouldn't have to lie about being gay and being in the military. Then, let me remind you what happened. The Congress voted, by a veto-proof majority, against that position. So that's how we got to "don't ask, don't tell."

My focus has been on trying to make the policy work the way the military commanders said it would work back in 1993, which it has not been doing. No one disputes that. To Secretary Cohen's credit, back in August we announced some new guidelines, which have now been implemented, for training and for implementation, which I think will significantly improve the present situation over the next few months.

Now, the Vice President and Senator Bradley say they want to go back to the position that I advocated in '92 and '93. In order to do that, the Congress will have to change the law, I believe. I don't think that the military and the President have the authority to do it. Now, you could go back and look at the constitutional arguments and do some research, but I think a lot of this debate, I think a lot of people have actually forgotten that Congress put into the law the present policy.

And so what I'm going to do is spend the next year trying to make sure that we do what was intended and what I announced would be done, after extensive consultation with our commanders back in 1993. I believe that the next President, if he wants to change the policy, will have to get the Congress to change the law.

Q A quick follow-up on that. Wouldn't litmus tests like that have disqualified somebody like Colin Powell from serving as Joint Chiefs?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that I'm going to leave the appointment process to the next President. I'm not going to get involved in this election right now. I think that there have been, we know, going back all the way to the first world war, we have clear evidence that there have been gays in the military who have served with great distinction. I think it's quite interesting that most of the Vietnam veterans, combat veterans, in the United States Congress, including Senator Robb and Senator Kerry, just to mention two, have felt that -- both Senator Kerry and Kerrey, and Senator Robb -- have felt that the policy ought to be changed and supported my original position.

So I would like to find some way for people to be honest, to obey the law, and to serve with distinction in the military. So I think that is where our focus ought to be, and the next President will have to figure out how to do that. But I think there will have to be a change in the law.

Q Mr. President, the polls show that your wife is trailing right now. Do you have any advice for her?

MRS. CLINTON: Thank you so much.

Q What was the first night like?

THE PRESIDENT: We had a wonderful time. We don't have a television yet. (Laughter.)

Q So how did you watch the debate?

THE PRESIDENT: We didn't. They have a tape for me. I'm going to watch it tonight when I get home. So I had a tape. So we brought up our CD player, and I gave Hillary one of those South African radios that you crank -- have you seen them?

MRS. CLINTON: Solar-powered radios.

THE PRESIDENT: We bought them -- and I got it in Washington at that Discovery store. You crank it up and it's run either by solar power or by hand crank, but you never need a plug or anything. So we listened to the radio last night. It was quite wonderful.

Q -- what it was like being in the house for the first time in 17 years, your own house?

- 5 -

MORE

- 5 -

MRS. CLINTON: We loved it. Well, it was a little overwhelming because there is so much to be done, and we stayed up very late, working on getting things organized and put away. And then we're going to be back together next week and we'll keep the process going until we finally get things moved in.

But it was wonderful having a chance to be here. My mother is with us. We just had a great time.

Q How late were you up?

MRS. CLINTON: Oh, gosh.

THE PRESIDENT: Past 1:00 a.m.

MRS. CLINTON: Past 1:00 a.m. (Laughter.) Thanks.

END 11:38 A.N. EST

Message Sent

To:

Brian S. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brooke B. Livingston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu
wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov
Kathleen K. Ahn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/OA/EOP@EOP
Ralph Alswang/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP@EOP
Mark H. Bartholomew/OA/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark J. Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Todd A. Bledsoe/WHO/EOP@EOP
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Reich/OVP@OVP
Alejandro G. Cabrera/OVP@OVP
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
pcaplan@fbr.com
George G. Caudill/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP
Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lana Dickey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elliot J. Diringer/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Bird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon Farmer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP@EOP

Rachel E. Forde/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Wendy E. Gray/NSC/EOP@EOP
John A. Gribben/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Hadley/OA/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP@EOP
Ann C. Hertelendy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sheyda Jahanbani/NSC/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP@EOP
Wayne C. Johnson/OA/EOP@EOP
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
John_See@ed.gov
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jim Kohlenberger/OVP@OVP
KTORPEY@AOL.COM
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP@EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nathan B. Naylor/OVP@OVP
Ellen E. Olcott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Denver R. Peacock/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jonathan M. Prince/WHO/EOP@EOP
TDIXON@smtpgate.mac.whca.mil
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP@EOP
Evan Ryan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP

G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christopher K. Scully/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/OPD/EOP@EOP
Mark C. Sheppard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maria E. Soto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dana C. Strand/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael J. Sullivan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sylvia M. Mathews/OMB/EOP@EOP
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP@OVP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Loretta M. Ucelli/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP@EOP
Janice H. Vranich/WHO/EOP@EOP
Setti D. Warren/WHO/EOP@EOP
Essence P. Washington/OPD/EOP@EOP
Robert S. Weiner/ONDCP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP@EOP
carolmast@aol.com
dmilbank@tnr.com
john_see@ed.gov
skgmd@umich.edu
tingen-terri@dol.gov
usia01@access.digex.com
62955104@eln.attmail.com
newsdesk@usnewswire.com
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gina N. Dennis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alberto O. Feraren/OA/EOP@EOP
Hildy Kuryk/WHO/EOP@EOP
Pub_Arch@oa.eop.gov@inet
Releases@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@inet
Pub_Arch@EOP
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP

Sally Katzen/OMB/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us
Rachel A. Redington/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon H. Yuan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Nicole L. Davison/OPD/EOP@EOP
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Francisco J. Sanchez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Bridget T. Leininger/WHO/EOP@EOP
Abigail L. McDermott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laurie P. Kelleher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Samir Afridi/WHO/EOP@EOP
Terry Edmonds/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kymberly M. Escobar/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
sean.carr@cnn.com
Julia G. Bataille/OVP@OVP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
masonjulie@aol.com
Jason E. Hartke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Alexander/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrienne K. Elrod/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisel Loy/WHO/EOP@EOP
jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
kit.judge@mail.house.gov
Abigail C. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordanindc@aol.com
Deanne E. Benos/OPD/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gilbert S. Gonzalez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP

Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsay R. Drewel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Erica_Lepping@ed.gov
Mark D. Magana/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Barreto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lauren M. Supina/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrian E. Miller/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
Renee Sagiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather F. Hurlburt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean R. Dobson/OPD/EOP@EOP
Pamela P. Carpenter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Angela Blake/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eileen P. McCaughey/WHO/EOP@EOP
RSocarides@rlmnet.com
kamena@washpost.com
Mara A. Silver/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer I. Hoelzer/NSC/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 07:51:59.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Mon., Jan. 10, 2000

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Mon., Jan. 10, 2000

--today's papers: Grunts' Groans

--pundit central: McCain's Glass House

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Join Working Assets Long Distance Today and Help Build a Better World! Get 360 minutes of FREE calls plus FREE ice cream when you join now.

<http://www.workingassets.com/join/form.cfm?formID=IE-071-SLT-1>

Join now for the best of both worlds: great phone service at competitive rates and a strong commitment to progressive causes. We donate 1 percent of your charges to nonprofit groups working for peace, human rights, equality, education, and the environment--at no extra cost to you.

today's papers

Grunts' Groans

By Scott Shuger

USAT leads with the Clinton administration's proposal for establishing a nationwide computer system for rapidly tracking the course of infectious diseases like the flu and hepatitis C. The NYT lead also connects medicine and cyberspace with a report that the rise of Americans' online pharmaceutical purchases via foreign-based Web sites has led to record levels of illegal drug imports, judging from the latest figures on Customs Service seizures of imported drugs in 1999, which ran about 4.5 times higher than 1998. The LAT leads with good news about Medicare: the implementation of the DOJ's campaign against fraudulent claims, combined with the low inflation rate, has kept spending in the 25-year-old program to its lowest growth rate ever. The WP goes with a private study of the attitudes of members of the U.S. military. Main findings of the worldwide survey of 12,000: the

service members feel overworked and underpaid, feel that they don't have enough resources to carry out their assignments, and lack confidence in their leaders. But according to the survey, they still have a deep commitment to military service. By the way, the Post reports that the issue of gays in the military was hardly ever mentioned by the service members. The military study is the off-lead at USAT and is fronted at the LAT. It runs inside at the NYT. (To see that the U.S. military isn't the only one with big problems, check out <http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-07/Assessment.asp>.)

The USAT lead explains the need to replace the current patchwork paper-and-pencil-and-phone disease reporting system: 35 new infectious diseases have been identified since 1973, while some older ones have been reincarnated as drug-resistant superbugs.

The NYT lead points out that the FDA advises consumers not to purchase meds from foreign sites because they will generally be illegal (because, for instance, they're not labeled properly or don't meet purity standards), but adds that usually the government doesn't bother folks ordering small amounts (up to 3 months' worth) for their own use.

The LAT puts the Medicare news in perspective by stating that the cost of health care spending by business and individuals was up 6.9%. An inside WP AP dispatch has that figure and the Medicare one. But the story also states, in contrast to the fiscal optimism expressed high up by the LAT, that Medicare costs are not expected to continue to drop, once boomers begin to attain eligibility in large numbers.

A wild but true crime tale unfolds in the NYT's off-lead. Somebody has tried to extort \$100,000 from online music retailer CD Universe by threatening to release some of the company's more than 300,000 customer credit card files. Because the company wouldn't comply, says the Times, the intruder has released some of the card numbers on the Internet and claims to have used some for himself. The paper points out that the episode is apt to rekindle consumer concerns about online credit card security. Also, since the jerkball's email trail leads to Eastern Europe, the case stands to highlight the freedom online criminals have to operate beyond U.S. jurisdiction.

The NYT and WSJ report that on Sunday, General Motors announced an alliance with AOL and Ford announced one with Yahoo. Both deals will allow car buyers and owners to register to receive model-specific email from the manufacturers and dealers covering everything from oil changes to rebates. The Journal account adds that the deals are intended to include Internet access for owners from their cars as well.

Citing a report in London's Sunday Times, inside stories at the WP and NYT report that British officials say they've caught Libya trying to smuggle Scud missile parts through London's Gatwick airport. The contretemps comes just after the two countries

reestablished diplomatic relations.

The WSJ fronts a detailed feature about a type of worker increasingly common in the modern office: a company Internet snoop, who spends his days checking to see where other workers go on the Web. The story shows one such snoop reading the (deleted) emails of a former employee. At the company in question, online access to sites with any nudity is barred, but those about racism, extremism, violence and profanity, and sports are okay. Other types of URLs frowned upon are music downloading sites and online investment services. The story never questions the fundamental assumption of the snoopers: namely that companies should be able to control their employees' Web access. Now clearly, they have the right to, but the story might have considered whether this is wise from a productivity point of view. It's the wage-slave mentality that judges workplace performance by input, by the number of hours worked, say. The enlightened view of how to manage people is to judge them by their *output* instead. So why should a company care where an employee surfs as long as he/she is productive? Who knows--maybe those "irrelevant" visits stimulate the creativity that's behind the employee's next big idea.

A letter to the WP makes a gimlet observation about the recent upward economic drift of journalism. The missive notes that the paper recently characterized Hillary Clinton's recent move into her new house "as a seemingly typical move on a seemingly typical day, except for the 10 TV cameras...." The writer goes on to point out that ahem, this was a \$1.7 million home HRC was moving into. Typical perhaps for a Post editor or executive but...

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=356>

4

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

Saint Boris

<http://www.slate.com/InterNatPapers/00-01-07/InterNatPapers.asp>

The Russian Military

<http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-07/Assessment.asp>

McCain Knocks Himself Out

http://www.slate.com/framegame/entries/00-01-07_68393.asp

pundit central

McCain's Glass House

By Michael Brus

Issue 1 is GOP presidential politics, including John McCain's FCC letter and Bush's tax plan. Issue 2 is Democratic presidential politics, including Al Gore and Bill Bradley's promise to allow open gays in the military.

Most pundits agree that the revelation of John McCain's influence-peddling letter to the FCC has hurt his campaign, although several—including Paul Gigot (PBS's NewsHour With Jim Lehrer) and Tucker Carlson (CNN's Late Edition)--think that McCain is just defending his constituents, as he was elected to do.

Pundits disagree on Bush's sweeping tax-cut proposal. Joe Klein (NBC's Meet the Press) notes that the cut is bigger than the Congressional GOP's (doomed) proposal last fall, and Al Hunt (CNN's Capital Gang) and David Broder (PBS's Washington Week in Review) think that New Hampshire voters care more about schools and health care than taxes. Mark Shields (NewsHour) remarks that Jack Kemp's aggressive tax-cutting campaign strategy didn't work in the 1988 GOP primary, but his colleague, Gigot, responds that McCain's moderate tax apes the failed electoral strategies of George Bush (in 1980) and Bob Dole (in 1988). Appearing on Meet the Press, Rep. Lindsey Graham, R.-S.C., a McCain supporter, thinks that McCain's critique that Bush's tax plan as too large is not working. John McLaughlin, Lawrence Kudlow, and Jim Warren (all of PBS's McLaughlin Group) enthuse over Bush's recent debate performances.

Many pundits—including Mara Liasson (Washington Week), Mark Shields (NewsHour and Capital Gang), Sam Donaldson (ABC's This Week), and Paul Begala (MSNBC coverage of Friday's night's GOP debate)--think that Gore's aggressive stance on gays-in-the-military will hurt him in the general election. Paul Gigot (NewsHour) and Steve Roberts (Late Edition) contrast Gore's ideological approach to the issue with President Clinton's pragmatic approach. Tucker Carlson (Late Edition) notes that only a nation with no security threats could devote so much attention to a "boutique issue" like the military's homosexual policy. George Stephanopoulos and George F. Will (both of This Week) think the issue is a red herring, because Congress can override any executive order that overturns "don't ask-don't tell." Margaret Carlson (Capital Gang) and Joe Klein say that Bradley's aloofness and condescension still hurt his popularity, and Klein predicts that if he is the nominee his Senate votes against the Gulf War and welfare reform will haunt him.

Miscellany: John McLaughlin, Jim Warren, and Eleanor Clift (all of

the McLaughlin Group) call the new rule barring presidential candidates with less-than-15-percent support from general-election debates "undemocratic," and argue that any party qualifying for federal matching funds should get to participate. Appearing on Fox, Bill Bradley also voices disagreement with the new rule, saying that the Reform Party has a "strong case" that it should be included in the debates. Appearing on CBS's Face the Nation, Gov. Jesse Ventura, Ref.-Minn., notes that he had only 10-percent support when he debated Minnesota's Democratic and Republican candidates for governor; six weeks later he won the election with 37 percent. ? Appearing on Friday's Larry King Live (CNN), both Bob and Elizabeth Dole say that the general election will be close, and not a blowout by Bush. Appearing with his wife again on This Week, Bob Dole predicts that Bush will win the nomination (although he still will not endorse him). Steve Roberts opines that although Mrs. Dole has proved to be an awful presidential campaigner, her popularity among women will be hard for Bush to resist when he selects his running mate. ? When Elizabeth Dole praises Bush's "executive experience" on This Week, Sam Donaldson points out that her own husband had no such experience when he ran for president.

Last Word

"Look, I've always had two principles. One is make bureaucracies react on behalf of the taxpayers, and second, do whatever I can to increase competition and lower costs in telecommunications. Those are the guiding principles I've had. Today, we are asking the federal government to release all correspondence that I've had with every government agency. But finally, let me remind you, I'm the chairman of the committee that is designated by the Congress to oversight [sic] the FCC. And it's my responsibility to try to see and make them act. And so I believe that the record will be clear that I've done that on behalf of the consumer."

--John McCain (Face the Nation)

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 13:15:38.00

SUBJECT: 1/11 NSC Press Guidance

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jim Kohlenberger (CN=Jim Kohlenberger/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Patrick M. Dorton (CN=Patrick M. Dorton/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Elliot J. Diringer (CN=Elliot J. Diringer/OU=CEQ/O=EOP@EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Karen C. Burchard (CN=Karen C. Burchard/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: Ralph Alswang (CN=Ralph Alswang/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: 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: Brian S. Mason (CN=Brian S. Mason/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: Jason Furman (CN=Jason Furman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Neal Lane (CN=Neal Lane/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lynn G. Cutler (CN=Lynn G. Cutler/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brenda B. Costello (CN=Brenda B. Costello/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: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/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: Stephanie A. Cutter (CN=Stephanie A. Cutter/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: Francisco J. Sanchez (CN=Francisco J. Sanchez/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (CN=Margaret M. Suntum/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: Sharon K. Gill (CN=Sharon K. Gill/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jennifer I. Hoelzer (CN=Jennifer I. Hoelzer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Press Guidance
January 11, 2000

- Foreign
1. Colombia Assistance Rollout (DRAFT)
 2. Ecuador/Dollarization (new)
 3. Cuban Boy (updated)
 4. Panama/Unexploded Ordnance
 5. Mexico/Drug Traffickers
 6. War Criminal
 7. Russia/Politics (updated)
 8. Russia/Chechnya (updated)
 9. Russia/Embassy Shooting (new)
 10. Palestinian Authority/Corruption (new)
 11. China NTR
 12. China/Military-to-Military Relations
 13. Don't Ask/Don't Tell
 14. CSIS Military Culture Study
 15. Institute for Information Infrastructure Protection

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D74]ARMS296872024.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

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

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

January 11, 2000

INTER-AMERICAN/MULTILATERAL

Colombia Assistance Rollout (DRAFT)

Ecuador/Dollarization (new)

Cuban Boy (updated)

Panama/Unexploded Ordnance

Mexico/Drug Traffickers

EUROPE

War Criminal

RUSSIA/NIS

Russia/Politics (updated)

Russia/Chechnya (updated)

Russia/Embassy Shooting (new)

NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA

Palestinian Authority/Corruption (new)

ASIA

China NTR

China/Military-to-Military Relations

DEFENSE/INTELL

Don't Ask/Don't Tell

CSIS Military Culture Study

TRANSNATIONAL/OSTP

**Institute for Information Infrastructure
Protection**

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

DRAFT
COLOMBIA ASSISTANCE ROLLOUT
January 11, 2000

TOPICS: ASSISTANCE PACKAGE AND UNDERLYING RATIONALE...

What is in the proposed package of increased assistance for Colombia announced by the President?

- The proposal is a two-year, \$1.6 billion request to Congress for funding to enhance our bilateral assistance programs for Colombia.
- The assistance would be directed to counter-drug efforts and for other critical programs to help President Pastrana deepen democracy and promote peace and prosperity.

What is the increased assistance intended to accomplish?

- The primary focus of the proposed increased USG assistance to Colombia is to continue countering the production and trafficking of illicit drugs, both to protect counter-drug successes elsewhere in the region and to reduce the overall amount of drugs entering the United States.
- The increased assistance should also enable the GOC to make substantial additional progress in the realm of alternative development and extending effective governance throughout the country.

Why is it in our interest to provide such substantial assistance?

- The global drug problem is truly an increasing threat shared by all nations. The extensive drug production and trafficking imperils Colombia's security and fuels both addiction and violence in other countries, including ours.
- As the President has made clear, strengthening stability and democracy in Colombia, and fighting the drug trade there, is the right thing to do, and it is very much in America's own national interest.

How does this significant funding fit into the USG's overall drug policy? Why isn't the USG doing more to address the demand for drugs in the United States that drives Andean drug production in the first place?

- This package is perfectly in line with our National Drug Control Strategy – a strategy that represents a comprehensive approach that focusing on: educating children, decreasing the addict population, breaking the cycle of drugs and crime, securing our borders, and reducing the supply of drugs.

- Our effort to support Plan Colombia directly supports goal five of the National Strategy: Break foreign and domestic drug sources of supply.
- Funds used for overseas supply reduction still represent a small percentage of our entire National Drug Control budget. For example, in FY 99, USG funding by counter-drug activity was broken down as follows:
 - Demand reduction activities (e.g., treatment, prevention, research) accounted for 33% of the National Drug Control budget (\$5.4 billion).
 - Domestic law enforcement accounted for 53% of that budget (\$8.6 billion).
 - In contrast, our international efforts were a mere 3% of the budget (\$500 million), while interdiction activities accounted for the remaining 10% (\$1.6 billion).
- To deal effectively with the overall drug problem, we need to deal simultaneously with drug supply reduction, transportation, distribution, and abuses issues that have a complex interrelation. The Colombia package will make an important addition to this fight.

What effect is this package likely to have on the troubled Colombian economy?

- The emergency supplemental package will have a positive effect on the normally vigorous Colombian economy by addressing the serious security concerns business people face and by enhancing investor confidence.
- It must be remembered that additional resources, such as the \$2.7 billion IMF Extended Fund Facility and large social and infrastructural projects supported by loans from the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, will directly contribute to the revitalization of the Colombian economy.

TOPICS: PLAN COLOMBIA AND U.S. ROLE IN ITS DEVELOPMENT...

What is Plan Colombia?

- Plan Colombia is an integrated, comprehensive strategy developed by the GOC to address their many interrelated problems.
- The strategy addressed four critical areas: (1) the peace process and diplomacy; (2) counter-drug efforts, military reform, and the judicial system; (3) social development and democracy; and (4) economic development.

What is your reaction to the new strategy that the Colombian government has proposed?

- We think that President Pastrana and his government have developed a good, comprehensive, integrated approach to dealing with the considerable problems facing Colombia.

- With assistance from the United States and other donors, the GOC should be able to effectively implement this new strategy. We expect to see progress with respect to all of the interrelated challenges that confront Colombia, including fighting drug production and trafficking, and jumpstarting the economic recovery and the peace process.

What was U.S. role in developing Plan Colombia?

- Plan Colombia was developed by, was approved by, and will be implemented by the GOC.
- The GOC did consult extensively with the USG as it developed and refined its strategy.
- We have worked closely with all other countries committed to combating the illicit drug trade through robust domestic programs and international cooperation.

Is the United States seeking to impose a security and counter-drug strategy on Colombia?

- No. The Colombian Government and the USG have been discussing the increasing problems in Colombia on a continuing basis for more than a year. This dialogue intensified in August when Under Secretary of State Pickering traveled to Bogota.
- We assisted the Colombian Government in developing a comprehensive, integrated strategy to deal with the major challenges confronting Colombia, including drug trafficking, the economic slump, and the slow progress of the peace talks. The strategy that emerged from this process, however, was developed by, and approved by, the GOC.
- The strategy deals with four critical themes: (1) the peace process and diplomacy; (2) counter-drug efforts, military reform, and the judicial system; (3) social development and democracy; and (4) economic development.

Has the support package been coordinated with the GOC?

- Of course! The package is designed to support the GOC's own Plan Colombia.

How much is the GOC contributing to the implementation of its Plan Colombia?

- President Pastrana has pledged to commit \$4 billion in support of Plan Colombia.
- In addition, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank have committed hundreds of millions of dollars in loans to support primarily social, humanitarian, and infrastructure development, as well as economic revitalization. The International Monetary Fund has given Colombia a \$2.7 billion Extended Fund Facility that should assist its macroeconomic recovery.

What policy reforms do you believe the Colombians need to carry out to make effective use of this package? Are other international donors also providing assistance?

- An emergency supplemental for Colombia would reinforce the determined actions of President Pastrana to continue second-stage democratic reforms. These include: improving and modernizing the judicial system to end impunity and ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability; further professionalizing and restructuring the Colombian military; and breaking irretrievably any remaining links between members of the security forces and illegal armed groups.

TOPICS: POTENTIAL CRITICISMS OF PACKAGE...

Why is this an emergency supplemental? Why is it being done now instead of last fall during the regular 2000 budget cycle?

- President Clinton announced last fall that he would present Congress with a package to support Plan Colombia early this year; this is that package.
- Plan Colombia is a comprehensive and detailed plan, and it required a thoughtful and comprehensive and well-integrated support package.

Why has it taken so long to finalize this package?

- We first conducted a comprehensive policy review, and consulted extensively with the GOC, to ensure the most effective strategy for reaching our policy objectives.
- That process took longer than expected, but we believe that the investment in time was essential. We now have a well-conceived plan that implements the strategy and should provide the GOC with the critical additional assistance needed.

What about reports that U.S. support for Colombia will move beyond counter-drug cooperation to assistance for the counter-insurgency effort?

- The USG will not provide counter-insurgency aid to the GOC. Increased support to the Colombian military will continue to be focused on the common counter-drug objective and will be provided only after a full human rights vetting.
- Intimations that U.S. policy will shift from cooperating with the Colombians on the regional counter-drug fight to assisting their counter-insurgency efforts are ill-informed. As President Clinton has stated clearly, our policy in Colombia is to support President Pastrana's efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the country's longstanding civil conflict and to work with the Colombians – along with our other regional partners – on fighting illicit drugs.
- Finally, I would remind you that a military solution is simply not possible for Colombia. We continue to call on the FARC to honor its commitments and enter into good faith negotiations with the Colombian Government.

Is there concern about possible retaliatory violence by the drug traffickers following these arrests, especially given the prospect of extradition to face U.S. justice?

- All law enforcement operations against dangerous criminals involve a measure of risk, including the possibility of retaliation against law enforcement personnel or other targets.
- This concern is certainly relevant in the present context, especially given drug traffickers' well-documented willingness to use violence to achieve their ends.
- All of the governments involved in this operation are aware of this risk and are taking appropriate security measures. I might add that USG-supported counter-drug operations have been regularly attacked in Colombia, by guerrillas as well as narcos.
- We have and will continue to take the protection of U.S. citizens in Colombia, both official and unofficial, very seriously. One of our preventative measures is the publication here in this country of appropriate advisories for U.S. nationals abroad. For further information on these advisories, please contact Consular Affairs at the Department of State.
- Perhaps most importantly, I would note that our ongoing law enforcement operations will not be deterred by the threat of violence. We will remain steadfast in our commitment to ensure that drug traffickers are brought to justice, whether in the United States or other countries.

If the drug trade is a problem throughout the Andes, why is the package so heavily weighted towards Colombia?

- This package is a response to President Pastrana's Plan Colombia. Assistance is heavily weighted toward Colombia because Colombia is the source of most of the cocaine used in the United States. Counter-drug programs in Peru and Bolivia have significantly reduced coca leaf cultivation and cocaine production. One side-effect of this reduction has been an increase in leaf cultivation and cocaine production in Colombia.
- In addition, counter-drug efforts in Colombia have been complicated by the participation in the drug trade of well-armed guerrillas and paramilitaries, who protect narco-traffickers across a broad swath of southern Colombia.
- These factors, along with the effects of a recent devastating economic recession, have hampered the ability of the GOC to effectively deal with the narcotics trafficking problem.
- That said, we are recommending additional resources for existing programs in neighboring countries to assist them as they turn from drug production. Further, we are requesting funding in support of construction at a Forward Operating Location in Manta, Ecuador, to allow for more effective regional efforts against drug trafficking by air. These two programs taken together will help to counter the potential move of drug cultivation and production back out of Colombia.

What makes you think this new support package will work when previous USG support to Colombia seems to have had little effect on the drug flows?

- As our success in Peru and Bolivia demonstrates, it is possible to combat narcotics production in the Andean region using a comprehensive and balanced approach. An unfortunate side-effect of this success in Peru and Bolivia was a shift of coca cultivation and cocaine production to Colombia. Because of this, we have concluded that a comprehensive attack against illicit drug production and trafficking in Colombia is essential.
- This package is our response. It will enable the GOC's counter-drug program to move into the southern departments of Caqueta and Putumayo, where the narcos have found a safe-haven under guerrilla and paramilitary protection.

A significant portion of this package is focused on military assistance. Are you short-changing other components of Plan Colombia, such as alternative development, anti-corruption, etc.?

- We are committing \$240 million over the next two years to alternative development, enhancing good governance, judicial reform, and human rights protection. This is in addition to some \$4 billion that the GOC is committing to Plan Colombia from its own resources.
- Other donors, including the International Financial Institutions, are providing billions of dollars in loans aimed primarily at social, humanitarian, and infrastructure development, as well as economic revitalization.

Why are the CNP receiving so much less than the Colombian military when the police have the primary counter-drug responsibility?

- The Colombian National Police have no stronger supporters than the members of this administration. Not only will they receive some \$95 million in direct counter-drug support in this package, but they also were the primary GOC recipients of the FY 99 counter-drug emergency supplemental – receiving at least \$158 million in that package.
- It must be understood that assistance to the Colombian military is designed specifically to support the Colombian National Police law enforcement efforts by providing the Police with protection from attacks by illegal armed groups – whether guerrillas, paramilitaries, or the traffickers themselves – so that they can complete their mission.
- We have been impressed with the way in which the Colombian military and national Police have begun to work together more effectively. General Tapias and General Serrano are committed to work hand-in-glove as they enter the new, more dangerous zones.
- We believe that our assistance package is well-tailored to support the counter-drug strategy that we and the Colombians believe will be much more effective and secure for both the police and the military.

TOPIC: HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS...

What assurance do we have that this increased USG assistance will not lead to increased human rights abuses?

- In accordance with the Leahy Amendment, all U.S. assistance to the Colombian security forces is contingent upon human rights screening. No USG assistance can be provided to any unit of the Colombian security forces against which there is evidence of gross human rights violations.
- In addition, the USG has and will continue to provide support to strengthen the human rights offices of the GOC as well as human rights organizations.

What about allegations that the Colombian military is supporting paramilitary groups that have engaged in human rights abuses?

- We commend the Colombian government's efforts to investigate cases of human rights abuse, by paramilitary groups and others, and to prosecute the human rights abusers.
- We encourage the Colombian government to redouble these efforts. Bringing to an end the impunity enjoyed by those who abuse human rights is a critical component of the peace process.

What is the USG doing to ensure that increased assistance to the Colombian military will not go to those who abuse human rights?

- U.S. law prohibits the provision of assistance or training to units of the Colombian military against whom there are credible allegations of human rights abuses.
- Consistent with the law, the Administration carefully vets the recipients of all U.S. military assistance and training to ensure that our aid is not provided to human rights abusers.
- We note that the Colombian military has one of the longest unbroken records of support for democracy and civilian government in the hemisphere.

Any response to recent reports of the danger faced by human rights advocates working in Colombia?

- The human rights stance of the government and military has improved, but human rights workers are more vulnerable than ever to the guerrillas and paramilitaries. We continue to call on the paramilitaries, the FARC, and other guerrilla groups to respect international human rights norms and to cease the practice of kidnapping.
- A key element of our Colombia policy is strict adherence to Leahy and other human-rights-related provisions governing our security assistance.

- We are also actively promoting and assisting the development of a national human rights policy, working with the Colombian Vice President's Office, as well as providing human rights-related training and assistance to the Colombian military and the human rights ombudsman. We also support enhanced protection for human rights monitors in Colombia.
- Our support for the Colombian peace process is in part premised on the idea that a negotiated settlement is ultimately the best guarantee for human rights.

TOPIC: PEACE PROCESS...

What impact will this package likely have on the Colombian peace process?

- This package will provide support to help train GOC negotiators and advisors on managing conflict and negotiations. Training will draw on the lessons learned in Northern Ireland, the Middle East, and Central America. The training will also examine the techniques for reintegrating ex-combatants into civil society. A public diplomacy campaign will engage civil society and seek their support for all aspects of Plan Colombia.
- Also important, the package will send a strong message to Colombia's guerrillas that meaningful negotiations offer the best hope for peace and social justice. They can hope to win neither military victory nor political advantage through violence.
- Finally, we believe that to the extent that Plan Colombia reinvigorates the Colombian economy, enhances GOC governing capability, discourages human rights abuses, and reduces the money available to guerrillas and paramilitaries from involvement in drug trafficking, it will encourage the peace process.

How is the Colombia peace process going?

- Progress remains slow, but this important initiative is continuing.
- We strongly support President Pastrana's efforts to broker a negotiated settlement to end Colombia's civil conflict. He was elected on a peace platform and won by the widest margin of victory in recent Colombian history. We believe the peace process is the best way to end Colombia's long-running conflict.
- We also remain convinced that the peace process is also integral to long-run prospects for fighting narcotics trafficking, reducing kidnappings, restoring respect for human rights, and putting the Colombian economy back on a sustainable, high-growth trajectory.
- We never expected that a peace settlement with the guerrilla groups could be achieved quickly. Lessons from similar disputes elsewhere suggest that the start-up phase of talks is particularly prone to violence as groups position themselves for the negotiations.

What about criticisms that Pastrana is pursuing a mistaken peace strategy and giving up too much to the FARC for too little?

- We remain convinced that a negotiated settlement is the best way to end Colombia's long-running conflict. A purely military solution is simply not viable, given Colombia's vast size, the limited infrastructure in its interior, and the complex factors that have allowed a guerrilla presence for two generations.
- However, for the peace process to succeed, all parties must participate fully and in good faith. We regret that the FARC engages in attacks that result in civilian casualties.
- The GOC has worked hard to find formulations acceptable to both sides. In our view, the peace process in Colombia has to be broader than the issue of talking with any single guerrilla group, however significant that group is. President Pastrana and his team have set the peace table with a generous scope for negotiations. We encourage the FARC to sit down at that table and partake in a serious search for peace.
- Starting a peace process in a country that has suffered 40 years of civil conflict and over 35,000 dead in the past decade alone is not easy. We do not expect the Colombian government will achieve a peace settlement with the guerrilla groups quickly. Lessons from similar disputes elsewhere suggest that the start-up phase of talks is particularly prone to lengthy delays and setbacks – and sometimes by unexpected breakthroughs.

TOPICS: INSURGENCY, PARAMILITARY & U.S. INTERVENTION CONCERNS...

Are we moving to support of GOC counter-insurgency efforts?

- No. U.S. policy is not shifting from cooperating with the Colombians on the regional counter-drug fight to assisting their counter-insurgency efforts. As President Clinton has stated clearly, our policy in Colombia is to support President Pastrana's efforts to find a peaceful resolution to the country's longstanding civil conflict and to work with the Colombians – along with our other regional partners – on fighting illicit drugs.
- A military solution is simply not possible for Colombia. We continue to call on the FARC to honor its commitments and enter into good faith negotiations with the Colombian Government.

What about fears that the FARC's strength is growing militarily?

- The insurgency has been going on for 40 years. We see no evidence that either side has the wherewithal to settle the civil conflict militarily.
- That is why we continue to believe that the best way to promote our interest in a stable Colombia is to back President Pastrana's efforts to reach a negotiated settlement.

Will you intervene militarily if things continue to deteriorate - this country at least is in our hemisphere?

- We are aggressively supporting the GOC in its fight against drugs. In addition to providing financial assistance, we are trained special counter-drug military units to enhance Colombia's ability to conduct eradication and lab destruction operations.
- As for the insurgency, again let's remember that it has been going on for 40 years and there is no expedient military solution. We believe that the best way to promote our interest in a stable Colombia is to back President Pastrana's efforts to reach a negotiated settlement.
- Let me also reiterate the distinction between counter-drug and counter-insurgency assistance. The USG does not intend to provide counter-insurgency aid to the GOC. Any support to the Colombian military will continue to be focused on the common counter-drug objective and will be given only to units that have been vetted to ensure that they have not been responsible for human rights abuses.
- Greater progress is necessary in countering the production and distribution of illicit drugs in Colombia, both to diminish the revenue available to the guerrillas and to protect counter-drug successes elsewhere in the region. However, there is a distinction between counter-drug and counter-insurgency, and the USG does not intend to provide counter-insurgency aid to the GOC.

What assurances will we have that the paramilitaries do not become the ultimate beneficiaries of the increased USG assistance to the Colombian military?

- In accordance with U.S. law, all assistance to the Colombian armed forces is contingent upon human rights screening. No USG assistance is being provided to any unit of the Colombian military for which there is credible evidence of gross human rights violations by its members. None will be provided to such units, unless, as required by U.S. law, the Secretary of State determines that the GOC is taking steps to bring those responsible for gross human rights violations to justice.
- The Colombian military has markedly improved its human rights performance in recent years. Unfortunately, at the same time, the number of abuses committed by the guerrillas and, particularly, by the paramilitaries has increased markedly.
- We have urged the GOC to take effective steps to end abuses and impunity within the armed forces. We welcomed President Pastrana's decisions in 1999 to retire four generals linked to paramilitary groups, and statements by President Pastrana and top military officials that they would not tolerate collaboration with the paramilitaries.

Is any component of this package designed to help the Colombian military go after the paramilitaries?

- This package is aimed at enhancing the GOC's ability to combat both drug trafficking and human rights abuses. It will reduce the abilities of the paramilitaries to engage in these illegal activities.

TOPIC: OPERATION MILLENIUM...

Did Operation Millennium play a role in the U.S. decision to increase support for GOC?

- We are very pleased and encouraged by the results from Operation Millennium.
- This was a recent large-scale international operation in which law enforcement authorities in Colombia, Mexico and the United States worked closely together to identify and then arrest major cocaine traffickers centered in Colombia who have been shipping huge quantities of illicit drugs to the United States.
- We believe the operation is a model for the kind of multilateral cooperation, including the possibility of appropriate extraditions, that will be increasingly essential if responsible governments everywhere are to make substantial further progress against illicit drug trafficking.
- While Operation Millennium was not the trigger for the U.S. decision to increase assistance, the initiative did demonstrate what the GOC is capable of achieving against the drug traffickers with appropriate USG assistance.

TALKING POINTS ON COLOMBIA PACKAGE

- Want to brief you on our Colombia proposal, which we are now ready to present to the Hill.
- We have been concerned with the drug explosion in Colombia for some time and have worked with the Government of Colombia to understand their strategy and plans for dealing with it.
- In the GOC's view, and our own, the promotion of job creation, peace, and rule of law generally in Colombia could reinforce counter-drug efforts – as well as being desirable goals on their account.
- We believe our proposal provides important support in all these areas in parallel to the much larger financial commitment by Colombia.
- As the President promised, our package is substantial, integrated, comprehensive, and balanced. It includes \$1.6 billion over two years, including an emergency FY 2000 supplemental of \$954 million, additional FY 2001 funding of \$318 million, and current

support of approximately \$150 million each for FY 2000 and FY. Its elements include:

- Equipment and training to help facilitate a coordinated police-military push into the coca-growing strongholds in southern Colombia;
 - Enhanced air, maritime, and riverine interdiction of illicit drugs;
 - Other Colombian National Police counter-drug initiatives;
 - Major increases in alternative development programs, including both resettlement and job-generation activities;
 - Enhanced GOC governing capacity, especially in the areas of human rights, stronger judicial institutions, and training in support of the peace process.
- Our efforts to strengthen the Colombian Army will be for counter-drug activities, not for counter-insurgency, and we will, of course, adhere to the Congressional legislation prohibiting assistance to individuals and units known to have committed human rights abuses.
 - The push into southern Colombia, involving security units, eradication, and alternative development, follows a tested strategy that has worked in Peru and Bolivia. The air interdiction approach has been enormously successful in Peru and has been tested in Colombia on the north coast.
 - That said, we and the GOC want to do this in the context of the rule of law, ensuring that human rights are protected and democracy is supported.
 - Another objective is to encourage the peace process with the goal of ending multiple insurgencies by negotiation. How soon this will happen will depend on the willingness of the multiple insurgent groups to negotiate.
 - Likewise, we want to work with the GOC to rebuild Colombia's economy, once the envy of the rest of Latin America.
 - You should know that our effort, together with Colombia's, will also be supported in the international community. The World Bank and Inter-American Development funding are considering hundreds of millions in loans for Colombia next year, and IMF has approved a \$2.7B program. And we will now begin to push hard for other donors.
 - Finally, this package is not devoted exclusively to Colombia. There are also modest amounts of additional assistance for Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela in the areas of both interdiction and alternative development. This assistance is needed to ensure that stronger counter-drug pressure in Colombia does not simply displace the drug problem to its neighbors.

- In association with this phone call, we will begin briefing Congressional staffs on details. If you wish to receive the briefing personally, we would be pleased to provide it.

DRAFT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 11, 2000

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Today I am sending an urgently-needed, two-year \$1.3 billion request to Congress for additional funding to assist Colombia in vital counter-drug efforts aimed at keeping illegal drugs off our shores. It will also help Colombia promote peace and prosperity and deepen its democracy. Consistent with funds already appropriated by Congress, our resulting support over this year and next would total nearly \$1.6 billion.

President Pastrana's inauguration in August 1998 brought to Colombia a new spirit of hope -- for stronger democracy, for broader prosperity, for an end to that country's long civil conflict. But increased drug production and trafficking, coupled with a serious economic recession and sustained violence throughout much of the country, have put that progress in peril.

President Pastrana has responded with a bold agenda -- Plan Colombia. It provides a solid, multifaceted strategy that the United States should support with substantial assistance. We have a compelling national interest in reducing the flow of cocaine and heroin to our shores, and in promoting peace, democracy and economic growth in Colombia and the region. Given the magnitude of the drug trafficking problem and their current economic difficulties, neither the Government of Colombia nor its neighbors can carry the full burden alone.

In Fiscal Year 2000, much of our support will be focused on a one-time infusion of funds to help boost Colombia's interdiction and eradication capabilities, particularly in the south. The package will also include assistance for economic development, protection of human rights, and judicial reform.

Our bilateral aid to Colombia will be supplemented by multilateral agencies. The World Bank and Inter-American

Development Bank are considering hundreds of millions of dollars in loans for Colombia next year. The IMF has already pledged a \$2.7 billion Extended Fund facility to help jumpstart the economy. And we will also continue to encourage our allies to assist Colombia.

The obstacles to a better future for Colombia are substantial. We expect it will require years before the full benefits of Plan Colombia are felt. But I believe that with our support and that of other donors, Plan Colombia can soon accelerate Colombia's nascent economic recovery. Over the longer haul, we can expect to see more effective drug eradication and increased interdiction of illicit drug shipments.

Strengthening stability and democracy in Colombia, and fighting the drug trade there, is in our fundamental national interest. So, with President Pastrana and with our Congress, we must and we will intensify this vital work.

#

DRAFT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 11, 2000

FACT SHEET

Colombia Assistance Package

Colombia and its democratically elected government are facing an urgent crisis that has narcotics, military and economic dimensions. Narco traffickers in Colombia now supply about 80 percent of the cocaine used in the United States.

Colombian President Andres Pastrana, who took office in August 1998, has developed a comprehensive, integrated approach to addressing Colombia's problems. Plan Colombia would strengthen the Colombian economy and democracy, and fight narcotics trafficking. The Colombian government estimates that Plan Colombia will cost \$7.5 billion and is dedicating \$4 billion of its own resources. It has also asked for the participation and help of the United States and other nations.

The United States has a vital interest in the success of this plan. For this reason, the President is sending to Congress a \$1.3 request for additional funding for an expanded comprehensive program. Consistent with funds already appropriated by Congress, U.S. support over this year and next would total nearly \$1.6 billion.

The five major components of U.S. assistance are:

- Helping the Colombian Government push into the coca-growing regions of the southern Colombia, which are now dominated by insurgent guerillas. Funds will help train special counter-narcotics battalions, purchase 30 Blackhawk and 33 Huey helicopters, and provide other support.

- Upgrading Colombian capability to aggressively interdict cocaine and cocaine traffickers. Funds will be used for radar, aircraft and airfield upgrades, and improved anti-narcotics intelligence gathering.
- Increasing coca crop eradication. The Administration will propose \$96 million to purchase equipment that will enable the Colombian National Police to eradicate more coca and poppy fields.
- Creating alternative paths for development. The Administration will propose \$145 million over the next two years to provide economic alternatives for Colombian farmers who now grow coca and poppy plants.
- Increasing protection of human rights, expanding the rule of law, and promoting the peace process. The Administration will propose \$93 million for new programs that will help the judicial system, and crack down on money laundering.

This initiative will be submitted as part of the President's Budget. It will add to our current support of approximately \$150 million each year an emergency FY 2000 supplemental of \$954 million and additional FY 2001 funding of \$318 million.

The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to help Colombia confront its current problems, while reducing the supply of drugs coming to the United States - to help both their national interest and our own.

#

ECUADOR: REACTION TO DOLLARIZATION ANNOUNCEMENT

January 11, 2000

CONTEXT: President Mahuad announced on Sunday that Ecuador will move to dollarize its economy in reaction to its economic and political crisis .

What are your views on Ecuador's decision to adopt the dollar as its currency?

- We are closely watching developments in Ecuador following the GOE's announcement that it will dollarize. We have been in contact with Ecuadorian authorities and the IMF.
- Strong underlying economic policies, including policies to ensure a sound banking sector and sound public finances, will be essential for Ecuador to achieve economic and financial confidence and stability going forward.
- We encourage the GOE to consult with the IMF on its monetary and exchange rate arrangements in the context of its overall economic program.
- We encourage all Ecuadorian political leaders to put national interests ahead of party politics and avoid a more serious economic and institutional crisis.
- Above all, it is important that the constitutional order be respected.

CUBAN BOY
January 11, 2000

CONTEXT: *On January 10, the Miami Dade Circuit Court awarded emergency temporary custody of Elian Gonzalez to his great uncle, Lazaro Gonzalez, pending a full hearing on the great uncle's petition for temporary custody on March 6. The court also ruled that Elian may not be removed from the jurisdiction and gave the great uncle such limited legal authority as necessary to preserve the status quo and prevent his removal, including the authority to speak on behalf of Elian in immigration matters. Late January 7, Representative Dan Burton (R-IN) issued a subpoena for Elian to appear before the House Government Reform Committee on 10 February. In subsequent interviews, Burton claimed that his intent was not to have Elian testify but to keep him in the United States past the INS declared January 14 deadline. He added that his intent was to ensure that the case would be decided by a Florida court and that he would respect the decision of that court with regard to custody of Elian. A delegation from Miami, --the Mayors of Miami and Dade County, along with a lawyer for the boy and a representative from the Cuban American National Foundation--met with the Attorney General on January 7 to register their objections to the INS decision. Senator Bob Smith (R-NH) visited Elian on January 8 and announced his intention to ask the Attorney General to drop the Friday deadline.*

What is the INS decision in the Elian Gonzalez case?

- INS determined that Elian's father, Juan Gonzalez, has sole authority to speak on his son's behalf regarding his immigration status in this case. Mr. Gonzalez has asked that his son be returned to Cuba.

Now that a Florida court has awarded temporary custody to Elian's great uncle, will INS be able to carry out its decision?

- The Justice Department is currently reviewing this issue and I would refer you to them for response.

Do you expect that the father will come to the United States to contest custody?

- We hope that he will, but that decision is up to the father, Mr. Gonzalez. The State Department has offered to facilitate the issuance of a visa for the child's father should he wish to travel here, and we continue to believe that it would be helpful in resolving this matter expeditiously.

Gov. Bush of Florida is appealing to the President to overturn the INS decision. Will he do that?

- As the President has said, this was a legal, not a political decision. The decision was made by the appropriate legal authority within the U.S. government – the INS. INS followed the law and its procedures in determining that the boy's father speaks for the boy in immigration matters.

Was the decision to return Elian Gonzalez made so to appease Castro as reported in the January 6 edition of the New York Times?

- Let me repeat what the President has said. This decision was a non-political decision made by the relevant officials at the Immigration and Naturalization Service in consultation with the Department of Justice based on the facts of the case and in conformity with the law and with INS rules and procedures.

Were the political implications of the decision discussed at the senior levels?

- White House officials did not seek to, nor did they, influence the outcome of this decision, which, let me reiterate, was made solely by the responsible authorities following the law and INS rules and procedures.

Are U.S. officials concerned about the reaction of the Cuban American community in Miami?

- We understand that for many this is an emotional issue, but it is our hope that the Miami community will remain peaceful in order to allow the legal process to work its course in this matter.

Representative Dan Burton (R-IN) has issued a subpoena for Elian to appear before the House Government Reform Committee on 10 February. Will that prevent Elian from returning to his father by the INS deadline of January 14?

- The Department of Justice is reviewing this matter, and I refer you to them on this question.

PANAMA: UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE ON FORMER U.S. FIRING RANGES

January 10, 2000

CONTEXT: *The Washington Post reported today on allegations by the Government of Panama (GOP) that the U.S. has not met its treaty obligations regarding the clean up of unexploded ordnance (UXO) on former firing ranges in the Canal Zone in Panama. In the article, the Post notes that the GOP has presented photographs, taken by a private consultant, of alleged UXO at various sites within the former ranges. In previous public statements, the Departments of State and Defense have stated that the U.S. had fulfilled its obligations under the Panama Canal Treaty to remove UXO "insofar as practicable." Until a USG inspection is conducted, it is impossible to say with certainty if this new evidence belies these statements or not. We have notified the GOP of our desire to inspect the sites of alleged UXO and have assured the GOP of our commitment to live up to our treaty obligations. We hope to send a team of experts to Panama to inspect the sites in the near future. The GOP is anxious for this team to come, and has agreed that such a visit should be low key. During a December 26 television interview, Panamanian Foreign Minister Aleman claimed that the USG now recognizes that the ranges were not cleaned up properly.*

Any comment on the allegation that the U.S. has not met its treaty obligations regarding UXO on former firing ranges in Panama?

- The Panama Canal Treaty requires the U.S. to remove unexploded ordnance to the extent "practicable." Most – 84 percent – of the areas of former ranges has been restored to full use. However, a small portion of the former ranges (14 percent of the ranges and 2 percent of the former Canal Zone) must remain off limits to human access because complete removal of all unexploded ordnance for these areas is not practicable, given current technology, difficulties imposed by the terrain, and the need to preserve forested areas that protect vital Canal watershed and provide habitat for numerous endangered plants and animals.

Are you saying that the U.S. has complied with the treaty?

- We believe we have complied with the terms of the treaty. We informed the Government of Panama when the ranges were transferred that there were areas that would have to remain off limits. We provided it with a complete range management plan, including equipment and training, to manage those areas at the time. We are willing to continue to provide assistance to the Government of Panama in managing those areas.

But what about reports of photographs of unexploded ordnance?

- Representatives of the Government of Panama recently briefed the Department of State about purported unexploded ordnance on former U.S. firing ranges. We are looking into the matter

and will work with the Government of Panama in a cooperative spirit to determine the facts and resolve any outstanding issues.

But Foreign Minister Aleman said the Department of State has recognized that the clean up was not adequate. Is this not true?

- I am not going to get into characterizing what the Foreign Minister said. The important point is that we are looking into the matter and will work with the Government of Panama to resolve any outstanding issues.

Will the U.S. send a team of experts to Panama to examine the evidence?

- I have nothing to say at this time about any specific plans.

MEXICO: ARELLANO DRUG TRAFFICKERS STILL AT LARGE IN MEXICO

January 10, 2000

BACKGROUND: *In a front-page NYT article on January 10th, Tim Golden describes the still-at-large Arellano brothers and their close drug trafficking associates as “glaring symbols of the failure of the American and Mexican governments even to disrupt the powerful gangs that control Mexico’s drug trade.” Golden bases his assessment on the simple fact that, despite a sustained and costly effort to bring the Arellanos to justice, they remain at large and very much at work moving illicit drugs north into the United States. Golden goes further to assert that the “most basic obstacle remains the corruption that pervades Mexican law enforcement.” Most of Golden’s key points are valid, but his article fails to provide sufficient context relating to the overall counter-drug effort in Mexico. While the Arellanos are still at large, and there is certainly significant corruption in Mexican law enforcement, GOM has made progress in its ongoing counter-drug campaign, and the fact that the Arellanos remain active traffickers today doesn’t mean that ongoing law enforcement initiatives won’t prove successful against them in the future, as such initiatives have against other major traffickers in Mexico and elsewhere.*

- Both the U.S. and Mexican Governments share the frustration reflected in media reports and elsewhere that the Arellano cartel has not been dismantled.
- In addition, there is significant concern on the part of both governments about the way in which corruption often makes it much more difficult to carry out effective law enforcement operations against drug traffickers, wherever they may be found.
- That said, sustained efforts by the Government of Mexico against the Arellano cartel will continue and remain a primary focus of cooperation between our two governments. We’ve made progress against other major cartels, both in Mexico and elsewhere, and we will persevere for as long as necessary to succeed against the Arellano cartel as well.
- For any further reaction, I would refer you to the Department of Justice.

PROSECUTION OF WWII WAR CRIMINAL KONRADS KALEJS

January 10, 2000

BACKGROUND: *Konrads Kalejs, an Australian citizen since 1957, fled Britain yesterday bound for Australia. He was deported from the U.S. in 1994 and from Canada in 1997 for the murders and persecution of tens of thousands of Jews, Roma and others in Latvia during World War II. Kalejs was found to be a former company commander in the Arajs Kommando Unit of the security police in German-occupied Latvia. After a recent television news program found him living in Rugby, England, and his subsequent departure from England before deportation proceedings against him were initiated, Jewish leaders in Britain have said there will be protests upon his return to Australia.*

Kalejs was previously investigated by the Australian government for war crimes, but was not prosecuted. Australian prosecutors have said they have reviewed evidence in the possession of the USG but have found it insufficient to bring forward a prosecution. Latvian government representatives have recently said that they would seek to extradite him back to Latvia if there was sufficient evidence for a prosecution.

Does the U.S. have a view on whether Konrads Kalejs should be prosecuted for war crimes?

- The U.S. wants to see Konrads Kalejs stand trial for war crimes in a country with criminal jurisdiction over him. Kalejs was found by a U.S. Immigration judge and a Court of Appeals judge to be responsible for the deaths and persecution of Jews, Roma and other civilians as a member of the "Arajs Kommando" Unit of the Security Police in German-occupied Latvia during 1941-1944. He was deported from the U.S. in 1994.
- We understand that Kalejs is returning to Australia. We have seen press reports that the Government of Latvia has indicated its possible willingness to seek extradition, though they have not formally done so at this time.
- The U.S. has already shared evidence with authorities in several countries. DOJ prosecutors are prepared to meet here in Washington with prosecutors from other countries to review the evidence in our possession.
- This evidence was sufficient to convince several U.S. judges to deport Kalejs. Although deportation under U.S. law is a civil proceeding rather than a criminal one, the Government's burden of proof is the same, and we believe the evidence deserves a fresh review by prosecutors. The USG is prepared to assist in this effort.

What was the reason that DOJ did not prosecute Kalejs for war crimes when he was in the U.S.?

- The USG can not bring a prosecution for crimes committed outside the U.S. unless there is a statute specifically authorizing it to do so, and at the time when the alleged war crimes were committed by Kalejs in Latvia, U.S. law had not established jurisdiction over such crimes.
- (If pressed:) Even if Congress were to pass such a law today providing for the prosecution of war crimes committed by foreign nationals outside the U.S., it would be unconstitutional to apply that statute retroactively to crimes committed more than 50 years ago.

RUSSIA -- POLITICS UPDATE

January 11, 2000

BACKGROUND: Acting President Putin promoted Finance Minister Mikhail Kasyanov to the key post of first deputy prime minister. Former First Deputy Prime Minister Aksyoneko remains Railway Minister. He also dismissed Kremlin business manager Pavel Borodin, who has been implicated in the Mabatex scandal. Putin promoted Emergencies Minister Shoigu to Deputy Prime Minister and reappointed Viktor Khristenko Deputy Prime Minister in charge of economy. Putin characterized reshuffle as temporary and "related to the pre-election situation."

Does Putin's appointment of Russian Finance Minister Kasyanov for the government's number two job signal the importance Putin places on relations with Western creditors?

- Personnel choices are Acting President Putin's to make; not helpful for us to speculate on the rationale behind specific personnel decisions.

What does the government reshuffle mean for economic reform and crime and corruption efforts?

- We welcome Putin's statements emphasizing the importance of democratic process, adherence to Russia's constitution and right to private property. We look to Putin not only to oversee democratic transfer of power from first democratically elected President of Russia to the next, but also to pursue meaningful progress towards developing a law-based state.

Any reaction to new government changes? Is Acting President Putin cleaning house and throwing out members of the old guard in the Kremlin such as Pavel Borodin?

- Personnel choices are Acting President Putin's to make; not helpful for us to speculate on the rationale behind specific personnel decisions.
- Important that developments in Russia continue to unfold according to constitutional procedures; look now for Putin to oversee free and fair electoral process to select next democratically elected president of Russia.

Do you think that the head start Putin has received is healthy for Russian democracy and that the results aren't predetermined, because viable candidates simply do not have the resources and time to organize effective campaigns?

- Not for us to handicap Russian elections. That is a choice for the Russian people. There will be more developments over the coming days and weeks.
- Key point here is that procedures for electing a new president are laid out in Russian Constitution and those are being respected. Important that upcoming campaign be free and fair and that conduct of elections be consistent with international democratic norms.

- Note Acting President Putin's statements emphasizing the importance of free and fair elections, democratic process, adherence to Russia's constitution, and freedom of speech and press.

Is the Administration worried that a Putin presidency will pursue more authoritarian approaches to domestic problems (such as crime and corruption) and greater nationalist adventurism abroad, leading to bloodshed?

- Yeltsin's place in history is marked by the steps he and the Russian people took to dismantle the communist system and create an enduring democratic process within a constitutional framework.
- Welcome Acting President Putin's initial statements emphasizing the importance of democratic process, adherence to Russia's constitution, and commitment to protect freedom of speech, conscience and press and right to private property.
- Important that President Yeltsin's resignation occurred in accordance with Russian constitution. As Yeltsin said, his intent was to accelerate a competitive electoral process, not to circumvent it. Now look to Putin to oversee the democratic transfer of power from first democratically elected Russian president to the next.
- As Putin himself has suggested, both Russian and international opinion about Putin will be shaped by his actions and steps taken by the Russian government. Hope Putin will act on this opportunity to set a strong reform agenda and pursue it.

BACKGROUND: Russian soldiers lifted the suspension of air and artillery attacks on Grozny and resumed attacks in Chechnya after a lull to mark Orthodox Christmas and the end of Ramadan. Intense fighting continues in southern Chechnya, and Chechen fighters over the weekend staged attacks on Argun, Shali and Gudermes, all of which had been under the control of Russian forces. The two primary Russian combat commanders in Chechnya, Major Generals Troshev and Shamanov, were reassigned to other positions.

Any update on Chechnya, Russian resumption of attacks in Chechnya and lifting of suspension of bombardment of Grozny?

- Our position has been consistent: military solution not viable, will lead to the kind of cycle of violence we now see emerging, urge both sides to exercise restraint, avoid indiscriminate attacks, engage in political dialogue.
- Believe there needs to be immediate cease-fire across Chechnya, meaningful steps toward a political dialogue utilizing good offices of OSCE and durable political solution.

How do you respond to the criticism of President Clinton's characterization of Russia's campaign to "liberate" Grozny in his Time Magazine column on Boris Yeltsin?

- The President made two very strong points in the article.
- First, we have consistently recognized that there are terrorists in Chechnya, and that Russia has a right to combat terrorism. The President used the word "liberate" in this context. He also stressed that Russia's campaign in Chechnya is killing innocent civilians, and that we have a profound disagreement with the manner in which it is being conducted.
- Second, he stressed that the issue at stake is even larger than the humanitarian tragedy inside Chechnya itself. If Russia's conduct in Chechnya becomes a model for how to deal with the complex problems of separatism and terrorism, if it chooses to address those problems solely by violent means, that will have profound implications for our interest in seeing Russia emerge as a stable, open society governed by the rule of law.
- That's why the President has repeatedly urged Russian leaders -- President Yeltsin and Acting President Putin -- to resolve this crisis through dialogue.

Aren't you headed for a confrontation with Putin since he is the architect of Chechnya policy?

- We are deeply troubled about Chechnya, but hope that the reality of the situation will sink in and that Putin will see the importance of bringing this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as

quickly as possible. It is in the interests of Russia to do so as well as Putin's -- especially with elections looming in March.

- The ultimate test, however, will be Putin's leadership of Russia -- both in strengthening democracy and instituting difficult economic reforms. We'll need to wait and see how he defines and implements his agenda for Russia.
- Believe that both sides in conflict should implement immediate cease-fire throughout Chechnya and launch meaningful political dialogue to resolve the conflict. Russia has an ongoing obligation to stop indiscriminate use of force against civilians, to provide for the safety of all civilians affected by the conflict, and to ensure that people who want to flee the conflict can do so.
- We think Russians should seriously consider utilizing OSCE's good offices to help develop political dialogue. Also want to see reestablishment of OSCE permanent presence in region.

Some commentators note that Western complaints of Russia's actions have become an "empty ritual". Why not apply sanctions?

- International community has spoken with one voice that purely military solution to Chechnya conflict is not possible, indiscriminate use of force against civilians is unacceptable.
- Russia has heard our concern that its behavior is isolating it from the international community. Prime Minister Putin has acknowledged that Russia's integration with international community is a key national security concern for Russia.
- As we look at effective levers to help bring the conflict to an end, we also need to be realistic about what will not work and when certain actions would be counterproductive since our economic engagement with Russia is fundamentally rooted in our self-interest to help Russia complete the transition to a market economy and safeguard sensitive technologies.
- Russia has not yet met the conditions for IMF disbursements. If it does meet those conditions, we will make our decisions based on our national interests, including the impact on democracy and stability in Russia.
- Regarding our bilateral assistance, two thirds goes to programs such as dismantling warheads, destroying missiles and protecting fissile materials; the vast majority of the rest goes to build civil society and promote change outside of Moscow. We continue to support these goals.

RUSSIA: EMBASSY SHOOTING

January 11, 2000

BACKGROUND: An unidentified intruder in fatigues entered U.S. Embassy compound in an apparent attempt to steal vehicle. The intruder gained entry to Ambassador's empty car. He was shot by Marine guard after refusing to stop. The intruder was taken to hospital, where he is in intensive care. Moscow authorities said two drunken soldiers were involved and they have arrested second suspect.

Was there a terrorist attack on the US Embassy in Moscow on January 10? Can you provide details?

- At 18:50 Moscow time, a Russian-speaking intruder wearing military fatigues, apparently in his mid-twenties, gained unauthorized entry to the Embassy grounds, near the Chancery Building on Novinskiy Blvd. He was discovered by Embassy security personnel. He had gained access to an unlocked passenger automobile in the courtyard, seized it and began to ram other vehicles parked in the courtyard. He also tried to drive the car into pedestrians and guards, some of whom were forced to flee for safety behind barriers in the compound.
- During this period, while security personnel moved all Embassy employees out of danger, US Embassy security attempted to stop the intruder. They repeatedly ordered him to stop the car; they tried unsuccessfully to open the locked door of the car and break the windows of the vehicle. Ignoring all orders to stop, the intruder continued to threaten the lives of those in the courtyard. Security persons on the scene could not determine whether the intruder was armed or had explosives. After all alternative measures failed, guards fired on the vehicle, wounding the intruder. They were then able to apprehend him and determine that he had no firearms or explosives.
- The US Embassy immediately summoned the appropriate Russian investigatory team and called for Russian medical assistance and an ambulance. Until the ambulance arrived, US medical personnel provided emergency care tot he injured person, who remained conscious.
- The incident ended approximately 2000 hours, without any injury to American or Russian staff of the US Embassy or other individuals other than the wounded intruder.

How did the intruder get onto the Embassy grounds?

- We're still investigating how the intruder gained access. We can only confirm that he entered in an unauthorized manner.

Can you identify the intruder, why was he trying to get into the Embassy?

- The investigation of the incident is in the hands of the Russian authorities and is on-going. The US Embassy is cooperating as fully as possible with the Russian authorities, within the constraints of usual diplomatic practice. We would refer you to the Russian authorities.

Will the US Embassy be conducting its own investigation?

- Yes, Embassy investigation is already ongoing. In every case of an incident of this kind we think it's important to determine the facts, to insure that actions taken were appropriate, and to make recommendations for improvements, if needed, in procedures.

Some media reports say that two individuals entered the Embassy. Can you confirm that more than one person was involved?

- We have seen press reports that a second individual who apparently tried to gain access to the Embassy has been apprehended by Russian authorities.
- The Embassy has no independent information on this person and cannot confirm the report. This is one of the issues the ongoing Russian investigation will explore.

Do you believe that this is a terrorist incident or conspiracy? Has any group claimed responsibility?

- The Embassy has no evidence of any kind that this incident involved more than the one or two individuals involved. No one has claimed responsibility. The Russian investigation, of course, will look at these issues as well.

Are you satisfied with the Russian response, with Russian protection of the Embassy?

- The US Embassy wishes to express its appreciation for the professional assistance of the Russian authorities, both Federal and the City of Moscow. We will continue to work with these authorities to insure our security cooperation is as effective as possible.

CORRUPTION IN THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY
January 10, 2000

Do you have any comment on an editorial in the January 10, 2000 Washington Times, which criticizes the Palestinian Authority for widespread corruption?

- We have seen these reports.
- As we have said before, the issue of corruption is one which we view with great concern and have consistently raised with Palestinian Authority officials on a variety of occasions.
- We have made clear to them that transparency and accountability are necessary in order to build civil society.

CHINA: NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS

January 11, 2000

Why has the Administration made a decision to sponsor a resolution on China at the UN Human Rights Commission?

- Since the last meeting of the Human Rights Commission the human rights situation in China has deteriorated. China has suppressed political dissent and breached fundamental rights such as freedom of conscience, assembly, and expression.
- Our goal in deciding to sponsor a resolution on China is to improve the human rights situation in China. Our hope is that the Chinese authorities will take tangible steps to bring their human rights practices into compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and other international obligations.

Is this decision designed to help persuade the Congress to approve permanent Normal Trade Relations status for China in connection with the WTO bilateral accession deal that the U.S. and China recently concluded?

- The Human Rights Commission in Geneva is the appropriate international forum for bringing attention to bear on UN member countries' human rights situations. We decided to sponsor a resolution at the Commission based on deterioration in the human rights situation in China since last year.
- As the President said yesterday in the context of our effort to secure permanent NTR status for China, we continue to have serious disagreements with the PRC on human rights and we'll continue to press our views and protect our interests.
- Bringing China into the WTO will promote the right kind of change in China while at the same time serving the broad interests of the American people.
- It will promote China's integration into the global economy and benefit American businessmen, investors, farmers, workers, and consumers as China reduces barriers to free trade.
- WTO accession will encourage China to advance economic reform and deepen the rule of law.

CHINA: MILITARY-TO-MILITARY RELATIONS

January 6, 2000

Have US-PRC military-to-military relations resumed?

- Having concluded our discussions with the Chinese regarding the humanitarian and property payments associated with the tragic mistaken bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, we look forward to moving ahead comprehensively in our relationship with China.
- Refer you to the Pentagon for comment on next steps in military-to-military relations.

Are relations back on track with China?

- We have advanced many of our priority agenda items in U.S.-China relations, but have more work to do. We would like to see broader and deeper exchanges on human rights as well as nonproliferation and arms control, for example.

FORT CAMPBELL/DON'T ASK DON'T TELL

January 10, 2000

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 has entered a guilty plea on the charges of obstructing justice, making false statements, and providing alcohol to a minor. [The family of Private Winchell has filed suit against the U.S. Army, accusing it of failing to protect... – DOD is checking, but this is unconfirmed]

What is your reaction to this weekend's verdict in the Ft. Campbell court marshal of Justin Fischer?

- This case is in the military justice system. Although there has been a guilty plea, the process is on-going and it is not appropriate for me to comment on the case.

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. I strongly support any measures that improve the safety of our soldiers.

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, and I refer you to DOD for details.

CSIS STUDY OF MILITARY CULTURE

January 10, 2000

BACKGROUND: The Washington Post, New York Times and Washington Times reported today on a just-published study by The Center for Strategic and International Studies on "American Military Culture in the 21st Century." The study, authored by retired Army Colonel Joseph Collins, reports survey results that found military personnel feel overworked and underpaid, lack the resources to carry out their missions, and lack confidence in their leaders (particularly in the senior military leadership of the services). It concludes that the leadership of the Armed Services – military as well as civilian – have not adjusted to significant changes in military demographics (large increase in married personnel and two-career families) and the impact of increased deployment rates in the post-Cold War world. That military personnel hold such views is well known in the Services and DOD, and strongly influenced recommendations the Joint Chiefs and Secretary of Defense made to the President regarding increases in pay and benefits. The Services have also made or initiated a number of changes in personnel assignment policies, the organization of operational units, and management of rotational deployments in order to better cope with the demands of the post-Cold War security environment.

Points to be Made

- First, would like to point out positive findings in the study that were not highlighted in this morning's articles. For example:
 - Peace operations and other small-scale contingencies are essential to the national interest and the study's findings do not argue against undertaking them.
 - Fundamental professional values are remarkably strong – military personnel today overwhelmingly subscribe to traditional military values such as self-sacrifice, discipline and obedience to lawful authority.
 - Quality and efficiency of joint operations have improved during the 1990s.
 - Services have made significant strides in more closely integrating plans and operations of their reserve and active forces.
 - Race relations in the armed forces are generally better than in the wider society.
- Study raised two important issues that have been top priorities over the past two years: the quality of life and job satisfaction concerns of military personnel.
- President cares deeply about the well being of men and women in uniform.

- He meets with them whenever he can, abroad as well as at home. He talks with them and listens to their concerns. Has done this in Bosnia and Kosovo, and many other locations around the world.
- He also meets with their families, as he did in Norfolk last year when he met with families of troops deployed to the Balkans. They do not hesitate to share their concerns with him.
- President has full and complete confidence in the leadership and judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and civilian leadership of the services. They are aware of the challenges they face and are pursuing a number of initiatives to address the concerns raised by the military personnel surveyed in the CSIS study.
- President meets regularly with the Joint Chiefs and Secretary of Defense to hear their views on readiness and personnel issues. When they expressed concerns about readiness and personnel, he took action.
- As study notes, defense resources are an important issue. President has often stated his commitment to ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to carry out their mission.
- President requested supplemental appropriations in fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and increased funding for readiness, personnel and other critical accounts by \$12 billion in fiscal year 2000.
- Over last six months, have seen encouraging signs that we are turning the corner on readiness. Although our Armed Forces still face readiness challenges, particularly in recruiting and retaining skilled individuals, Administration initiatives are helping us achieve our readiness goals.
- President's budget also projects continued increases in defense spending – over \$112 billion through fiscal year 2005 – the first sustained, long-term increase in a decade.
- Quality of life and job satisfaction concerns of military personnel are also being addressed.
- President requested and signed into law significant increases in pay and benefits in his fiscal year 2000 budget.
- Services are pursuing a number of initiatives to better manage the increase in peacetime deployments that have marked the post-Cold War world.
 - They are implementing improved personnel assignment and unit rotation policies, and are exploring further changes – including organizational changes – to better manage operational tempo and reduce the impact of deployments on military personnel.
 - I refer you to the Defense Department for details on those changes.
- Challenges remain, but these are important steps in the right direction.

- President is confident that America's Armed Forces are – and will continue to be – capable of carrying out our national strategy and meeting America's defense commitments around the world.

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION

January 10, 2000

CONTEXT: In December 1998, the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) proposed to the President that the government establish a new institute to address pressing information infrastructure protection needs. In his response to PCAST, the President directed OSTP and NSC to further evaluate the proposal in close consultation with the private sector. The Administration's detailed review of the proposal, which included discussions with numerous experts in government, the private sector, and academia, concluded that there is a need for such an institute, and that existing entities are not conducting the research and other technical activities needed to protect our information infrastructure. In a capstone meeting, the Chief Technology Officers from 15 of the nation's leading information technology corporations unanimously agreed that such an institute is needed to develop key technologies for information infrastructure protection.

Today we announced that we will request \$50 million for the Institute in FY01. The Institute will be operated through the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and it will work directly with the private sector and academia on crucial problems such as intrusion and malicious code detection.

Why is such an Institute required?

- During the Administration's review of PCAST's proposal, we contacted well over 100 leaders and specialists in information technologies in the government, private sector, and academia. We were particularly concerned with whether existing institutes and laboratories, both inside and outside of government, were already satisfying requirements for information infrastructure protection research.
- The overwhelming response was that key research areas are not being adequately addressed by either government or the private sector. Furthermore, there is insufficient market demand to drive private sector research investments in these areas – even though they are vital to the protection of the nation's information infrastructure.

Isn't the Department of Defense currently funding considerable research in information security? Can't DoD's investments adequately protect the nation's information infrastructure?

- DoD is making substantial investments in information security programs. However, the focus of DoD's efforts are related to the agency's mission: national defense. Our current concern is broader than national defense—we must protect the entire national information infrastructure upon which our economic and national security rest.

- Furthermore, DoD does not have the mandate to protect the largely civilian owned- and operated information infrastructure. While it is important that DoD-funded and developed technologies are applied to protect our national information infrastructure to the maximum degree possible, defense technologies and investments cannot do it all.

**Why isn't private industry developing the technologies to protect its own infrastructures?
Is this a duplication of effort?**

- The private sector is investing substantially in advanced technologies to protect the information infrastructure and ensure its robust, reliable operation. This investment is essential as we move into an information-age economy. However, market forces alone will not motivate the private sector to invest in all the research and technology development needed to protect our nation's information systems.
- During our analysis of PCAST's proposal, the private sector's message was clear: the government must not duplicate existing R&D, but must fill the "gaps." These gaps are real and pressing.
- The reasons why private sector investments are insufficient are many: some of the needed technologies are very high risk or ill-defined; some will require substantial investments in time, personnel, and facilities; some may not lead immediately to products on the market; and others will not produce benefits that the investing firms can capture.

Can you give us some examples of programs in which the private sector is not willing to invest that would be right for the Institute?

- Intrusion detection and monitoring. While there are numerous intrusion detection products on the market, there are a number of fundamental intrusion detection research issues that are ideally suited for the Institute: detection on large scale networks, data fusion from multiple sources, frameworks and protocols that enable different products to "talk" to one another, interfaces with human operators, to name a few.
- Malicious code detection. Sorting through thousands or millions of lines of computer code to detect malicious code such as trapdoors and logic bombs is an extremely challenging technical problem. However, it is essential that we have an automated capability to detect and eliminate such code from our critical infrastructures.
- Interdependencies. The information infrastructure is a fabric that weaves together many of our nation's critical infrastructures. As one example, automatic control of electrical grids, which is particularly important in this era of deregulation, relies upon robust, secure, and continuous operation of information networks. However, very little government or private sector research is devoted to understanding these interdependencies among the infrastructures. Given the innumerable, crucial linkages and dependencies that permeate our infrastructures, interdependencies research is a prime candidate for the Institute.

- Large scale testbeds. Large scale testbeds for testing new, advanced technologies do not exist, and few network owners would be willing to test new technologies on “live” networks. The Institute could develop and operate testbeds in a “neutral environment” – similar to an Underwriters Laboratory.

How do you envision making an Institute in the government fully responsive to the needs of the private sector?

- The Institute will have multiple customers, including the private sector and government owners and operators of information networks. The Institute must be designed from the onset to be flexible, nimble, and responsive to each customer. The Institute will coordinate closely with and receive inputs and recommendations from the National Infrastructure Assurance Council, Sector Coordinators, and expert teams from the private sector. Furthermore, the Institute would continuously review its programs with these private sector experts to ensure the relevancy of its research agenda.

Will this Institute perform its own research or require a new laboratory facility?

- A key consideration for the Institute is that it engage the best and brightest minds in information security. Consequently, the Institute will consist of a small, expert core staff and will primarily support research done by the technology leaders, whether in industry, academia, or the government.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: weekinreview@gallup.com (weekinreview@gallup.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 11-JAN-2000 02:41:40.00

SUBJECT: GALLUP WEEK IN REVIEW: January 2 - 8, 2000

TO: Sarah L. Rosen (CN=Sarah L. Rosen/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

GALLUP WEEK IN REVIEW: January 2 - 8, 2000

The following is a digest of the week's releases from the Gallup News Service. For complete coverage of public opinion on current events, including question wordings, sample sizes and margins of error, go to <http://www.gallup.com>. To view a graphically enhanced version of this digest, go to <http://www.gallup.com/weekinreview.asp>. If you have comments or suggestions regarding the update, or if you wish to decline this service, simply send an e-mail to <mailto:weekinreview@gallup.com>.

SOCIAL ISSUES & POLICY

Russia Faces Image Problem in U.S. as Yeltsin Resigns

With elections in Russia now set for March 26, acting Russian President Vladimir Putin is poised to succeed Boris Yeltsin at a time when U.S. public opinion of Russia is more negative than in recent years. In a Gallup survey conducted last fall, only 38% of Americans had a favorable opinion of Russia, while 58% viewed it unfavorably. Other measures of U.S.-Russia relations in 1999 indicate that Americans were growing uncomfortable with the leadership of Yeltsin, and are reluctant to view Russia as an ally.

View full release at
<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000106.asp>

Public Skepticism About Extent of Y2K Computer Problems Proves Accurate

As New Year's Eve approached, a CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll conducted Tuesday, December 28 found more Americans convinced that a Y2K terrorist attack would occur in the U.S. than thought Y2K-related computer failures would wreak societal havoc. Almost two-thirds of Americans, 61%, believed that one or more terrorist attacks were likely to happen on New Year's, while just 37% thought major disruption from computer errors awaited

us. However, a much smaller percentage thought either of these prospects was very likely to occur. Perhaps as a result, only a third or so of Americans indicated they would adjust their behavior or take other precautionary steps -- a sign that public alarm was at low levels.

View full release at

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000104b.asp>

BUSINESS & THE ECONOMY

Investor Optimism Surged in December

Investor optimism surged in December to its highest level since last summer, led by increases on the personal and economic dimensions, with essentially no change on the governmental dimension. According to the latest PaineWebber/Gallup Index of Investor Optimism, a nationwide survey of 1,000 investors who have at least \$10,000 in investable assets, the December Index is at 167, up 35 points over the previous month's reading, and just under the 171 recorded last July. The Index was established with a baseline of 100 in October 1996.

View full release at

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000105.asp>

MANAGING

Campaign Measurement and Campaign Accountability: Part 3 The Marketing Communications Process

Clear differences exist between the marketing goals for a new product versus a mature brand, or for a considered, high-risk purchase as opposed to a frequent, low-risk purchase. And there are different tasks assigned to (and expected from) the communications programs developed for each brand - so the process and progression of "impact" evolves somewhat differently. Still, certain commonalities in communications impact and consumer response exist regardless of the nature (or speed) of the purchase decision made by the targeted consumer.

View full release at

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/managing/Comm3.asp>

LIFESTYLE

Trends Show Bathing and Exercise Up, TV Watching Down

Times change, and with those changes come new attitudes. Gallup has been tracking these attitudes for almost 70 years, making it possible to compare the lifestyles of today with yesteryear.

View full release at

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000107.asp>

Jordan Picked as Athlete of the Century

A CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll conducted December 20-21, 1999 gives Michael Jordan the nod as the Athlete of the Century. Nearly one in four Americans, 23%, named Jordan when asked "What man or woman living anytime this century do you think was the greatest athlete of the century, in terms of their athletic performance."

View full release at

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr000104.asp>

GALLUP POLL FAST FACTS

Key Indicators

Bill Clinton Overall Job Approval

- * 57% of Americans approve of President Clinton's job performance. More than one third (36%) disapprove. [December 20-21, 1999]

2000 Republican Party Nomination

- * George W. Bush remains the frontrunner in the race for the GOP nomination among registered Republican voters nationwide, favored by 60%. John McCain is running second, with 17% support nationally. Steve Forbes continues to hold third, with 9%. Alan Keyes now receives 4% of the vote, while Gary Bauer holds fifth, supported by 2%. Orrin Hatch comes in sixth, supported by 1% of Republicans. [December 20-21, 1999]

2000 Democratic Party Nomination

- * Al Gore continues to lead Bill Bradley among Democrats nationwide. Gore is supported by 52%, compared to 38% for Bradley. [December 20-21, 1999]

2000 General Presidential Election

- * In trial heats for the general election, George W. Bush as the Republican candidate beats both Al Gore and Bill Bradley, while John McCain as the Republican ties with Gore and loses to Bradley. If the race is between George W. Bush and Al Gore, Bush beats Gore by 11 percentage points (53% to 42%). If the race is between George W. Bush and Bill Bradley, Bush still wins, but by just 5 points, 50% to 45%. A race between John McCain and Al Gore would be deadlocked with McCain and Gore both receiving 47%, but when matched up against Bradley, McCain loses 52% to 39%. [December 20-21, 1999]

2000 Race for Congress

* Gallup measures the congressional strength of the two major parties by asking respondents whether they plan to vote for the Republican or Democratic candidate in their district. Among national adults, the Democrats currently hold a slim lead over Republicans, 46% to 43%. Among likely voters, Republicans lead Democrats by 47% to 43%. Historically Gallup's "generic ballot" measure, based on likely voters, is a highly accurate predictor of the national two-party vote for Congress. [November 18-21, 1999]

Congress Job Approval

* 38% of Americans approve of the way the Republicans in Congress are handling their job, while 53% disapprove. The Democrats enjoy slightly higher ratings, with 49% approving and 42% disapproving of their handling of the job. [November 4-7, 1999]

State of the Country Satisfaction

* 52% of Americans say they are satisfied with the way things are going in the country; 45% are dissatisfied. [September 23-26, 1999]

Economic Confidence Ratings

* 65% of Americans believe the economy is in excellent or good shape, very similar to when last measured in September. Another 27% describe the economy today as "only fair" while just 8% call it "poor." In addition to the positive assessment, a majority of Americans, 52%, believe economic conditions are getting better while just 34% say they are worsening. [October 21-24, 1999]

In the News

Mega-Merger

* As of one year ago, a Gallup poll found Americans generally negative about mergers between large corporations, with 37% saying "the government should generally allow mergers like these to happen" while the majority, 55%, believed "the government should do more to stop mergers like these." However, at the same time, Gallup found no increase in public concern over the power concentrated in the hands of big business. At the time, 77% agreed with the statement that "there is too much power concentrated in the hands of a few big companies," while 20% disagreed. When previously asked in 1987, an identical number were in agreement. [December 4-6, 1998] More recently, Gallup has found that only a quarter of the public, 24%, believe "big business" is the country's biggest future threat. Instead, most (65%) say big government is the bigger threat. [August 24-26, 1999]

Cuban Shipwreck Boy

* A recent Gallup poll found Americans evenly divided at 45% over whether it is Elian Gonzalez's best interests to remain with relatives in the U.S., or return to Cuba to live with his father. By a 51% to 39% margin, women tend to think the child should remain here. By contrast, by a nearly identical margin of 52% to 39%, a majority of men think he should go to live with his father. [December 9-12, 1999]

"Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Under Fire

* Following an investigation initiated by Defense Secretary William Cohen last month, Army Secretary Louis Caldera has now ordered a review

whether the Army has been fairly applying the "don't ask, don't tell" policy toward homosexuals. Gallup finds Americans closely divided about the merits of the policy, with 50% saying they support the policy, and 46% opposed to it. Most opponents--representing 35% of the public--object on the basis that they believe gays should be allowed to serve openly in the military. Only 8% of Americans object to the policy because they believe gays should not be allowed to serve at all. [December 9-12, 1999]

Poll Insights

- * American adults report that on the average weekday, they spend 4 hours and 15 minutes watching television. [December 20-21, 1999]
- * Eight percent of Americans describe their employment status as a "homemaker" including 1% of men and 15% of women. [December 20-21, 1999]
- * President Franklin Delano Roosevelt is cited by 45% of seniors (aged 65+) but only 19% of 18-29 year olds as one of the people they "most admire" from this century. [December 20-21, 1999]
- * A majority of Americans, 54%, have a pet cat or dog. [December 20-21, 1999]
- * 49% of Americans believe the new millennium began January 1, 2000; 45% think it won't start until January 1, 2001. [December 28, 1999]
- * Prior to New Year's Eve, 59% of Americans thought Y2K computer warnings were "necessary precautions;" 38% considered them "unnecessary overreactions." [December 28, 1999]
- * 54% of Americans describe themselves as "religious;" 30% call themselves "spiritual, but not religious;" 9% say they are neither, while 6% insist they are both. [December 9-12, 1999]
- * 86% of Americans believe in God; 8% don't believe in God but believe in a "universal spirit;" 5% believe in neither. [December 9-12, 1999]

=====

COMING NEXT WEEK

- * What distinguishes Bradley from Gore voters?
- * A major Election 2000 update
- * Americans economic confidence at the start of a big new year
- * Public reaction to INS decision to return shipwrecked boy to his father in Cuba

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 15:30:28.00

SUBJECT: SLATE POLITICS: frame game--Question the Question; pundit central--McCain's Glass House

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

SLATE POLITICS: Tues, Jan. 11, 2000

--frame game: Question the Question

--pundit central: McCain's Glass House

frame game

Question the Question

By William Saletan

In the first five minutes of Friday's Republican presidential debate in South Carolina, three of the six candidates refused to answer questions as posed. They rephrased queries, rejected scenarios, and chose options other than those offered by the moderators. When politicians revise questions this way, as they do with increasing frequency, journalists accuse them of "ducking." But if someone swings a bottle at your head, what's wrong with ducking? If the answer is fair game for scrutiny and dispute, why isn't the question?

Think about how politicians manipulate discussions of issues. They insert hidden assumptions to rig the dialogue in their favor. They narrow the range of options under discussion to force their opponents into embarrassing dilemmas. They frame lopsided yes/no questions and squelch attempts to articulate a middle ground. When reporters use these tactics, why shouldn't they, too, be called to account? That's what the Republicans did Friday. For every artfully framed question, they demonstrated a way to escape and counterframe it.

1. Reject the premise. The first question of the debate went to Alan Keyes. "If you had a choice between eight more years of a Democratic president or eight years of a pro-choice Republican," asked co-moderator David Stanton of WIS-TV, "which would you choose?" Keyes replied, "I don't think that has to be our choice. ?

We have to choose to stand forthrightly for the pro-life position.
? So your hypothetical is of no matter to me. We will not face that alternative."

A hypothetical question is no more important than the likelihood of the scenario it assumes. Imagine that Al Gore were asked to choose between a Republican president and a pro-life Democrat who had pledged to appoint Supreme Court justices who would overturn Roe vs. Wade. Since no leading Democratic presidential candidate is pro-life, Gore could reasonably dismiss the question, arguing that the Democratic Party is too principled to nominate a pro-lifer. Why can't Keyes make the converse argument about the GOP?

2. Add an option. The third question of the debate went to Gary Bauer. Stanton asked, "If someone in your family was raped and became pregnant and wanted an abortion, and at the discussion with you they were adamant in their decision to have an abortion, would you support that decision? Or would you try to prevent it?" Bauer replied, "If my daughter or somebody that I loved was raped, that would be the most horrible thing. ? I would comfort her. I would pray with her. I would explain to her that she couldn't make right the terrible thing that had happened to her by taking the life of her innocent unborn child. But the most important thing, sir, is not what I would do under those circumstances, but what I would do as president. And as president I would throw rapists in jail for a long time so America's women wouldn't have to worry about it."

The question is designed to make Bauer choose between two terrible answers: hypocrisy (he'd allow the abortion because the woman is in his family) or cruelty (he'd force the victim to suffer the lifelong consequences of her rape). In his answer, Bauer begins by amending what he deems the less awful of the two options: He wouldn't just "prevent" the abortion, he would "comfort" and counsel the woman. Then Bauer steps outside the two-option scenario forced on him and argues for a third option, which he claims would prevent the scenario. The efficacy of the third option can be debated. But until Bauer enlarged the question, this option wasn't even on the table.

3. Choose a process, not a position. The fourth question went to George W. Bush. "A few blocks from here, on top of the state Capitol building, the Confederate flag flies with the state flag and the U.S. flag," said co-moderator Brian Williams of NBC. "The question is: Does the flag offend you personally?" Bush replied, "What you're trying to get me to do is to express the will of the people of South Carolina." Williams persisted, "No, I'm asking you about your personal opinion." Bush elaborated, "I don't believe it's the role of someone from outside South Carolina ? to come into this state and tell the people of South Carolina what to do with their business when it comes to the flag." Williams repeated, "As an American citizen, do you have a visceral reaction to seeing the Confederate flag?" And Bush concluded, "As an American citizen, I trust the people of South Carolina to make the decision for South Carolina."

The prolonged exchange made Bush look evasive, and he was criticized afterward for dodging the question. But why is Williams' formulation of the issue better than Bush's? Suppose Williams were to ask Bill Bradley, "A few blocks from here, women are walking into a clinic every day and receiving abortions. Does abortion offend you personally?" And suppose Bradley were to reply, "I don't believe it's the role of a politician to go into that clinic and tell those women what to do with their bodies. I trust the women of South Carolina to make that decision." Most people would agree that the process Bradley is endorsing (let the woman decide) is more relevant than his "visceral reaction" as to whether abortion "offends him personally." Why can't Bush make the same argument?

4. Insert a caveat. Halfway through the debate, Williams announced "a brief phase of short questions and rapid-fire answers. ? We will settle for one to two sentences in length, if you must. ? All gentlemen will answer this first question. Has affirmative action made America a better nation?" McCain answered first: "Yes, but quotas have made it worse." Bauer answered second: "The idea behind affirmative action was legitimate and decent. But when you start counting by race, you divide America, you don't bring it together." Bush answered third: "Only if affirmative action means equal opportunity for everybody."

The question seems to demand a yes/no answer. Instead, the candidates reply with "but" and "only if." This kind of qualification is often ridiculed as evasiveness by those who demand "no ifs, ands, or buts." But why is a policy of ifs and buts worse than a policy of no ifs and buts? Most people prefer a morality of ifs and buts, and most real-life laws and regulations are riddled with ifs and buts. Affirmative action in particular cries out for such moral and legal nuance. What voters really needed from the candidates on this question were longer answers, not shorter ones. For example, what does Bush mean by "equal opportunity"?

5. Change the question. By the time the affirmative action question got to the sixth candidate, Keyes, it was being completely rewritten. "It may be more important to ask whether it's helped the people it was supposed to help," he began. "And I think it has actually hurt them by damaging the reputation of many minorities in this country and not giving them credit for their real achievements."

Keyes' answer didn't precisely address the question, but which was more interesting and enlightening? When the question is more specific than the answer, a candidate can be accused of evasion. But what's wrong with an answer that's more specific than the question? Keyes wasn't ducking the pitch. He was tossing back a weak, hanging slider and demanding a fastball so he could hit it harder.

6. Reject the topic. A few minutes later, Stephanie Trotter, a local NBC reporter, asked the candidates, "Gentlemen, I'm curious.

As an adult, what is the biggest mistake that you've made, and what lesson did you learn from it?" The crowd booed, and when Trotter was asked to repeat the question, she rephrased it: "Our viewers are curious. On a personal note, what is the biggest mistake you made as an adult, and what lesson did you learn from it?"

Others answered the question, but Keyes stuffed it. "The biggest mistake I might make as an adult would be to treat that as if it's a question that is appropriate to be asked," he said. "There ought to be in our public life a certain decorum, a certain dignity. There are things that I'll tell my priest in the confessional that I will not tell you or any other American." However, Keyes added, "In terms of what I think we believe to be relevant for the purposes of running for president ? maybe the biggest mistake I had made in my public life ? was not to have spoken out on the issue of the right of the unborn before I did."

Keyes overreacted, but his answer illustrated three lessons. First, sometimes the propriety or significance of a question is a more important and instructive topic than the question itself. Whether the question was improper can be debated--as it turned out, Keyes' comments about his "mistake" on abortion were more interesting than his comments about the question--but viewers benefited from considering both.

Second, challenging questions is a healthy way to hold the press accountable. Questions are instruments of power. Who gets to choose them? Notice how Trotter changed her question after the crowd booed her. First she said, "I'm curious." Then she said, "Our viewers are curious." Obligated to account for her question, she appealed to the notion of a popular mandate. Whether her station's viewers wanted her to ask that question can be checked. What questions should be asked, why they should be asked, and who gets to choose them are now open subjects for scrutiny.

Third, even if the question was really about Keyes' public life, he ended up answering it. Believing that it was framed too personally, he didn't just dismiss it. He reframed it the way he thought it should have been asked, and he answered it. Questions don't have to be answered with a yes or no. Neither does the question of whether to answer them.

Click here to share your opinion of this article and see what others have said: http://www.slate.com/framegame/entries/00-01-10_68641.asp

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

Free Jim Cramer!
<http://www.slate.com/code/PressBox/PressBox.asp?Show=1/10/00&idMessage=4348>

Debate Cocktail Chatter

The Politics of Masochism

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

pundit central

McCain's Glass House

By Michael Brus

Issue 1 is GOP presidential politics, including John McCain's FCC letter and Bush's tax-cut plan. Issue 2 is Democratic presidential politics, including Al Gore and Bill Bradley's promise to allow open gays in the military.

Most pundits agree that the revelation of John McCain's influence-peddling letter to the FCC has hurt his campaign, although several—including Paul Gigot (PBS's NewsHour With Jim Lehrer) and Tucker Carlson (CNN's Late Edition)—think that McCain is just defending his constituents, as he was elected to do. Pundits disagree on Bush's sweeping tax-cut proposal. Joe Klein (NBC's Meet the Press) notes that the cut is bigger than the congressional GOP's (doomed) proposal last fall, and Al Hunt (CNN's Capital Gang) and David Broder (PBS's Washington Week in Review) think that New Hampshire voters care more about schools and health care than taxes. Mark Shields (NewsHour) remarks that Jack Kemp's aggressive tax-cutting campaign strategy didn't work in the 1988 GOP primary, but his colleague, Gigot, responds that McCain's emphasis on tax-cut moderation apes the failed electoral strategies of George Bush (in 1980) and Bob Dole (in 1988). On Meet the Press, Rep. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a McCain supporter, thinks that McCain's critique that Bush's tax plan as too large is not working. John McLaughlin, Lawrence Kudlow, and Jim Warren (all of PBS's McLaughlin Group) enthuse over Bush's recent debate performances.

Many pundits—including Mara Liasson (Washington Week), Mark Shields (NewsHour and Capital Gang), Sam Donaldson (ABC's This Week), and Paul Begala (MSNBC coverage of Friday's night's GOP debate)—think that Gore's and Bradley's outspoken advocacy of gays in the military will hurt them in the general election. Paul Gigot (NewsHour) and Steve Roberts (Late Edition) contrast Gore's ideological approach to this issue with President Clinton's pragmatic approach. Tucker Carlson (Late Edition) notes that only a nation with no security threats could devote so much attention to a "boutique issue" like the military's homosexual policy. George Stephanopoulos and George F. Will (both of This Week) think the issue is a red herring, because Congress can override any executive order that overturns "don't ask, don't tell." Margaret Carlson (Capital Gang) and Joe Klein say that Bradley's aloofness and

condescension still hurt his popularity, and Klein predicts that if he is the Democratic nominee his Senate votes against the Gulf War and welfare reform will haunt him.

Miscellany: John McLaughlin, Jim Warren, and Eleanor Clift (of the McLaughlin Group) call the new criterion for participating in general-election presidential debates "undemocratic." (A participant must have at least 15 percent support in five national polls.) They argue that any party qualifying for federal matching funds should get to participate. On Fox News Sunday, Bill Bradley also voices disagreement with the rule, saying that the Reform Party has a "strong case" that it should be included in the debates, even without 15 percent support. On CBS's Face the Nation, Gov. Jesse Ventura, Ref.-Minn., notes that he had only 10 percent support when he debated Minnesota's Democratic and Republican candidates for governor; six weeks later he won the election with 37 percent. ... On Friday's Larry King Live (CNN), both Bob and Elizabeth Dole say that the general election will be close, not a blowout by Bush. Appearing with his wife again on This Week, Bob Dole predicts that Bush will win the nomination (although he still will not endorse him). Steve Roberts opines that although Mrs. Dole has proved to be an awful presidential campaigner, her popularity among women will be hard for Bush to resist when he selects his running mate. ... When Elizabeth Dole praises Bush's "executive experience" on This Week, Sam Donaldson points out that her own husband had no such experience when he ran for president.

Last Word

Look, I've always had two principles. One is make bureaucracies react on behalf of the taxpayers, and second, do whatever I can to increase competition and lower costs in telecommunications. Those are the guiding principles I've had. Today, we are asking the federal government to release all correspondence that I've had with every government agency. But finally, let me remind you, I'm the chairman of the committee that is designated by the Congress toooversight [sic] the FCC. And it's my responsibility to try to see and make them act. And so I believe that the record will be clear that I've done that on behalf of the consumer.

--John McCain (Face the Nation)

Highlights from the Fray:

1. Was I the only one who found Bob Schrum defending Al Gore on Meet the Press an absolute disaster? Schrum looked like he'd just left a barroom brawl and wanted to continue the fisticuffs with Russert and poor Congressman Nadler.
2. John McCain will probably now be called "former" media darling. The FCC flap put a bit of blood in the water. Defenders of McCain's actions sounded tepid and now other McCain policy weaknesses are

suddenly being talked about.

3. If This Week thinks that dropping Bill Kristol is helping their show, they need to think again. Even though they never gave him much airtime, he was an insightful, dispassionate observer. Of all the former active political partisans turned talking head, Republican and Democrat alike, Kristol seemed to have the best understanding of the "other" party's internal mechanics. He never seemed to color his opinions about Democrats to fit a pro-Republican agenda. I hope he resurfaces somewhere. Yesterday's This Week panel discussion was absolutely vacuous.

--Will

Will,

I agree about Bob Shrum--he looked idiotic, not just because he was trying to make $1+1=3$, but because he was so insistent about such a minor goof. (See "Kausfiles" for more on Shrum's Sunday appearance.)

I agree about Kristol, too. I think This Week just didn't want two conservatives on the show, and George F. Will had seniority.

--Michael Brus

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

<http://www.slate.com/Code/PunditCentral/PunditCentral.asp?Show=1/9/00&idMessage=4338>

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JAN-2000 15:22:47.00

SUBJECT: SLATE POLITICS: When is Rape a Federal Case?; Slander Patrol--Gore's Litmus Test

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

SLATE POLITICS: Wed, Jan. 12, 2000

--dispatch: When is Rape a Federal Case?

--ballot box: Slander Patrol--Gore's Litmus Test

dispatch

When is Rape a Federal Case?

By Dahlia Lithwick

The Federal Rape Rap

If I were a first-grade teacher, I'd have my students put on a Constitution Pageant. I'd dress up the First Amendment kid to look like fire in a crowded theater. I'd have the Second Amendment kid carry an Uzi. I'm not sure what I'd do with the poor kid who has to play the Bill of Attainder, but I would definitely dress up the Commerce Clause kid as Stretch Armstrong.

You won't know Stretch Armstrong unless you were a kid in the '70s, or had a kid in the '70s. Just so we can all be on the same page here, let me explain that Stretch Armstrong was a muscled male action figure--G.I. Joe on steroid shakes--whose body could be tugged and pulled like rubber taffy.

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution (the "Commerce Clause") gives Congress the right to meddle in states' affairs as long as the statute in question purports to regulate interstate commerce. Since the late 1930s, the Commerce Clause has been stretched and tortured to expand federal powers into areas--including farmers' consumption of their own wheat--involving neither interstate activity nor commerce. In a 1964 case involving the refusal of the Heart of Atlanta Motel to comply with the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Supreme Court held that any establishment catering to interstate travelers, or serving food purchased out-of-state, could

be comfortably regulated under the federal Commerce Clause power.

Sneaky ...

Since most of us think the desegregation cases were long overdue, we often overlook the fact that the poor Commerce Clause was tortured beyond recognition to get us there. By the '80s, Commerce Clause jurisprudence had turned Stretch Armstrong into melted mozzarella.

Enter the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Rehnquist--a court that's all about curbing federalism. It's about limiting mushrooming federal powers and letting the states be as backward, narrow-minded, and parochial as they please. The trend began in 1995 in *United States vs. Lopez*, when--for the first time in 60 years--the court invalidated a federal statute (the Gun-Free School Zones Act) as overreaching the scope of Congress' powers.

Today they are poised to do it again. The cases are *United States vs. Morrison* and *Brzonkala vs. Morrison*, and by the time you read this, you will have already heard Nina Totenberg say "Brzonkala" enough times to know that it's not pronounced as it's spelled.

Morrison concerns the Violence Against Women Act, a 1994 federal law, which, among other things, created a private civil cause of action against anyone committing a crime of violence motivated by gender. (And no, no one supplied any answers today to the question of what sorts of rape might not be motivated by gender.) That section of VAWA is being challenged as beyond the scope of Congress' Commerce Clause powers, because it punishes purely private, non-economic activity--rape.

Because Commerce Clause power has become a legal fiction, the attempt to unstretch it and corral it into some bounded, principled thing is bound to be fraught with other legal fictions. Oral argument today is a snuffling, wheezy quest for a limiting principle on federal powers. As the protesters from the National Organization for Women demonstrate on the sidewalk outside ("2-4-6-8: Stop the violence, stop the hate"), inside the justices are carefully counting out how many hypothetical federal statutes they can cram on the head of a pin.

Julie Goldscheid--Christy Brzonkala's attorney--explains that Congress made extensive findings before enacting VAWA--bone-chilling findings about the magnitude of violence directed at women, and the apathy, or at least inefficacy, with which the state criminal justice systems handle it. But Justice Scalia is not interested in congressional findings or the purposes of the act. He wants to know why the act is limited to gender-based violence. He wants to know why Congress cannot enact a federal Robbery Law or federal Murder Law under its Commerce Clause authority.

Goldscheid explains that the states requested federal help in this

matter. Thirty-eight state attorneys general testified before Congress. Thirty-six states signed an amicus (friend of the court) brief detailing the toll taken by violence against women. How unutterably bizarre that the high court and a rapist are "protecting" the states against federal assistance sought by the states themselves.

Solicitor General Seth Waxman rises to speak on behalf of the United States. Immediately, Justices Rehnquist, Kennedy, and Scalia are clambering all over him for a theoretical limit on federal Commerce Clause power. Waxman lays out a four-pronged test cobbled together from the holding in *United States vs. Lopez*. Indeed, throughout his presentation, Waxman is in the uncomfortable position of having to argue that the United States won something in *Lopez*--as if some meaningful jurisprudential lesson might be read into the skid marks left after Rehnquist pulled the brake on the barreling train that was federal power.

Michael Rosman, defending Antonio Morrison, the young man who was sued under VAWA in 1995, does an astonishing job of drawing limiting principles on Commerce Clause powers--so much so that at times it appears as though he'd like to disband Congress altogether. When asked by Justice Breyer for a line between "local and interstate acts," Rosman replies that only economic activities should be subject to federal Commerce Clause authority. Breyer asks: What about federal drug laws? Rosman backs down and concedes that the federal government may regulate some non-economic conduct.

When Congress passed VAWA, it found that domestic violence caused \$3 billion worth of economic harm to women each year due to employee absenteeism alone. Justice Souter asks Rosman why the \$3 billion finding does not represent economic harm. And Justice Stevens is not happy with Rosman's definition of commerce--since it would bar the federal government from proscribing marijuana grown in one's own backyard.

Justice Kennedy asks how it is that the federal government's intercession to protect the 14th Amendment rights of blacks unable to achieve equal protection in a biased system is permissible, while intercession to protect the rights of women is not. To which the answer--never given--is: Because it's 2000 baby, not 1964. And because the reckless, sloppy, well-intentioned Warren court is gone. The Rehnquist court sits high, high up on its wall and guards the boundaries between state and federal. It clarifies, refines, and revises the tests. And it never shines its light on the broken people anymore.

Christy Brzonkala sits in the back of the gallery this morning. In 1994, when she was a freshman at Virginia Tech, Brzonkala was raped in her own dormitory by Antonio Morrison, a varsity football player. After he did so, Morrison allegedly bragged that he liked "to get girls drunk and f--- the s--- out of them." Brzonkala sought help from the university rather than the state criminal system. The Virginia Tech "Judicial Committee" found Morrison

guilty of assault and suspended him for two semesters--with the suspension deferred by the provost until after he graduated. Morrison was thus able to play football for Virginia Tech. Brzonkala dropped out.

If I were a first-grade teacher, I'd have my students put on a Constitution Pageant. And I'd worry about the little girls. I'd teach them not to rely on their universities, or their state courts, or that champion of the underdog--the U.S. Supreme Court--to make the world a fairer place for women. I'd teach them to play football.

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

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

Chatterbox: Anagrams of "AOL Time Warner Inc."
<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/12/00&idMessage=4360>

Microsoft Leaks Own Plans for Coup D'Etat
<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/11/00&idMessage=4356>

Why Online Polls Are Bunk
http://www.slate.com/netelection/entries/00-01-11_68660.asp

ballot box

Slander Patrol: Gore's Litmus Test

By Jacob Weisberg

John McCain says Al Gore and Bill Bradley are not qualified to be commander in chief "based upon their support of a litmus test for future chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff." The Republican National Committee is now running ads that say the same thing. Leaving aside the minor nuance that Bradley never endorsed any test at all, let alone a "litmus" test for the Joint Chiefs chairman, is McCain right to argue that Gore's position is unreasonable?

Here's what Gore said in the debate on January 5, in response to a question from Peter Jennings on whether he would have a "litmus test" for the post of chairman of the Joint Chiefs:

I would try to bring about the kind of change in policy, on the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, that President Harry Truman brought

about after World War II in integrating the military. And I think that would require those who wanted to serve in on the position of--on the Joint Chiefs to be in agreement with that policy. So, yes.

In answer to a follow-up question from Jennings, Gore modified his answer slightly. "I would insist, before appointing anybody to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that that individual support my policy," the vice president said. "And, yes, I would make that a requirement." Requiring "support" is somewhat different than requiring "agreement" (see "Kausfiles" for further analysis of this distinction). After he was attacked for the answer, Gore made clear his preference for his second response over his first. "I did not mean to imply that there should ever be any kind of inquiry into the personal, political opinion of officers in the U.S. military," Gore said, at an impromptu press conference two days later. As Gore belatedly realized, "support" is the better answer, because it leaves open the theoretical possibility of appointing a military officer so honorable that he will work assiduously to implement a policy he personally disagrees with. But in reality, there isn't much of a difference between "support" and "agreement"--certainly not enough to constitute a "reversal," which was how the New York Times characterized Gore's adjustment. Chairmen and members of the Joint Chiefs who "personally" oppose this particular change in policy are not likely to put their feelings aside and implement it. They're likely to try to sabotage it.

Consider what happened to Bill Clinton when he tried to lift the ban on gays in the military in 1993. In theory, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs at that time, Colin Powell, was an obedient officer ranking directly below Clinton in the chain of command. In practice, Powell worked around Clinton to prevent a policy change that he disagreed with. After Clinton was elected but before he was sworn in, Powell gave a speech at the Naval Academy in Annapolis in which he told midshipmen that if the new policy violated their beliefs, they should consider resigning from the military.

George Stephanopoulos describes the political reality of the situation in his book *All Too Human*. "I knew we had no cards to play," Stephanopoulos writes, describing Clinton's first meeting with Powell and the Joint Chiefs. "If we didn't work out a compromise with the chiefs, they would sabotage us on the Hill. While they were obliged to obey their commander, they had the right to present their personal views to congressional committees publicly." It was, in fact, the prospect of Powell and the other chiefs testifying before Congress about their personal opposition to allowing gays to serve in the military that gave Senator Sam Nunn the leverage to foist Powell's own preferred compromise of "don't ask, don't tell" on the administration. And had Congress not acted, it's entirely likely that the chiefs would have worked to sabotage the new policy at the bureaucratic level.

For this reason, Gore's "litmus test" position is not merely defensible; it's the only sensible one to take if you seriously

intend to get rid of "don't ask, don't tell." By contrast, Bradley's stance--that he would expect the chairman of the Joint Chiefs to follow his orders--is utterly naive. As for the Republican line that all the Joint Chiefs ever do is offer advice and obey their commander in chief, it's worse than naive. It's disingenuous. Conservatives know that litmus-untested chiefs are likely to try to undermine a Democratic president's effort to allow gays to serve openly in the military. And what's more, Republicans want them to undermine it.

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

The Internet's informed look at politics and culture -- SLATE. What

Matters. (<http://www.slate.com>)

SLATE offers a variety of e-mail delivery services that enable you to get your favorite SLATE articles delivered right to your in-box.

Go to <http://www.slate.com/Code/Reg3/emailservices.asp> to see what's available.

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JAN-2000 08:04:11.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Wed., Jan. 12, 2000

TO: fernald@post.harvard.edu (fernald@post.harvard.edu [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Wed., Jan. 12, 2000

--today's papers: Strokes of Luck

--the week/the spin: Case's Best Scenario

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Join Working Assets Long Distance Today and Help Build a Better World! Get 360 minutes of FREE calls plus FREE ice cream when you join now.
<http://www.workingassets.com/join/form.cfm?formID=IE-071-SLT-1>

Join now for the best of both worlds: great phone service at competitive rates and a strong commitment to progressive causes. We donate 1 percent of your charges to nonprofit groups working for peace, human rights, equality, education, and the environment--at no extra cost to you.

today's papers

Strokes of Luck

By Scott Shuger

The WP and NYT lead with the British government's finding, based on an independent medical examination, that Gen. Augusto Pinochet, under house arrest in England, is too sick to be tried on the human rights charges awaiting him in Spain. This means, say the papers, that Pinochet could instead return to Chile soon. The USAT final edition leads with a saber-rattling leak from the DOJ/Microsoft wrangle: that government prosecutors will shortly offer up during negotiations with MS a proposal for a break-up yielding two companies, one for the Windows operating system, another for software programs. The story says that it's unclear where MS Internet activities would go. A MS spokesman is quoted saying a breakup "would do great harm to the industry." The top non-local story at the LAT (which fronts Pinochet) is the Supreme Court's ruling Tuesday saying the nation's state workers, including

teachers, do not enjoy the federal government's protection against age discrimination, yet another example, says the paper, of the Court's recent championing of states' rights. The NYT fronts the decision. The WSJ runs Pinochet and the Court one-two at the top of its front-page news box.

The papers say that a decision to allow Pinochet--who was found to have suffered a series of small strokes--to return to Chile is in the hands of the Home Secretary and may come next week. The WP and LAT report that Pinochet still may face charges back in Chile. The Post adds that although Pinochet was granted legal immunity in Chile in return for his step-down from power, it's not clear that the current government is willing to honor it. On the other hand, the NYT reminds that while he's been in England, Pinochet has received the support of former P.M. Margaret Thatcher, who it says, was "delighted" with the doctors' report.

The WP reports that Spain and even many human rights advocates will accept Pinochet's escape of the Spanish charges because, as all the papers note, the case has via the British courts created a historic precedent: a former head of state can be brought to trial in another country for crimes against humanity committed in his home country while in office.

The WP off-leads yesterday's 11 percent drop-off in AOL's stock price, significant, notes the paper, because AOL plans to purchase Time Warner with its stock.

USAT fronts the latest wrinkle in the Elian Gonzalez saga. It seems that the Miami family court judge who just delayed the INS plan to return the boy to his father in Cuba employed--during her 1998 election campaign--the spokesman for the boy's Miami relatives as well as the spokesman's wife. The numbers vary a bit from paper to paper, but ballpark, the two received a total of \$60,000. The stories say the Miami court does not require judges in this sort of situation to recuse themselves.

The NYT fronts an Alex Kuczynski effort reporting a surprising image manipulation at CBS News. It seems that the network's evening news broadcast for Dec. 30 and Dec. 31 included images of Times Square with a billboard advertising CBS News. But the billboard and the CBS ad are not actually in Times Square. They were digitally inserted by CBS into the shot. The story says the anchor on the show, Dan Rather, learned about the practice during the broadcast but did not protest. Rather did not return a phone call from the Times. By the way, journalists who don't return phone calls from the press are precisely the sorts who don't hesitate to manipulate content--it's all part of the belief that the rules they constantly apply to others don't apply to themselves.

The WP's "Reliable Source" says Hillary Clinton will appear on Letterman tonight. Maybe the network can digitally give her a prayer in New York.

On the WP op-ed page, Cindy Williams, an MIT researcher, does a good nuts-and-boltsy job of bringing some reality to the topic of military pay raises. The author notes that the alleged gap of 13 percent between civilian and military pay fails to take into account allowances for food and housing. Also, she notes that some of the allowances are not taxed. Such details help to explain why soldiers typically earn more money than 75 percent of civilians with similar backgrounds. And there some concrete earnings examples: a Marine master sergeant with 20 years in makes more than \$50,000, better than a senior fire fighter or police officer, and both of those civilian jobs are as dangerous or more so than the typical military job. And a colonel with 26 years' service makes more than \$108,000. And none of this includes, the op-ed notes, reenlistment and other special bonuses. The one point the author leaves out that would make her argument even stronger: the very young retirement ages available to military personnel. That colonel, for instance, can retire on a nice pension at age 47.

In a letter to the NYT, a working mother explains how her household handles her child's homework: "First ask the babysitter for help; if that fails, try Mom's fax if she's not traveling to close a deal; if that fails, try Dad's fax if he's not in court, and if all of the above fail, call Grandma Ro. (No fax available.)"

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=356>

4

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

McCain's Press Problem

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

The Federal Rape Rap

<http://www.slate.com/dispatches/99-11-09/dispatches.asp>

Microsoft Leaks Own Plans for Coup D'Etat

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/11/00&idMessage=4356>

the week/the spin

Case's Best Scenario

By Matt Alsdorf

America Online is buying Time Warner. The \$166 billion deal is the biggest corporate merger ever and would create the world's largest media company, valued at over \$350 billion. Analysts hailed the marriage because 1) Time Warner will be able to market its movies, music, and magazines to AOL's 20 million subscribers; and 2) AOL will be able to use Time Warner's massive cable network to deliver high-speed Internet access. Reporters tripped over themselves to describe the importance of the deal, saying, in order of increasing excitement: 1) it signals "convergence between old media content and the new medium of the Net"; 2) it presages more megamergers, as other companies struggle to keep pace; 3) it "marks the passage of the Internet from an exotic technology into a mass media industry"; and 4) it represents "the triumph of the Internet as the irresistible force in business." Customers were tepid, wondering whether the mammoth company would improve consumers' access to products or increase investors' access to profits. ("Moneybox" asks if AOL paid too much for Time Warner, and "Chatterbox" wonders if Nora Ephron brokered the deal.)

Three Chinese stowaways died on their way to the United States. Their bodies were discovered, along with 15 survivors, inside a metal shipping container unloaded in Seattle. Eighty-seven illegal Chinese immigrants have been arrested in West Coast ports since the new year--almost all on container ships from Hong Kong. Unless the stowaways can prove they were persecuted in China, they will be sent home. Officials were incensed by: 1) the greed of the smugglers, who charge up to \$60,000 per person; 2) the complicity of the shipping lines; and 3) the negligence of Hong Kong authorities. The gloomy spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to escape Chinese oppression. The rosier spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to gain American freedom.

A Florida court granted temporary custody of Eli n Gonz lez to his Miami relatives. The state judge ordered Gonz lez to remain in the United States until a hearing in March. Last week, the Immigration and Naturalization Service ruled that the 6 year-old should be reunited with his father in Cuba. The INS could overrule the judge's decision but has hinted that it won't. Gonz lez's Miami relatives said he was gaining a chance at due process and a better life in the States. Most legal experts said the chance would be short-lived, since courts are almost certain to grant permanent custody to the father. Last week's cynical spin: The INS caved to political pressure from Cuba. This week's cynical spin: Florida caved to political pressure from Cuban exiles.

The Postal Service wants to raise prices. If approved by Postal

Rate Commission, stamps for letters and postcards would each increase by a penny in early 2001, to 34 and 21 cents, respectively. The Postal Service spun the rate hike as a competitive necessity that would allow it to maintain universal service, improve technology, and cover rising costs. Critics charged that it would hinder 1) businesses and nonprofits that rely on direct mail; and 2) the Postal Service itself, by providing even greater incentive to use alternative shippers.

Peace talks between Israel and Syria wound down. Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk Shara are returning home without an agreement on Israel's withdrawal from the Golan Heights or Syria's guarantees of security. Their delegations will continue to negotiate, and the leaders will likely meet again in late January. The Clinton administration deemed the talks a success, saying 1) no one expected a breakthrough in the first round; and 2) the unprecedented discussion of substantive issues was a breakthrough. Skeptics said the progress was minimal and questioned whether the "well-rehearsed technique of locking Israel and its adversaries in a negotiating arena, cut off from other distractions, still works as well as it once did."

Al Gore and Bill Bradley reiterated their support of gays in the military. Gore said he would insist that potential appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff support allowing gays to serve openly. Bradley said he would require his Joint Chiefs to carry out such a policy. Gore later asserted that he meant what Bradley said. Military officers and the Republican candidates blasted Bradley and Gore for crossing "a boundary between social politics and military policy." Analysts variously said the hubbub revealed that 1) gay voters are increasingly important to Democrats; 2) the candidates are willing to sacrifice popular support in order to court them; and 3) Bradley is better than Gore at doing so.

The flu is hitting the United States. Flu season arrived earlier than in previous years, and the number and severity of infections are higher than average. Some hospitals are delaying elective procedures to deal with the influx of flu patients. The good news: 1) The most widespread flu strains are covered by the current vaccine; and 2) new medications are effective if taken immediately after symptoms appear. The bad news: 1) Fewer than 10 percent of people take the vaccine; 2) it may be too late to get vaccinated this season; and 3) people usually react too slowly to flu symptoms for the new medications to be effective.

Elizabeth Dole endorsed George W. Bush. In her long-expected announcement, Dole likened Bush to Ronald Reagan and said he would repair the presidency's tarnished image. Analysts called it a win for 1) Bush, who gains support from women voters; 2) Dole, who increases her chances of nabbing the vice presidential nomination; and 3) John McCain, who can again cast "Bush as the charmed insider and [himself] as the scrappy outsider."

La Niña is altering winter weather. The effects of the

cooler-than-normal Pacific Ocean currents include 1) balmy temperatures on the East Coast; 2) tornadoes in Kentucky and Mississippi; and 3) cool weather in California. Midwesterners ran for cover. Easterners celebrated with "giddiness usually reserved for the first days of spring." Pessimists called the weather a "spooky" reminder of Mother Nature's power and predicted further climatic changes from the greenhouse effect.

Y2K came and went without terrorism or technological snafus. Airplanes stayed airborne and ATMs dispensed cash as usual. Observers said the Y2K bug's threat 1) was averted thanks to diligent preparation; 2) had been exaggerated by greedy programmers so that customers would commission expensive repairs; and 3) won't pass until companies and governments have used their "backroom systems," which were not repaired as thoroughly as critical programs.

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-JAN-2000 21:30:03.00

SUBJECT: WHAT'S IN SLATE: The Real Winner in the AOL-Time Warner Deal; United Killers of Benneton; and more

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Jan. 14, 2000

Dear Reader:

Notes from this week's issue:

William Saletan's Frame Game defends a politician's right to duck questions: "Think about how politicians manipulate discussions of issues. They insert hidden assumptions to rig the dialogue in their favor. They narrow the range of options under discussion to force their opponents into embarrassing dilemmas. They frame lopsided yes/no questions and squelch attempts to articulate a middle ground. When reporters use these tactics, why shouldn't they, too, be called to account? That's what the Republicans did [in their presidential debate] Friday. For every artfully framed question, they demonstrated a way to escape and counterframe it."
http://www.slate.com/framegame/entries/00-01-10_68641.asp

Dahlia Lithwick's Supreme Court Dispatch reviews the arguments over the constitutionality of the Violence Against Women Act: " [A] section of VAWA is being challenged as beyond the scope of Congress' Commerce Clause powers, because it punishes purely private, non-economic activity -- rape. ... Oral argument today is a snuffling, wheezy quest for a limiting principle on federal powers. As the protesters from the National Organization for Women demonstrate on the sidewalk outside (12-4-6-8: Stop the violence, stop the hate), inside the justices are carefully counting out how many hypothetical federal statutes they can cram on the head of a pin."
<http://www.slate.com/dispatches/99-11-09/dispatches.asp>

Jacob Weisberg's Ballot Box explains why the next president should submit candidates for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to a litmus test: "Gore's litmus test position is not merely defensible; it's the only sensible one to take if you seriously intend to get rid of don't ask, don't tell. By contrast, Bradley's stance--that he would expect the chairman of the Joint Chiefs to follow his orders--is utterly naive. As for the Republican line that all the Joint Chiefs ever do is offer advice and obey their commander in

chief, it's worse than naive. It's disingenuous."

<http://www.slate.com/code/BallotBox/BallotBox.asp?Show=1/12/00&idMessage=43>

62

In TV Club, Judith Shulevitz and Jeffrey Goldberg wrangle over HBO's mob drama:

Shulevitz: "The Sopranos" brings the understatement of the American short story to a subject usually treated as high drama or farce.

Goldberg: "The Sopranos" accurately captures the desperation of today's mobsters. The smarter wise guys know that they are the track-suit-wearing equivalents of one of those prehistoric tribes living in the Orinoco River Basin, just waiting for extinction.

<http://www.slate.com/code/TVClub/TVClub.asp?Show=1/12/00&idMessage=4364&idBio=137>

David Plotz assesses AOL Time Warner's future CEO, Gerald Levin:

"Levin has been underestimated in part because he has cultivated such a diffident style. He is a man without a shadow, affectless, egoless. ... Levin's opaqueness actually masks a savage toughness. If he is a philosopher-businessman, his inspiration is Nietzsche."

<http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-14/Assessment.asp>

Also: James Surowiecki's Moneybox asks if AOL paid too much for Time Warner; Walter Reich and Peter D. Kramer debate whether psychology can cure racism, in Dialogues; in Press Box, Jack Shafer interprets TheStreet.com's latest move; Jennifer Mendelsohn exposes the cunning tricks of the tabloid trade, in Keeping Tabs; Chris Suellentrop's Net Election explains why online polls aren't really polls; and much more.

<http://www.slate.com/Code/Moneybox/Moneybox.asp?Show=1/11/00&idMessage=4358>

<http://www.slate.com/dialogues/00-01-12/dialogues.asp>

<http://www.slate.com/code/PressBox/PressBox.asp?Show=1/10/00&idMessage=4348>

<http://www.slate.com/keepingtabs/00-01-13/keepingtabs.asp>

http://www.slate.com/netelection/entries/00-01-11_68660.asp

You can link from here directly to Slate's Table of Contents and all the Slate stories and departments not mentioned above:

<http://www.slate.com>

Today's Papers;

<http://www.slate.com/Code/TodaysPapers/TodaysPapers.asp>

The Week/The Spin: The week's top stories;

<http://www.slate.com/Spin/00-01-10/Spin.asp?Show=11/30/99>

International Papers;

<http://www.slate.com/InterNatPapers/00-01-12/InterNatPapers.asp>

In Other Magazines: What's in "Time," "Newsweek," etc.;

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

News Quiz;

http://www.slate.com/newsquiz/entries/00-01-12_72846.asp

Explainer: Is it illegal to do favors for campaign donors?
<http://www.slate.com/Code/explainer/explainer.asp?Show=1/12/00&idMessage=4365>

Summary Judgment: What the critics are saying about what's new;
<http://www.slate.com/SummaryJudgment/00-01-11/SummaryJudgment.asp>

Pundit Central: The Sunday talk shows;
<http://www.slate.com/Code/PunditCentral/PunditCentral.asp?Show=1/9/00&idMessage=4338>

Everyday Economics: The patent system sucks;
<http://www.slate.com/Economics/00-01-12/Economics.asp>

Chatterbox: On AOL, Microsoft, and other stuff;
<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp>

Kausfiles: Litmus testing Bob Shrum;
<http://www.slate.com/code/kausfiles/kausfiles.asp?Show=1/10/00&idMessage=4342>

Crossword;
<http://www.slate.com/xword/00-01-10/xword.asp>

Diary: Stanley Fish on stirring up the academy;
<http://www.slate.com/diary/00-01-10/diary.asp>

Poem: "CAELICA, #100 (In Night, When Colors All to Black)," by Fulke Greville;
<http://www.slate.com/Poem/00-01-11/Poem.asp>

I See France: Michael Lewis on moving to Paris;
http://www.slate.com/ISeeFrance/entries/00-01-10_68600.asp

Dear Prudence: Get answers to your questions on morals and manners;
<http://www.slate.com/DearPrudence/00-01-13/DearPrudence.asp>

and Best of The Fray;
<http://www.slate.com/BestOfFray/00-01-12/BestOfFray.asp>

P.S. If you have friends (or, for that matter, enemies) who might be interested in Slate, please forward this.

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

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

For additional information about SLATE, go to

<http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/memberservices.asp> for SLATE Reader Services.

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-JAN-2000 07:34:16.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 14, 2000

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 14, 2000

--today's papers: Bradley Gives Gore the Willies

--the week/the spin: First Lady of the Night

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Join Working Assets Long Distance Today and Help Build a Better World! Get 360 minutes of FREE calls plus FREE ice cream when you join now.
<http://www.workingassets.com/join/form.cfm?formID=IE-071-SLT-1>

Join now for the best of both worlds: great phone service at competitive rates and a strong commitment to progressive causes. We donate 1 percent of your charges to nonprofit groups working for peace, human rights, equality, education, and the environment--at no extra cost to you.

today's papers

Bradley Gives Gore the Willies

By Scott Shuger

The LAT leads with Alan Greenspan's comment in a speech Thursday that nudging interest rates further upwards is necessary to control the temperature of an economy overheated by soaring stock prices. The paper also notes that just hours before Greenspan spoke, President Clinton, in an appearance at the NYSE, said that dangerous inflation didn't seem to be a threat to this economy. No other paper fronts the story, although the WSJ puts it high up in its front-page financial news index. USAT goes with Bill Gates' announcement that, while remaining chairman of Microsoft, he's handing over CEO duties to long-time associate Steve Ballmer. Gates says that he will spend almost all of his time focused on the company's software strategy. The paper says Ballmer might "put a kinder, gentler face on the company" during its antitrust settlement talks with the government, but then quotes his

assessment of any government breakup of the company: "absolutely reckless and irresponsible." The LAT (which high up strongly suggests that Gates will remain the de facto leader of MS) and WP front the story, and the WSJ puts it atop its financial news index, while the NYT puts it inside. The NYT leads with the latest in a story the paper has pretty much owned: the battle between the White House and drug companies over whether or not Medicare should cover prescription drugs. The paper explains that companies have long expressed the fear that coverage would lead to government price-setting on the bulk of their sales. Today's installment: two top drug pharmaceutical executives now say they could accept the coverage. The Times suggests that they are trying to head off a full-on Clinton administration depiction as price-gougers. The WP goes with the very rare sports lead: the NBA Washington Wizards have reached an agreement in principle to give Michael Jordan complete control of the team's front office, including all trades, signings, draft selections and all other personnel decisions. The main remaining fill-in is how much equity in the franchise Jordan will get. A striking defect in the story: no mention of whether or not Jordan is buying that equity share or being given it or what his other compensation would be. The story says Jordan is not considering a comeback as part of the arrangement.

The LAT and NYT front and the WSJ reefs the revelation that under a little known federal program, the government drug control office has been getting advanced looks at scripts for primetime TV shows and making suggestions for changes that send an anti-drug message. Some of the changes have been accepted by producers. Under an agreement with the government, such in-story messages allowed the networks to make more money selling ads because they then don't have to run as many anti-drug public service announcements. The story was broken by Salon, a fact that the papers report on with varying degrees of candor: The LAT comes clean in the 2nd paragraph and the WSJ in the 4th, but the NYT holds off until the 7th.

Citing a story in Thursday's Boston Herald, the LAT fronts and the WP goes inside with Bill Bradley's decision, with ten days to go until the Iowa caucuses, to hit Al Gore for introducing the racially explosive Willie Horton issue against Michael Dukakis during Gore's 1988 presidential primary bid. The controversy was later used against Dukakis to great effect by George Bush. Both papers point out that Bradley had previously been eschewing scorched-earth politics. The Post reports on the novel spin tactics being used by the Gore and Bradley camps: The Gore campaign responded by giving out Michael Dukakis' phone number, and Dukakis is quoted saying Bradley's charge is "nonsense" because the Horton case was already well known in New England. The Bradleyites released the number of Dukakis' campaign manager, Susan Estrich, who is quoted saying the Dukakis campaign was indeed surprised by Gore's raising Horton.

Everybody goes inside with a fresh shift in the demographics of AIDS: the majority of gay men being diagnosed with the disease are now either black or Hispanic.

USAT's front-page "snapshot" shows how Americans rank various high profile crimes for qualification as the "Crime of the Century." According to the paper the number one contender is the JFK assassination. Yet another sign of Boomer myopia: Not even making the list is the Lindbergh kidnapping or the theft of the U.S.' atom bomb secrets.

The WSJ "Washington Wire" reports that ex-Clinton press secretary Mike McCurry introduced a conference speaker the other day as having served in "the first Bush administration."

The NYT runs an op-ed today that says the real reason not to like the AOL/TW deal and its ilk is that mergers inherently dilute the quality of journalism. Of course, as the piece points out, two heads aren't guaranteed to be better than one. But this is a plausible possibility isn't it? After all, this piece has a co-byline; it's by media bigfeet Tom Rosenstiel and Bill Kovach. If they're absolutely right, then why didn't they write better separate articles instead?

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

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

Keeping Tabs: Bait and Snitch

<http://www.slate.com/keepingtabs/00-01-13/keepingtabs.asp>

In Other Magazines: Dialysis for Your Cat

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

Chatterbox: United Killers of Benetton

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/13/00&idMessage=4367>

the week/the spin

First Lady of the Night

USAT's front-page "snapshot" shows how Americans rank various high profile crimes for qualification as the "Crime of the Century."

According to the paper the number one contender is the JFK assassination. Yet another sign of Boomer myopia: Not even making the list is the Lindbergh kidnapping or the theft of the U.S.' atom bomb secrets.

The WSJ "Washington Wire" reports that ex-Clinton press secretary Mike McCurry introduced a conference speaker the other day as having served in "the first Bush administration."

The NYT runs an op-ed today that says the real reason not to like the AOL/TW deal and its ilk is that mergers inherently dilute the quality of journalism. Of course, as the piece points out, two heads aren't guaranteed to be better than one. But this is a plausible possibility isn't it? After all, this piece has a co-byline; it's by media bigfeet Tom Rosenstiel and Bill Kovach. If they're absolutely right, then why didn't they write better separate articles instead?

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=356>

4

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

Keeping Tabs: Bait and Snitch

<http://www.slate.com/keepingtabs/00-01-13/keepingtabs.asp>

In Other Magazines: Dialysis for Your Cat

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

Chatterbox: United Killers of Benetton

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/13/00&idMessage=4367>

the week/the spin

First Lady of the Night

By Matt Alsdorf

America Online is buying Time Warner. The \$166 billion deal is the biggest corporate merger ever and would create the world's largest media company, valued at over \$350 billion. Analysts hailed the marriage because 1) Time Warner will be able to market its movies, music, and magazines to AOL's 20 million subscribers; and 2) AOL will be able to use Time Warner's massive cable network to deliver high-speed Internet access. Reporters tripped over themselves to describe the importance of the deal, saying, in order of increasing excitement: 1) it signals "convergence between old media content and the new medium of the Net"; 2) it presages more megamergers, as other companies struggle to keep pace; 3) it "marks the passage of the Internet from an exotic technology into a mass media industry"; and 4) it represents "the triumph of the Internet as the irresistible force in business." Customers were tepid, wondering whether the mammoth company would improve consumers' access to products or increase investors' access to profits. ("Moneybox" asks if AOL paid too much for Time Warner, and "Chatterbox" wonders if Nora Ephron brokered the deal.)

Augusto Pinochet was ruled unfit for trial. British doctors deemed him too frail mentally and physically to stand trial in Spain on charges of crimes against humanity dating from his days as dictator of Chile. Britain will likely return him to Chile within weeks, and Spain has promised not to fight the decision. Relieved parties: 1) Pinochet, who may escape trial in his home country; 2) Britain, whose relations with Spain and Chile had been strained by the controversy; and 3) human rights groups, who feared public reaction to the prosecution of "a sick, elderly man." The spins, in order of increasing optimism: 1) A murderer got off the hook; 2) a tyrant got a lesson in compassion; and 3) dictators learned that imminent death is their only protection from international law. (Slate's "International Papers" rounds up world reaction to the doctors' findings, and "Explainer" describes the correct pronunciation of Pinochet.)

Hillary Clinton appeared on the Late Show With David Letterman. The host had badgered her for a month to be a guest, but she did not relent until a poll showed that New Yorkers favored her appearance by a margin of 2-to-1. Clinton aced a pop quiz of New York trivia, criticized and complimented Rudolph Giuliani, and traded one-liners with Letterman. The Washington Post said she came across as relaxed, funny, and likable. But critics said it looked like a cold and calculated effort to make Clinton look as though she isn't cold and calculated.

Three Chinese stowaways died on their way to the United States. Their bodies were discovered, along with 15 survivors, inside a metal shipping container unloaded in Seattle. About 100 illegal Chinese immigrants have been arrested in West Coast ports since the new year--almost all on container ships from Hong Kong. Unless the

stowaways can prove they were persecuted in China, they will be sent home. Officials were incensed by: 1) the greed of the smugglers, who charge up to \$60,000 per person and sell the immigrants into indentured servitude; 2) the complicity of the shipping lines; and 3) the negligence of Hong Kong authorities. The gloomy spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to escape Chinese oppression. The rosier spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to gain American freedom.

The Supreme Court handed down four mixed rulings. It decided that 1) states are exempt from age discrimination lawsuits; 2) states are not exempt from federal laws banning the sale of personal information; 3) police may be justified in searching a person simply because he or she flees; and 4) defendants do not have a constitutional right to defend themselves on appeal. Conservatives called the decisions "nuanced" and "moderate" and hailed the trend toward states' rights. Liberals applauded some small victories but protested the trend away from civil rights.

A Florida court granted temporary custody of Eli n Gonz lez to his Miami relatives. The state judge ordered Gonz lez to remain in the United States until a hearing in March. Attorney General Janet Reno deemed the decision invalid, saying the Immigration and Naturalization Service--which ruled last week that Gonz lez should be reunited with his father in Cuba--had sole jurisdiction over the 6-year-old's fate. Observers said the INS was in a bind: It has legal authority to forcibly return Gonz lez, but would create an ugly scene if it did so. Last week's cynical spin: The INS caved to political pressure from Cuba. This week's cynical spin: Florida caved to political pressure from Cuban exiles.

The Postal Service wants to raise prices. If approved by the Postal Rate Commission, stamps for letters and postcards would each increase by a penny in early 2001, to 34 and 21 cents, respectively. The Postal Service 1) spun the rate hike as a competitive necessity that would allow it to maintain universal service, improve technology, and cover rising costs; and 2) asserted that stamps remain "a real bargain," given inflation. Critics charged that it would hinder: 1) businesses and nonprofits that rely on direct mail; and 2) the Postal Service itself, by providing even greater incentive to use e-commerce and alternative shippers.

Peace talks between Israel and Syria wound down. Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk Shara are returning home without an agreement on Israel's withdrawal from the Golan Heights or Syria's guarantees of security. Their delegations will continue to negotiate, and the leaders will likely meet again in late January. The Clinton administration deemed the talks a success, saying 1) no one expected a breakthrough in the first round; and 2) the unprecedented discussion of substantive issues was a breakthrough. Skeptics said the progress was minimal and questioned whether the "well-rehearsed technique of locking Israel and its adversaries in a negotiating arena, cut off from other

distractions, still works as well as it once did."

Al Gore and Bill Bradley reiterated their support of gays in the military. Gore said he would insist that potential appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff support allowing gays to serve openly. Bradley said he would require his Joint Chiefs to carry out such a policy but would not require them to agree with it. Gore later asserted that he meant what Bradley said. Military officers and the Republican candidates blasted Bradley and Gore for crossing "a boundary between social politics and military policy." Separately, Britain ended its ban on gays in the military, making the U.S. the only NATO nation that maintains the prohibition. Analysts variously said the hubbub revealed that 1) gay voters are increasingly important to Democrats; 2) the candidates are willing to sacrifice popular support in order to court them; and 3) Bradley is better than Gore at doing so. (Slate's Jacob Weisberg defends Gore's initial suggestion of a "litmus test" for Joint Chiefs nominees.)

The flu is hitting the United States. Flu season arrived earlier than in previous years, and the number and severity of infections are higher than average. Some hospitals are delaying elective procedures to deal with the influx of flu patients. The good news: 1) The most widespread flu strains are covered by the current vaccine; and 2) new medications are effective if taken immediately after symptoms appear. The bad news: 1) Fewer than 10 percent of people take the vaccine; 2) a vaccination taken now may not take effect until after the season has peaked; and 3) people usually react too slowly to flu symptoms for the new medications to be effective.

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-JAN-2000 08:50:20.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 14, 2000

TO: fernald@post.harvard.edu (fernald@post.harvard.edu [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 14, 2000

--today's papers: Bradley Gives Gore the Willies

--the week/the spin: First Lady of the Night

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Join Working Assets Long Distance Today and Help Build a Better World! Get 360 minutes of FREE calls plus FREE ice cream when you join now.
<http://www.workingassets.com/join/form.cfm?formID=IE-071-SLT-1>

Join now for the best of both worlds: great phone service at competitive rates and a strong commitment to progressive causes. We donate 1 percent of your charges to nonprofit groups working for peace, human rights, equality, education, and the environment--at no extra cost to you.

today's papers

Bradley Gives Gore the Willies

By Scott Shuger

The LAT leads with Alan Greenspan's comment in a speech Thursday that nudging interest rates further upwards is necessary to control the temperature of an economy overheated by soaring stock prices. The paper also notes that just hours before Greenspan spoke, President Clinton, in an appearance at the NYSE, said that dangerous inflation didn't seem to be a threat to this economy. No other paper fronts the story, although the WSJ puts it high up in its front-page financial news index. USAT goes with Bill Gates' announcement that, while remaining chairman of Microsoft, he's handing over CEO duties to long-time associate Steve Ballmer. Gates says that he will spend almost all of his time focused on the company's software strategy. The paper says Ballmer might "put a kinder, gentler face on the company" during its antitrust settlement talks with the government, but then quotes his

assessment of any government breakup of the company: "absolutely reckless and irresponsible." The LAT (which high up strongly suggests that Gates will remain the de facto leader of MS) and WP front the story, and the WSJ puts it atop its financial news index, while the NYT puts it inside. The NYT leads with the latest in a story the paper has pretty much owned: the battle between the White House and drug companies over whether or not Medicare should cover prescription drugs. The paper explains that companies have long expressed the fear that coverage would lead to government price-setting on the bulk of their sales. Today's installment: two top drug pharmaceutical executives now say they could accept the coverage. The Times suggests that they are trying to head off a full-on Clinton administration depiction as price-gougers. The WP goes with the very rare sports lead: the NBA Washington Wizards have reached an agreement in principle to give Michael Jordan complete control of the team's front office, including all trades, signings, draft selections and all other personnel decisions. The main remaining fill-in is how much equity in the franchise Jordan will get. A striking defect in the story: no mention of whether or not Jordan is buying that equity share or being given it or what his other compensation would be. The story says Jordan is not considering a comeback as part of the arrangement.

The LAT and NYT front and the WSJ reefs the revelation that under a little known federal program, the government drug control office has been getting advanced looks at scripts for primetime TV shows and making suggestions for changes that send an anti-drug message. Some of the changes have been accepted by producers. Under an agreement with the government, such in-story messages allowed the networks to make more money selling ads because they then don't have to run as many anti-drug public service announcements. The story was broken by Salon, a fact that the papers report on with varying degrees of candor: The LAT comes clean in the 2nd paragraph and the WSJ in the 4th, but the NYT holds off until the 7th.

Citing a story in Thursday's Boston Herald, the LAT fronts and the WP goes inside with Bill Bradley's decision, with ten days to go until the Iowa caucuses, to hit Al Gore for introducing the racially explosive Willie Horton issue against Michael Dukakis during Gore's 1988 presidential primary bid. The controversy was later used against Dukakis to great effect by George Bush. Both papers point out that Bradley had previously been eschewing scorched-earth politics. The Post reports on the novel spin tactics being used by the Gore and Bradley camps: The Gore campaign responded by giving out Michael Dukakis' phone number, and Dukakis is quoted saying Bradley's charge is "nonsense" because the Horton case was already well known in New England. The Bradleyites released the number of Dukakis' campaign manager, Susan Estrich, who is quoted saying the Dukakis campaign was indeed surprised by Gore's raising Horton.

Everybody goes inside with a fresh shift in the demographics of AIDS: the majority of gay men being diagnosed with the disease are now either black or Hispanic.

USAT's front-page "snapshot" shows how Americans rank various high profile crimes for qualification as the "Crime of the Century." According to the paper the number one contender is the JFK assassination. Yet another sign of Boomer myopia: Not even making the list is the Lindbergh kidnapping or the theft of the U.S.' atom bomb secrets.

The WSJ "Washington Wire" reports that ex-Clinton press secretary Mike McCurry introduced a conference speaker the other day as having served in "the first Bush administration."

The NYT runs an op-ed today that says the real reason not to like the AOL/TW deal and its ilk is that mergers inherently dilute the quality of journalism. Of course, as the piece points out, two heads aren't guaranteed to be better than one. But this is a plausible possibility isn't it? After all, this piece has a co-byline; it's by media bigfeet Tom Rosenstiel and Bill Kovach. If they're absolutely right, then why didn't they write better separate articles instead?

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

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

Keeping Tabs: Bait and Snitch

<http://www.slate.com/keepingtabs/00-01-13/keepingtabs.asp>

In Other Magazines: Dialysis for Your Cat

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

Chatterbox: United Killers of Benetton

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/13/00&idMessage=4367>

the week/the spin

First Lady of the Night

By Matt Alsdorf

America Online is buying Time Warner. The \$166 billion deal is the biggest corporate merger ever and would create the world's largest media company, valued at over \$350 billion. Analysts hailed the marriage because 1) Time Warner will be able to market its movies, music, and magazines to AOL's 20 million subscribers; and 2) AOL will be able to use Time Warner's massive cable network to deliver high-speed Internet access. Reporters tripped over themselves to describe the importance of the deal, saying, in order of increasing excitement: 1) it signals "convergence between old media content and the new medium of the Net"; 2) it presages more megamergers, as other companies struggle to keep pace; 3) it "marks the passage of the Internet from an exotic technology into a mass media industry"; and 4) it represents "the triumph of the Internet as the irresistible force in business." Customers were tepid, wondering whether the mammoth company would improve consumers' access to products or increase investors' access to profits. ("Moneybox" asks if AOL paid too much for Time Warner, and "Chatterbox" wonders if Nora Ephron brokered the deal.)

Augusto Pinochet was ruled unfit for trial. British doctors deemed him too frail mentally and physically to stand trial in Spain on charges of crimes against humanity dating from his days as dictator of Chile. Britain will likely return him to Chile within weeks, and Spain has promised not to fight the decision. Relieved parties: 1) Pinochet, who may escape trial in his home country; 2) Britain, whose relations with Spain and Chile had been strained by the controversy; and 3) human rights groups, who feared public reaction to the prosecution of "a sick, elderly man." The spins, in order of increasing optimism: 1) A murderer got off the hook; 2) a tyrant got a lesson in compassion; and 3) dictators learned that imminent death is their only protection from international law. (Slate's "International Papers" rounds up world reaction to the doctors' findings, and "Explainer" describes the correct pronunciation of Pinochet.)

Hillary Clinton appeared on the Late Show With David Letterman. The host had badgered her for a month to be a guest, but she did not relent until a poll showed that New Yorkers favored her appearance by a margin of 2-to-1. Clinton aced a pop quiz of New York trivia, criticized and complimented Rudolph Giuliani, and traded one-liners with Letterman. The Washington Post said she came across as relaxed, funny, and likable. But critics said it looked like a cold and calculated effort to make Clinton look as though she isn't cold and calculated.

Three Chinese stowaways died on their way to the United States. Their bodies were discovered, along with 15 survivors, inside a metal shipping container unloaded in Seattle. About 100 illegal Chinese immigrants have been arrested in West Coast ports since the new year--almost all on container ships from Hong Kong. Unless the

stowaways can prove they were persecuted in China, they will be sent home. Officials were incensed by: 1) the greed of the smugglers, who charge up to \$60,000 per person and sell the immigrants into indentured servitude; 2) the complicity of the shipping lines; and 3) the negligence of Hong Kong authorities. The gloomy spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to escape Chinese oppression. The rosier spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to gain American freedom.

The Supreme Court handed down four mixed rulings. It decided that 1) states are exempt from age discrimination lawsuits; 2) states are not exempt from federal laws banning the sale of personal information; 3) police may be justified in searching a person simply because he or she flees; and 4) defendants do not have a constitutional right to defend themselves on appeal. Conservatives called the decisions "nuanced" and "moderate" and hailed the trend toward states' rights. Liberals applauded some small victories but protested the trend away from civil rights.

A Florida court granted temporary custody of Eli n Gonz lez to his Miami relatives. The state judge ordered Gonz lez to remain in the United States until a hearing in March. Attorney General Janet Reno deemed the decision invalid, saying the Immigration and Naturalization Service--which ruled last week that Gonz lez should be reunited with his father in Cuba--had sole jurisdiction over the 6-year-old's fate. Observers said the INS was in a bind: It has legal authority to forcibly return Gonz lez, but would create an ugly scene if it did so. Last week's cynical spin: The INS caved to political pressure from Cuba. This week's cynical spin: Florida caved to political pressure from Cuban exiles.

The Postal Service wants to raise prices. If approved by the Postal Rate Commission, stamps for letters and postcards would each increase by a penny in early 2001, to 34 and 21 cents, respectively. The Postal Service 1) spun the rate hike as a competitive necessity that would allow it to maintain universal service, improve technology, and cover rising costs; and 2) asserted that stamps remain "a real bargain," given inflation. Critics charged that it would hinder: 1) businesses and nonprofits that rely on direct mail; and 2) the Postal Service itself, by providing even greater incentive to use e-commerce and alternative shippers.

Peace talks between Israel and Syria wound down. Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk Shara are returning home without an agreement on Israel's withdrawal from the Golan Heights or Syria's guarantees of security. Their delegations will continue to negotiate, and the leaders will likely meet again in late January. The Clinton administration deemed the talks a success, saying 1) no one expected a breakthrough in the first round; and 2) the unprecedented discussion of substantive issues was a breakthrough. Skeptics said the progress was minimal and questioned whether the "well-rehearsed technique of locking Israel and its adversaries in a negotiating arena, cut off from other

distractions, still works as well as it once did."

Al Gore and Bill Bradley reiterated their support of gays in the military. Gore said he would insist that potential appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff support allowing gays to serve openly. Bradley said he would require his Joint Chiefs to carry out such a policy but would not require them to agree with it. Gore later asserted that he meant what Bradley said. Military officers and the Republican candidates blasted Bradley and Gore for crossing "a boundary between social politics and military policy." Separately, Britain ended its ban on gays in the military, making the U.S. the only NATO nation that maintains the prohibition. Analysts variously said the hubbub revealed that 1) gay voters are increasingly important to Democrats; 2) the candidates are willing to sacrifice popular support in order to court them; and 3) Bradley is better than Gore at doing so. (Slate's Jacob Weisberg defends Gore's initial suggestion of a "litmus test" for Joint Chiefs nominees.)

The flu is hitting the United States. Flu season arrived earlier than in previous years, and the number and severity of infections are higher than average. Some hospitals are delaying elective procedures to deal with the influx of flu patients. The good news: 1) The most widespread flu strains are covered by the current vaccine; and 2) new medications are effective if taken immediately after symptoms appear. The bad news: 1) Fewer than 10 percent of people take the vaccine; 2) a vaccination taken now may not take effect until after the season has peaked; and 3) people usually react too slowly to flu symptoms for the new medications to be effective.

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-JAN-2000 21:56:49.00

SUBJECT: WHAT'S IN SLATE: The Real Winner in the AOL-Time Warner Deal; United Killers of Benneton; and more

TO: fernald@post.harvard.edu (fernald@post.harvard.edu [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Jan. 14, 2000

Dear Reader:

Notes from this week's issue:

William Saletan's Frame Game defends a politician's right to duck questions: "Think about how politicians manipulate discussions of issues. They insert hidden assumptions to rig the dialogue in their favor. They narrow the range of options under discussion to force their opponents into embarrassing dilemmas. They frame lopsided yes/no questions and squelch attempts to articulate a middle ground. When reporters use these tactics, why shouldn't they, too, be called to account? That's what the Republicans did [in their presidential debate] Friday. For every artfully framed question, they demonstrated a way to escape and counterframe it."
http://www.slate.com/framegame/entries/00-01-10_68641.asp

Dahlia Lithwick's Supreme Court Dispatch reviews the arguments over the constitutionality of the Violence Against Women Act: " [A] section of VAWA is being challenged as beyond the scope of Congress' Commerce Clause powers, because it punishes purely private, non-economic activity -- rape. ... Oral argument today is a snuffling, wheezy quest for a limiting principle on federal powers. As the protesters from the National Organization for Women demonstrate on the sidewalk outside (12-4-6-8: Stop the violence, stop the hate), inside the justices are carefully counting out how many hypothetical federal statutes they can cram on the head of a pin."
<http://www.slate.com/dispatches/99-11-09/dispatches.asp>

Jacob Weisberg's Ballot Box explains why the next president should submit candidates for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to a litmus test: "Gore's litmus test position is not merely defensible; it's the only sensible one to take if you seriously intend to get rid of don't ask, don't tell. By contrast, Bradley's stance--that he would expect the chairman of the Joint Chiefs to follow his orders--is utterly naive. As for the Republican line that all the Joint Chiefs ever do is offer advice and obey their commander in

chief, it's worse than naive. It's disingenuous."

<http://www.slate.com/code/BallotBox/BallotBox.asp?Show=1/12/00&idMessage=43>

62

In TV Club, Judith Shulevitz and Jeffrey Goldberg wrangle over HBO's mob drama:

Shulevitz: "The Sopranos" brings the understatement of the American short story to a subject usually treated as high drama or farce.

Goldberg: "The Sopranos" accurately captures the desperation of today's mobsters. The smarter wise guys know that they are the track-suit-wearing equivalents of one of those prehistoric tribes living in the Orinoco River Basin, just waiting for extinction.

<http://www.slate.com/code/TVClub/TVClub.asp?Show=1/12/00&idMessage=4364&idBio=137>

David Plotz assesses AOL Time Warner's future CEO, Gerald Levin:

"Levin has been underestimated in part because he has cultivated such a diffident style. He is a man without a shadow, affectless, egoless. ... Levin's opaqueness actually masks a savage toughness. If he is a philosopher-businessman, his inspiration is Nietzsche."

<http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-14/Assessment.asp>

Also: James Surowiecki's Moneybox asks if AOL paid too much for Time Warner; Walter Reich and Peter D. Kramer debate whether psychology can cure racism, in Dialogues; in Press Box, Jack Shafer interprets TheStreet.com's latest move; Jennifer Mendelsohn exposes the cunning tricks of the tabloid trade, in Keeping Tabs; Chris Suellentrop's Net Election explains why online polls aren't really polls; and much more.

<http://www.slate.com/Code/Moneybox/Moneybox.asp?Show=1/11/00&idMessage=4358>

<http://www.slate.com/dialogues/00-01-12/dialogues.asp>

<http://www.slate.com/code/PressBox/PressBox.asp?Show=1/10/00&idMessage=4348>

<http://www.slate.com/keepingtabs/00-01-13/keepingtabs.asp>

http://www.slate.com/netelection/entries/00-01-11_68660.asp

You can link from here directly to Slate's Table of Contents and all the Slate stories and departments not mentioned above:

<http://www.slate.com>

Today's Papers;

<http://www.slate.com/Code/TodaysPapers/TodaysPapers.asp>

The Week/The Spin: The week's top stories;

<http://www.slate.com/Spin/00-01-10/Spin.asp?Show=11/30/99>

International Papers;

<http://www.slate.com/InterNatPapers/00-01-12/InterNatPapers.asp>

In Other Magazines: What's in "Time," "Newsweek," etc.;

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

News Quiz;

http://www.slate.com/newsquiz/entries/00-01-12_72846.asp

Explainer: Is it illegal to do favors for campaign donors?
<http://www.slate.com/Code/explainer/explainer.asp?Show=1/12/00&idMessage=4365>

Summary Judgment: What the critics are saying about what's new;
<http://www.slate.com/SummaryJudgment/00-01-11/SummaryJudgment.asp>

Pundit Central: The Sunday talk shows;
<http://www.slate.com/Code/PunditCentral/PunditCentral.asp?Show=1/9/00&idMessage=4338>

Everyday Economics: The patent system sucks;
<http://www.slate.com/Economics/00-01-12/Economics.asp>

Chatterbox: On AOL, Microsoft, and other stuff;
<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp>

Kausfiles: Litmus testing Bob Shrum;
<http://www.slate.com/code/kausfiles/kausfiles.asp?Show=1/10/00&idMessage=4342>

Crossword;
<http://www.slate.com/xword/00-01-10/xword.asp>

Diary: Stanley Fish on stirring up the academy;
<http://www.slate.com/diary/00-01-10/diary.asp>

Poem: "CAELICA, #100 (In Night, When Colors All to Black)," by Fulke Greville;
<http://www.slate.com/Poem/00-01-11/Poem.asp>

I See France: Michael Lewis on moving to Paris;
http://www.slate.com/ISeeFrance/entries/00-01-10_68600.asp

Dear Prudence: Get answers to your questions on morals and manners;
<http://www.slate.com/DearPrudence/00-01-13/DearPrudence.asp>

and Best of The Fray;
<http://www.slate.com/BestOfFray/00-01-12/BestOfFray.asp>

P.S. If you have friends (or, for that matter, enemies) who might be interested in Slate, please forward this.

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

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

For additional information about SLATE, go to

<http://www.slate.com/code/reg3/memberservices.asp> for SLATE Reader Services.

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-JAN-2000 07:39:43.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 14, 2000

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 14, 2000

--today's papers: Bradley Gives Gore the Willies

--the week/the spin: First Lady of the Night

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Join Working Assets Long Distance Today and Help Build a Better World! Get 360 minutes of FREE calls plus FREE ice cream when you join now.

<http://www.workingassets.com/join/form.cfm?formID=IE-071-SLT-1>

Join now for the best of both worlds: great phone service at competitive rates and a strong commitment to progressive causes. We donate 1 percent of your charges to nonprofit groups working for peace, human rights, equality, education, and the environment--at no extra cost to you.

today's papers

Bradley Gives Gore the Willies

By Scott Shuger

The LAT leads with Alan Greenspan's comment in a speech Thursday that nudging interest rates further upwards is necessary to control the temperature of an economy overheated by soaring stock prices. The paper also notes that just hours before Greenspan spoke, President Clinton, in an appearance at the NYSE, said that dangerous inflation didn't seem to be a threat to this economy. No other paper fronts the story, although the WSJ puts it high up in its front-page financial news index. USAT goes with Bill Gates' announcement that, while remaining chairman of Microsoft, he's handing over CEO duties to long-time associate Steve Ballmer. Gates says that he will spend almost all of his time focused on the company's software strategy. The paper says Ballmer might "put a kinder, gentler face on the company" during its antitrust settlement talks with the government, but then quotes his

assessment of any government breakup of the company: "absolutely reckless and irresponsible." The LAT (which high up strongly suggests that Gates will remain the de facto leader of MS) and WP front the story, and the WSJ puts it atop its financial news index, while the NYT puts it inside. The NYT leads with the latest in a story the paper has pretty much owned: the battle between the White House and drug companies over whether or not Medicare should cover prescription drugs. The paper explains that companies have long expressed the fear that coverage would lead to government price-setting on the bulk of their sales. Today's installment: two top drug pharmaceutical executives now say they could accept the coverage. The Times suggests that they are trying to head off a full-on Clinton administration depiction as price-gougers. The WP goes with the very rare sports lead: the NBA Washington Wizards have reached an agreement in principle to give Michael Jordan complete control of the team's front office, including all trades, signings, draft selections and all other personnel decisions. The main remaining fill-in is how much equity in the franchise Jordan will get. A striking defect in the story: no mention of whether or not Jordan is buying that equity share or being given it or what his other compensation would be. The story says Jordan is not considering a comeback as part of the arrangement.

The LAT and NYT front and the WSJ reefer the revelation that under a little known federal program, the government drug control office has been getting advanced looks at scripts for primetime TV shows and making suggestions for changes that send an anti-drug message. Some of the changes have been accepted by producers. Under an agreement with the government, such in-story messages allowed the networks to make more money selling ads because they then don't have to run as many anti-drug public service announcements. The story was broken by Salon, a fact that the papers report on with varying degrees of candor: The LAT comes clean in the 2nd paragraph and the WSJ in the 4th, but the NYT holds off until the 7th.

Citing a story in Thursday's Boston Herald, the LAT fronts and the WP goes inside with Bill Bradley's decision, with ten days to go until the Iowa caucuses, to hit Al Gore for introducing the racially explosive Willie Horton issue against Michael Dukakis during Gore's 1988 presidential primary bid. The controversy was later used against Dukakis to great effect by George Bush. Both papers point out that Bradley had previously been eschewing scorched-earth politics. The Post reports on the novel spin tactics being used by the Gore and Bradley camps: The Gore campaign responded by giving out Michael Dukakis' phone number, and Dukakis is quoted saying Bradley's charge is "nonsense" because the Horton case was already well known in New England. The Bradleyites released the number of Dukakis' campaign manager, Susan Estrich, who is quoted saying the Dukakis campaign was indeed surprised by Gore's raising Horton.

Everybody goes inside with a fresh shift in the demographics of AIDS: the majority of gay men being diagnosed with the disease are now either black or Hispanic.

USAT's front-page "snapshot" shows how Americans rank various high profile crimes for qualification as the "Crime of the Century." According to the paper the number one contender is the JFK assassination. Yet another sign of Boomer myopia: Not even making the list is the Lindbergh kidnapping or the theft of the U.S.' atom bomb secrets.

The WSJ "Washington Wire" reports that ex-Clinton press secretary Mike McCurry introduced a conference speaker the other day as having served in "the first Bush administration."

The NYT runs an op-ed today that says the real reason not to like the AOL/TW deal and its ilk is that mergers inherently dilute the quality of journalism. Of course, as the piece points out, two heads aren't guaranteed to be better than one. But this is a plausible possibility isn't it? After all, this piece has a co-byline; it's by media bigfeet Tom Rosenstiel and Bill Kovach. If they're absolutely right, then why didn't they write better separate articles instead?

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

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

Keeping Tabs: Bait and Snitch

<http://www.slate.com/keepingtabs/00-01-13/keepingtabs.asp>

In Other Magazines: Dialysis for Your Cat

<http://www.slate.com/OtherMags/00-01-10/OtherMags.asp?Show=11/29/99>

Chatterbox: United Killers of Benetton

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/13/00&idMessage=4367>

the week/the spin

First Lady of the Night

By Matt Alsdorf

America Online is buying Time Warner. The \$166 billion deal is the biggest corporate merger ever and would create the world's largest media company, valued at over \$350 billion. Analysts hailed the marriage because 1) Time Warner will be able to market its movies, music, and magazines to AOL's 20 million subscribers; and 2) AOL will be able to use Time Warner's massive cable network to deliver high-speed Internet access. Reporters tripped over themselves to describe the importance of the deal, saying, in order of increasing excitement: 1) it signals "convergence between old media content and the new medium of the Net"; 2) it presages more megamergers, as other companies struggle to keep pace; 3) it "marks the passage of the Internet from an exotic technology into a mass media industry"; and 4) it represents "the triumph of the Internet as the irresistible force in business." Customers were tepid, wondering whether the mammoth company would improve consumers' access to products or increase investors' access to profits. ("Moneybox" asks if AOL paid too much for Time Warner, and "Chatterbox" wonders if Nora Ephron brokered the deal.)

Augusto Pinochet was ruled unfit for trial. British doctors deemed him too frail mentally and physically to stand trial in Spain on charges of crimes against humanity dating from his days as dictator of Chile. Britain will likely return him to Chile within weeks, and Spain has promised not to fight the decision. Relieved parties: 1) Pinochet, who may escape trial in his home country; 2) Britain, whose relations with Spain and Chile had been strained by the controversy; and 3) human rights groups, who feared public reaction to the prosecution of "a sick, elderly man." The spins, in order of increasing optimism: 1) A murderer got off the hook; 2) a tyrant got a lesson in compassion; and 3) dictators learned that imminent death is their only protection from international law. (Slate's "International Papers" rounds up world reaction to the doctors' findings, and "Explainer" describes the correct pronunciation of Pinochet.)

Hillary Clinton appeared on the Late Show With David Letterman. The host had badgered her for a month to be a guest, but she did not relent until a poll showed that New Yorkers favored her appearance by a margin of 2-to-1. Clinton aced a pop quiz of New York trivia, criticized and complimented Rudolph Giuliani, and traded one-liners with Letterman. The Washington Post said she came across as relaxed, funny, and likable. But critics said it looked like a cold and calculated effort to make Clinton look as though she isn't cold and calculated.

Three Chinese stowaways died on their way to the United States. Their bodies were discovered, along with 15 survivors, inside a metal shipping container unloaded in Seattle. About 100 illegal Chinese immigrants have been arrested in West Coast ports since the new year--almost all on container ships from Hong Kong. Unless the

stowaways can prove they were persecuted in China, they will be sent home. Officials were incensed by: 1) the greed of the smugglers, who charge up to \$60,000 per person and sell the immigrants into indentured servitude; 2) the complicity of the shipping lines; and 3) the negligence of Hong Kong authorities. The gloomy spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to escape Chinese oppression. The rosier spin: This shows the desperate measures people will take to gain American freedom.

The Supreme Court handed down four mixed rulings. It decided that 1) states are exempt from age discrimination lawsuits; 2) states are not exempt from federal laws banning the sale of personal information; 3) police may be justified in searching a person simply because he or she flees; and 4) defendants do not have a constitutional right to defend themselves on appeal. Conservatives called the decisions "nuanced" and "moderate" and hailed the trend toward states' rights. Liberals applauded some small victories but protested the trend away from civil rights.

A Florida court granted temporary custody of Eli n Gonz lez to his Miami relatives. The state judge ordered Gonz lez to remain in the United States until a hearing in March. Attorney General Janet Reno deemed the decision invalid, saying the Immigration and Naturalization Service--which ruled last week that Gonz lez should be reunited with his father in Cuba--had sole jurisdiction over the 6-year-old's fate. Observers said the INS was in a bind: It has legal authority to forcibly return Gonz lez, but would create an ugly scene if it did so. Last week's cynical spin: The INS caved to political pressure from Cuba. This week's cynical spin: Florida caved to political pressure from Cuban exiles.

The Postal Service wants to raise prices. If approved by the Postal Rate Commission, stamps for letters and postcards would each increase by a penny in early 2001, to 34 and 21 cents, respectively. The Postal Service 1) spun the rate hike as a competitive necessity that would allow it to maintain universal service, improve technology, and cover rising costs; and 2) asserted that stamps remain "a real bargain," given inflation. Critics charged that it would hinder: 1) businesses and nonprofits that rely on direct mail; and 2) the Postal Service itself, by providing even greater incentive to use e-commerce and alternative shippers.

Peace talks between Israel and Syria wound down. Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk Shara are returning home without an agreement on Israel's withdrawal from the Golan Heights or Syria's guarantees of security. Their delegations will continue to negotiate, and the leaders will likely meet again in late January. The Clinton administration deemed the talks a success, saying 1) no one expected a breakthrough in the first round; and 2) the unprecedented discussion of substantive issues was a breakthrough. Skeptics said the progress was minimal and questioned whether the "well-rehearsed technique of locking Israel and its adversaries in a negotiating arena, cut off from other

distractions, still works as well as it once did."

Al Gore and Bill Bradley reiterated their support of gays in the military. Gore said he would insist that potential appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff support allowing gays to serve openly. Bradley said he would require his Joint Chiefs to carry out such a policy but would not require them to agree with it. Gore later asserted that he meant what Bradley said. Military officers and the Republican candidates blasted Bradley and Gore for crossing "a boundary between social politics and military policy." Separately, Britain ended its ban on gays in the military, making the U.S. the only NATO nation that maintains the prohibition. Analysts variously said the hubbub revealed that 1) gay voters are increasingly important to Democrats; 2) the candidates are willing to sacrifice popular support in order to court them; and 3) Bradley is better than Gore at doing so. (Slate's Jacob Weisberg defends Gore's initial suggestion of a "litmus test" for Joint Chiefs nominees.)

The flu is hitting the United States. Flu season arrived earlier than in previous years, and the number and severity of infections are higher than average. Some hospitals are delaying elective procedures to deal with the influx of flu patients. The good news: 1) The most widespread flu strains are covered by the current vaccine; and 2) new medications are effective if taken immediately after symptoms appear. The bad news: 1) Fewer than 10 percent of people take the vaccine; 2) a vaccination taken now may not take effect until after the season has peaked; and 3) people usually react too slowly to flu symptoms for the new medications to be effective.

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lowell J. Taylor (CN=Lowell J. Taylor/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-FEB-2000 13:27:29.00

SUBJECT: Demography paper

TO: gary gates <gjpg@andrew.cmu.edu> (gary gates <gjpg@andrew.cmu.edu> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Gary,

Every week, we write a briefing for the President that includes a one-two page article on a current research topic of interest. This week I'd like to write a brief on the demographics of gays in the military. So, I need for you to send via e-mail a copy of a Demography paper as soon as possible. Also, I seem to recall that the current version of our paper contains less discussion about gays in military than previous versions. If you have an earlier version of the paper that does have more stuff could you send that along as well?

Thanks,
Lowell

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: John C. Williams (CN=John C. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-2000 16:57:37.00

SUBJECT: Re: WEB

TO: Christopher W. Snow (CN=Christopher W. Snow/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Lowell is promising something soon.

Noah is promising something Wed. AM.

John W.

Christopher W. Snow

02/08/2000 04:51:38 PM

Record Type: Record

To: John C. Williams/CEA/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: WEB

Are there other articles that I am supposed to have? ie. Gays in the Military, Personal Debt? I don't have anything yet.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christopher W. Snow (CN=Christopher W. Snow/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-2000 16:51:42.00

SUBJECT: WEB

TO: John C. Williams (CN=John C. Williams/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Are there other articles that I am supposed to have? ie. Gays in the
Military, Personal Debt? I don't have anything yet.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-FEB-2000 07:53:20.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Mon., Feb. 21, 2000

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Mon., Feb. 21, 2000

--today's papers: Suits and Pants

--pundit central: High Noon in the GOP

today's papers

Suits and Pants

By Scott Shuger

Both the WP and NYT lead with the next phase of George W. Bush vs. John McCain--Tuesday's Michigan primary. The LAT, which fronts the GOP-off, goes instead with the case the Supreme Court will hear this week that could result in patients gaining a fairly general right to sue their HMOs. The three papers front a picture of an Al G.--Hillary C. lip-lock during a joint campaign appearance in New York state.

The WP lead emphasizes that McCain's Michigan strategy is based on challenging Bush's credentials as a reformer, quoting McCain on the Michigan stump saying, "If he's a reformer, I'm an astronaut." The NYT says McCain said this several times yesterday. Indeed, the paper sees so many McCain attacks with so little response from Bush (they notice that Bush is now talking less about McCain and more about Al Gore) that the paper sees a role reversal from South Carolina. The Post says McCain's challenge is to find a way to fight back against Bush without breaking his no-negative-ads pledge.

The WP has a quotation from a top McCain aide saying that the senator "got off message" in South Carolina, but it doesn't explain in what respect, and in fact sticks the remark in a paragraph that isn't even about campaign tactics, but rather is about McCain's position on the budget surplus. The NYT doesn't have the very same quote but is clearer about the campaign staff's sentiment about S.C.--there was too much time spent discussing political technique,

in the form of negative ads and push polling.

Both papers mention that McCain is continuing to talk in Michigan (with a lot of Catholic voters) about Bush's failure to criticize Bob Jones University's anti-Catholic sentiments when he visited there. The Post has Bush's response that his brother Jeb is a Catholic. But the paper doesn't mention that this is the second time Bush has used Jeb to deflect criticism of his silence about BJU's Neanderthal mores.

The domestic focus of the papers right now is exemplified by the papers' inside placement of word that a mob of Serbs in Mitrovica, Kosovo pelted with stones and otherwise assaulted some American troops trying to conduct a weapons search. The U.S. peacekeepers departed without responding with force.

The LAT lead notes that the Supreme Court case centers on a misdiagnosis and the patient's right to collect damages caused by it from an HMO that rewards its doctors financially for limiting the number of diagnostic tests and referrals to specialists without informing patients of this. A somewhat surprising fact about the case is left until the story's penultimate paragraph: the Clinton administration, the one that has urged Congress to pass a patients' bill of rights, has filed a brief urging the Supremes to rule against the woman.

An important story about the Alaska Air crash can be found on the front of the Sunday LAT: the aircraft factory that made the very plane that crashed was, at the time, being criticized by government auditors for slipshod work, improper parts inspections and other safety-impacting discrepancies. The paper says there is no indication that poor quality control at the plant played a role in the crash. But given all the stabilizer problems described in this piece, that statement is prematurely concessive. The paper should have said, "...no indication so far..."

A piece in the "Metro" section of Sunday's LAT describes a little-noticed problem: Many poor school kids don't have nice clothes to wear to school, which often means they go to school unprotected from the elements and/or subject to teasing because of unfashionable togs. Now, this may indeed be a serious problem. But the lead paragraph speaks of two brothers so poor that they "alternated days in class because they only had one pair of good pants between them." Really? If so, why couldn't they have been mentioned by name and interviewed in the story? A little further down the reader is told that "officials estimate that at least half the students at the poorest schools wear little more than rags or unwashed clothes..." At least half? Which officials? Now, if the LAT can document either statement adequately, Today's Papers will pitch in on the problem. But this kind of documentation should always be a part of such stories--the papers can't fight hard-heartedness with soft-headedness.

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=356>

4

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

The Week/The Spin: Gold??Mine!

<http://slate.msn.com/Spin/00-02-14/Spin.asp?Show=2/18/2000>

South Carolina--It's Not Crazy Anymore.

<http://slate.msn.com/Assessment/00-02-18/Assessment.asp>

Readme Quick--The Slate Slow Reader Test.

<http://slate.msn.com/Features/SpeedReadTest/SpeedReadTest.asp>

pundit central

High Noon in the GOP

By Michael Brus

Issue 1 is George W. Bush's big win in the South Carolina primary.

It's a black weekend for John McCain. Every pundit show trots out the decisive numbers from Saturday's primary: Not only did Bush beat McCain by over ten points, but he won nearly two-to-one among Christian conservatives, Republicans, and pro-lifers. He also won among women and youth, and even won half the veterans' vote. A few talking heads, such as George Stephanopoulos (ABC's This Week), point out that McCain won a majority of GOP voters excluding the Christian right. But Stephanopoulos' colleague, George F. Will, notes that for a Republican to win the presidency he must win the South, and winning the South requires winning the evangelical vote, which McCain clearly cannot do.

Many pundits--such as Brit Hume (Fox News Sunday) and George F. Will--berate McCain for his bitter, defiant concession speech Saturday night. (Will calls it a "tantrum.") As if to burnish this abrasive image, John McCain tells Tim Russert (NBC's Meet the Press) that Bush has been lying like--that's right--Bill Clinton. But several pundits--such as Steve Roberts (CNN's Late Edition), Mark Shields (CNN's Capital Gang), Bill Kristol (CBS's Face the Nation), and Tucker Carlson (LE)--rise to McCain's defense, calling

Bush's South Carolina campaign dirty and "cutthroat conservative" rather than "compassionate conservative" (Kristol). At any rate, notes Eleanor Clift (The McLaughlin Group), the conventional wisdom about primaries has been reversed: Just last week pundits were pronouncing the death of negative ads, state political machines, and the Christian right. Now they are the three pillars of Bush's political resuscitation.

The day before the primary, Paul Gigot and Mark Shields (both of PBS's NewsHour With Jim Lehrer) argued that South Carolina was a must-win for Bush but not for McCain. But now that Bush has revived his campaign and McCain has lost, nearly everyone agrees that McCain is toast if he doesn't win Michigan on Tuesday. ("We're in sudden-death overtime, and I think that McCain has no illusions about it," says Carlson.) What are the senator's chances? Karen Tumulty (FNS) calls Michigan a "mirror image" of South Carolina, with few evangelicals and lots of Catholics (who may be offended by Bush's visit to the anti-Catholic Bob Jones University). But Al Hunt (CG) points out that Gov. John Engler is Catholic, pro-life, very popular--and a Bush ally.

In the long term, several pundits see peril for Bush. Susan Page and Tucker Carlson (both LE) note that the governor will have trouble veering back to the center for the general election. Brit Hume, Juan Williams, and Karen Tumulty (of FNS) argue that his large tax-cut proposal won't play well in the general election.

A Tale of Two Questions

The media may be guilty of swooning for John McCain, but Tim Russert is not among the idolators. Exhibit A is Russert's hour-long grilling of McCain on Sunday--an interrogation that was just as hard-hitting as his hour-long interrogation of Bush last week. Russert asked several identical questions of each candidate. Comparing the candidate's answers to two of these is instructive. One of these identical questions concerns gays in the military. How, Russert asks, will the U.S. and our European allies perform joint military exercises now that all of our allies allow homosexual soldiers to serve openly? Wouldn't any joint operations undermine the "unit cohesion" of American forces? Here is Bush's brush-off:

"Interesting angle. I haven't thought of that. That's a very interesting way to look at it. I'm not changing my position, though. I support what Colin Powell put in place. What's best for America is what I'm thinking about. What's best for morale and our troops. We can figure out how to deal with joint exercises if we ever have any. But what's best for the American military is that policy which was developed by generals like Colin Powell, of 'Don't ask, don't tell.' I adhere to the policy. It's an important policy and it needs to stay in place."

This is classic Dubya. His idea of an effective response is to zero in on the questioner's tactics (Hey, you're trying to get me to change my position!) and then to profess his own moral virtue (Because I have our troops' best interests at heart, my position cannot possibly be wrong). Conversely, this question plays to McCain's strengths--in this case, an intricate knowledge of the military command structure and a willingness to listen to advice from people he trusts:

"[No, b]ecause [the allied countries] don't totally integrate their armed forces. And I don't want the United States military to be anything like any of those [nation's militaries]--even the Israeli military. We have the best military in the world, that's why they call on us at every turn. And when people like Gen. Colin Powell and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf and many other military people I respect--including the NCOs--tell me that they can [change the policy and also] maintain unit cohesion, I would be glad to review the policy."

But Russert asked another identical question: What's your take on the new Russian president, Vladimir Putin? This elicited a thoughtful, conciliatory response from Bush:

"Too early to tell on [Putin]. First of all, he hasn't ever been elected. He was--you know, he succeeded Yeltsin, really appointed to the temporary president. My hope with Vladimir Putin is two things. One, that we can work with him in the post-Cold War era to bring some security in to Europe. We need to work with him to continue to dismantle strategic and tactical nuclear warheads. That's the old Nunn-Lugar bill that's been around for awhile. It's a good program, where scientists from both sides of the ocean come together to help bring some security into the region. We need to work with Putin--if he is the president, if he's elected--to change the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty."

But when Russert posed the same question to McCain, it brought out the senator's jingoism:

"[Putin is a] ruthless, ex-Communist apparatchik that is probably going to tell the Russian people that he wants to make the trains run on time, and I'm telling you this is a serious situation, because I think the Russian people may turn to more and more of a dictatorial government because of the incredible economic woes they face. And us letting Mr. Putin get away literally unscathed with this brutality that's taking place in Chechnya has a lot of implications for the future."

Now _That's_ Staying On Message

"I talked [to South Carolinians] about my record in the state of Texas, that I was a reformer with results. ?The people heard it loud and clear. And I'm honored and humbled by the support. ? It's

hard to get as huge a turnout as we got without running a positive campaign, and I stand by the campaign I ran. ?We got a big, big youth vote because the youth heard somebody who is optimistic about the future. The youth heard somebody who has got a positive agenda. And, you know, I've heard all this kind of punditry about ads, but our ads--I stand by our ads. ? [Voters] want somebody who's got a record of leadership. And I'm a conservative, but I also have got a brand of conservatism called compassionate conservatism that people all throughout our party can relate to. And I've got the results to show it."

--George W. Bush (FTN)

"I'm humbled by the outpouring of support here in South Carolina. ... I won because I was a reformer with results. ... A lot of young people came out to the polls today and supported me in big numbers. And they did so because I'm an optimistic person and they heard that optimistic message. ... That's one of the ingredients that happened here in South Carolina, is [voters want] somebody to lead. And the people of this state, of South Carolina, sent a strong message to the rest of America that George W. is a leader."

--George W. Bush (FNS)

"My message was one of compassionate conservatism. ... I am in fact a reformer who's had positive results when given the chance to lead. ... If you look at the exit polls, I ran the positive campaign according to the voters who actually made the decision. I know that some punditry are talking about [negative ads], but the people who actually turned up at the polls said they appreciated my campaign. And it was a positive campaign, and I stand by the campaign I ran. ... I'm really proud of it, we ran a great campaign. ... I'm really pleased with the organization and the thousands of South Carolinians that worked on my behalf, and I'm very gracious and humbled."

--George W. Bush (TW)

"Well, Wolf, I'm honored, and thanks. I'm humbled by the outpouring of support. ... Well, first of all, I won because my message of compassionate conservatism took hold here. People heard the message. Secondly, I explained to people clearly that I was a reformer who had gotten positive results in my state of Texas. ... I was able to connect with the voters here with a message that's very hopeful and positive, and [with] a reform agenda. ... When you look at the exit polls, Wolf, the people said that Gov. Bush ran the positive campaign here in South Carolina, and I'm proud of my campaign. ... They responded overwhelmingly for me because I ran a positive campaign. ... I stand by the campaign I ran and I'm proud of the campaign I ran. ... The reason the vote was so big is because people were excited about my message and were positive

about my message. ... As a matter of fact, the reason people voted for me is because I'm optimistic, I'm a hopeful person. ... I'm going to continue running the kind of campaign I ran, which is positive and optimistic, with an agenda that people can hear. And it paid off here in South Carolina."

--George W. Bush (LE)

Last Word (Infinite Loop Version)

"I've had a few hard knocks in my life, crashed a few airplanes, spent some time in a hotel where they don't leave men on the pillow, and been taking on the special interests in Washington."

--John McCain (MTP)

"Look, I've crashed a few airplanes in my time, I spent some time in a hotel where they don't put men on the pillow. And I've been fighting the special interests and the iron triangle in Washington."

--John McCain (LE)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-FEB-2000 07:53:49.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Mon., Feb. 21, 2000

TO: Jason A. Bernstein (CN=Jason A. Bernstein/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Mon., Feb. 21, 2000

--today's papers: Suits and Pants

--pundit central: High Noon in the GOP

today's papers

Suits and Pants

By Scott Shuger

Both the WP and NYT lead with the next phase of George W. Bush vs. John McCain--Tuesday's Michigan primary. The LAT, which fronts the GOP-off, goes instead with the case the Supreme Court will hear this week that could result in patients gaining a fairly general right to sue their HMOs. The three papers front a picture of an Al G.--Hillary C. lip-lock during a joint campaign appearance in New York state.

The WP lead emphasizes that McCain's Michigan strategy is based on challenging Bush's credentials as a reformer, quoting McCain on the Michigan stump saying, "If he's a reformer, I'm an astronaut." The NYT says McCain said this several times yesterday. Indeed, the paper sees so many McCain attacks with so little response from Bush (they notice that Bush is now talking less about McCain and more about Al Gore) that the paper sees a role reversal from South Carolina. The Post says McCain's challenge is to find a way to fight back against Bush without breaking his no-negative-ads pledge.

The WP has a quotation from a top McCain aide saying that the senator "got off message" in South Carolina, but it doesn't explain in what respect, and in fact sticks the remark in a paragraph that isn't even about campaign tactics, but rather is about McCain's position on the budget surplus. The NYT doesn't have the very same quote but is clearer about the campaign staff's sentiment about S.C.--there was too much time spent discussing political technique,

in the form of negative ads and push polling.

Both papers mention that McCain is continuing to talk in Michigan (with a lot of Catholic voters) about Bush's failure to criticize Bob Jones University's anti-Catholic sentiments when he visited there. The Post has Bush's response that his brother Jeb is a Catholic. But the paper doesn't mention that this is the second time Bush has used Jeb to deflect criticism of his silence about BJU's Neanderthal mores.

The domestic focus of the papers right now is exemplified by the papers' inside placement of word that a mob of Serbs in Mitrovica, Kosovo pelted with stones and otherwise assaulted some American troops trying to conduct a weapons search. The U.S. peacekeepers departed without responding with force.

The LAT lead notes that the Supreme Court case centers on a misdiagnosis and the patient's right to collect damages caused by it from an HMO that rewards its doctors financially for limiting the number of diagnostic tests and referrals to specialists without informing patients of this. A somewhat surprising fact about the case is left until the story's penultimate paragraph: the Clinton administration, the one that has urged Congress to pass a patients' bill of rights, has filed a brief urging the Supremes to rule against the woman.

An important story about the Alaska Air crash can be found on the front of the Sunday LAT: the aircraft factory that made the very plane that crashed was, at the time, being criticized by government auditors for slipshod work, improper parts inspections and other safety-impacting discrepancies. The paper says there is no indication that poor quality control at the plant played a role in the crash. But given all the stabilizer problems described in this piece, that statement is prematurely concessive. The paper should have said, "...no indication so far..."

A piece in the "Metro" section of Sunday's LAT describes a little-noticed problem: Many poor school kids don't have nice clothes to wear to school, which often means they go to school unprotected from the elements and/or subject to teasing because of unfashionable togs. Now, this may indeed be a serious problem. But the lead paragraph speaks of two brothers so poor that they "alternated days in class because they only had one pair of good pants between them." Really? If so, why couldn't they have been mentioned by name and interviewed in the story? A little further down the reader is told that "officials estimate that at least half the students at the poorest schools wear little more than rags or unwashed clothes..." At least half? Which officials? Now, if the LAT can document either statement adequately, Today's Papers will pitch in on the problem. But this kind of documentation should always be a part of such stories--the papers can't fight hard-heartedness with soft-headedness.

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=3564>

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

The Week/The Spin: Gold??Mine!

<http://slate.msn.com/Spin/00-02-14/Spin.asp?Show=2/18/2000>

South Carolina--It's Not Crazy Anymore.

<http://slate.msn.com/Assessment/00-02-18/Assessment.asp>

Readme Quick--The Slate Slow Reader Test.

<http://slate.msn.com/Features/SpeedReadTest/SpeedReadTest.asp>

pundit central

High Noon in the GOP

By Michael Brus

Issue 1 is George W. Bush's big win in the South Carolina primary.

It's a black weekend for John McCain. Every pundit show trots out the decisive numbers from Saturday's primary: Not only did Bush beat McCain by over ten points, but he won nearly two-to-one among Christian conservatives, Republicans, and pro-lifers. He also won among women and youth, and even won half the veterans' vote. A few talking heads, such as George Stephanopoulos (ABC's This Week), point out that McCain won a majority of GOP voters excluding the Christian right. But Stephanopoulos' colleague, George F. Will, notes that for a Republican to win the presidency he must win the South, and winning the South requires winning the evangelical vote, which McCain clearly cannot do.

Many pundits--such as Brit Hume (Fox News Sunday) and George F. Will--berate McCain for his bitter, defiant concession speech Saturday night. (Will calls it a "tantrum.") As if to burnish this abrasive image, John McCain tells Tim Russert (NBC's Meet the Press) that Bush has been lying like--that's right--Bill Clinton. But several pundits--such as Steve Roberts (CNN's Late Edition), Mark Shields (CNN's Capital Gang), Bill Kristol (CBS's Face the Nation), and Tucker Carlson (LE)--rise to McCain's defense, calling

Bush's South Carolina campaign dirty and "cutthroat conservative" rather than "compassionate conservative" (Kristol). At any rate, notes Eleanor Clift (The McLaughlin Group), the conventional wisdom about primaries has been reversed: Just last week pundits were pronouncing the death of negative ads, state political machines, and the Christian right. Now they are the three pillars of Bush's political resuscitation.

The day before the primary, Paul Gigot and Mark Shields (both of PBS's NewsHour With Jim Lehrer) argued that South Carolina was a must-win for Bush but not for McCain. But now that Bush has revived his campaign and McCain has lost, nearly everyone agrees that McCain is toast if he doesn't win Michigan on Tuesday. ("We're in sudden-death overtime, and I think that McCain has no illusions about it," says Carlson.) What are the senator's chances? Karen Tumulty (FNS) calls Michigan a "mirror image" of South Carolina, with few evangelicals and lots of Catholics (who may be offended by Bush's visit to the anti-Catholic Bob Jones University). But Al Hunt (CG) points out that Gov. John Engler is Catholic, pro-life, very popular--and a Bush ally.

In the long term, several pundits see peril for Bush. Susan Page and Tucker Carlson (both LE) note that the governor will have trouble veering back to the center for the general election. Brit Hume, Juan Williams, and Karen Tumulty (of FNS) argue that his large tax-cut proposal won't play well in the general election.

A Tale of Two Questions

The media may be guilty of swooning for John McCain, but Tim Russert is not among the idolators. Exhibit A is Russert's hour-long grilling of McCain on Sunday--an interrogation that was just as hard-hitting as his hour-long interrogation of Bush last week. Russert asked several identical questions of each candidate. Comparing the candidate's answers to two of these is instructive. One of these identical questions concerns gays in the military. How, Russert asks, will the U.S. and our European allies perform joint military exercises now that all of our allies allow homosexual soldiers to serve openly? Wouldn't any joint operations undermine the "unit cohesion" of American forces? Here is Bush's brush-off:

"Interesting angle. I haven't thought of that. That's a very interesting way to look at it. I'm not changing my position, though. I support what Colin Powell put in place. What's best for America is what I'm thinking about. What's best for morale and our troops. We can figure out how to deal with joint exercises if we ever have any. But what's best for the American military is that policy which was developed by generals like Colin Powell, of 'Don't ask, don't tell.' I adhere to the policy. It's an important policy and it needs to stay in place."

This is classic Dubya. His idea of an effective response is to zero in on the questioner's tactics (Hey, you're trying to get me to change my position!) and then to profess his own moral virtue (Because I have our troops' best interests at heart, my position cannot possibly be wrong). Conversely, this question plays to McCain's strengths--in this case, an intricate knowledge of the military command structure and a willingness to listen to advice from people he trusts:

"[No, b]ecause [the allied countries] don't totally integrate their armed forces. And I don't want the United States military to be anything like any of those [nation's militaries]--even the Israeli military. We have the best military in the world, that's why they call on us at every turn. And when people like Gen. Colin Powell and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf and many other military people I respect--including the NCOs--tell me that they can [change the policy and also] maintain unit cohesion, I would be glad to review the policy."

But Russert asked another identical question: What's your take on the new Russian president, Vladimir Putin? This elicited a thoughtful, conciliatory response from Bush:

"Too early to tell on [Putin]. First of all, he hasn't ever been elected. He was--you know, he succeeded Yeltsin, really appointed to the temporary president. My hope with Vladimir Putin is two things. One, that we can work with him in the post-Cold War era to bring some security in to Europe. We need to work with him to continue to dismantle strategic and tactical nuclear warheads. That's the old Nunn-Lugar bill that's been around for awhile. It's a good program, where scientists from both sides of the ocean come together to help bring some security into the region. We need to work with Putin--if he is the president, if he's elected--to change the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty."

But when Russert posed the same question to McCain, it brought out the senator's jingoism:

"[Putin is a] ruthless, ex-Communist apparatchik that is probably going to tell the Russian people that he wants to make the trains run on time, and I'm telling you this is a serious situation, because I think the Russian people may turn to more and more of a dictatorial government because of the incredible economic woes they face. And us letting Mr. Putin get away literally unscathed with this brutality that's taking place in Chechnya has a lot of implications for the future."

Now _That's_ Staying On Message

"I talked [to South Carolinians] about my record in the state of Texas, that I was a reformer with results. ?The people heard it loud and clear. And I'm honored and humbled by the support. ? It's

hard to get as huge a turnout as we got without running a positive campaign, and I stand by the campaign I ran. ?We got a big, big youth vote because the youth heard somebody who is optimistic about the future. The youth heard somebody who has got a positive agenda. And, you know, I've heard all this kind of punditry about ads, but our ads--I stand by our ads. ? [Voters] want somebody who's got a record of leadership. And I'm a conservative, but I also have got a brand of conservatism called compassionate conservatism that people all throughout our party can relate to. And I've got the results to show it."

--George W. Bush (FTN)

"I'm humbled by the outpouring of support here in South Carolina. ... I won because I was a reformer with results. ... A lot of young people came out to the polls today and supported me in big numbers. And they did so because I'm an optimistic person and they heard that optimistic message. ... That's one of the ingredients that happened here in South Carolina, is [voters want] somebody to lead. And the people of this state, of South Carolina, sent a strong message to the rest of America that George W. is a leader."

--George W. Bush (FNS)

"My message was one of compassionate conservatism. ... I am in fact a reformer who's had positive results when given the chance to lead. ... If you look at the exit polls, I ran the positive campaign according to the voters who actually made the decision. I know that some punditry are talking about [negative ads], but the people who actually turned up at the polls said they appreciated my campaign. And it was a positive campaign, and I stand by the campaign I ran. ... I'm really proud of it, we ran a great campaign. ... I'm really pleased with the organization and the thousands of South Carolinians that worked on my behalf, and I'm very gracious and humbled."

--George W. Bush (TW)

"Well, Wolf, I'm honored, and thanks. I'm humbled by the outpouring of support. ... Well, first of all, I won because my message of compassionate conservatism took hold here. People heard the message. Secondly, I explained to people clearly that I was a reformer who had gotten positive results in my state of Texas. ... I was able to connect with the voters here with a message that's very hopeful and positive, and [with] a reform agenda. ... When you look at the exit polls, Wolf, the people said that Gov. Bush ran the positive campaign here in South Carolina, and I'm proud of my campaign. ... They responded overwhelmingly for me because I ran a positive campaign. ... I stand by the campaign I ran and I'm proud of the campaign I ran. ... The reason the vote was so big is because people were excited about my message and were positive

about my message. ... As a matter of fact, the reason people voted for me is because I'm optimistic, I'm a hopeful person. ... I'm going to continue running the kind of campaign I ran, which is positive and optimistic, with an agenda that people can hear. And it paid off here in South Carolina."

--George W. Bush (LE)

Last Word (Infinite Loop Version)

"I've had a few hard knocks in my life, crashed a few airplanes, spent some time in a hotel where they don't leave men on the pillow, and been taking on the special interests in Washington."

--John McCain (MTP)

"Look, I've crashed a few airplanes in my time, I spent some time in a hotel where they don't put men on the pillow. And I've been fighting the special interests and the iron triangle in Washington."

--John McCain (LE)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anne_W._Bovaird@who.eop.gov (Anne_W._Bovaird@who.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-2000 13:00:55.00

SUBJECT: remarks of the President on prescription drug benefits

TO: Courtenay_Miller@ios.doi.gov (Courtenay_Miller@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra L. Via (CN=Sandra L. Via/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ben.Handford@sba.gov (Ben.Handford@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christi A. Schneeberger (CN=Christi A. Schneeberger/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: fantasia_kari@ustr.gov (fantasia_kari@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger_J._Chiang@hud.gov (Roger_J._Chiang@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: robert.nickerson@ssa.gov (robert.nickerson@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose.Vazquez@ost.dot.gov (Jose.Vazquez@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary_Beth.Schultheis@usda.gov (Mary_Beth.Schultheis@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: cortez.corina@epamail.epa.gov (cortez.corina@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: beth.newburger@gsa.gov (beth.newburger@gsa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: carole.florman@usdoj.gov (carole.florman@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bob.klear@mail.va.gov (bob.klear@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tim_Ahern@ios.doi.gov (Tim_Ahern@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rubey.Kim@epamail.epa.gov (Rubey.Kim@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brooke.anderson@hq.doe.gov (brooke.anderson@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joan.E.Wainwright@ssa.gov (Joan.E.Wainwright@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John.Hansonx@mail.va.gov (John.Hansonx@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: hwaddell@dol.gov (hwaddell@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffery T. Christiansen (CN=Jeffery T. Christiansen/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa.O.Monaco@usdoj.gov (Lisa.O.Monaco@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michele.Kreiss@sba.gov (Michele.Kreiss@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: davis.gail@epamail.epa.gov (davis.gail@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: McMahon@fca.gov (McMahon@fca.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: elisabeth.steele@fema.gov (elisabeth.steele@fema.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: bsmith@ustr.gov (bsmith@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ryan M. Morse (CN=Ryan M. Morse/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kenneth_L_Smith@ios.doi.gov (Kenneth_L_Smith@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: martinez-elizabeth@dol.gov (martinez-elizabeth@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: allison_balderston@ed.gov (allison_balderston@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rwerbel@os.dhhs.gov (rwerbel@os.dhhs.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gardenswartz-craig@dol.gov (gardenswartz-craig@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: tbish@ios.doi.gov (tbish@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: jdoyle@doc.gov (jdoyle@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mike.Derian@usda.gov (Mike.Derian@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LeeAnn.Inadomi@hq.doe.gov (LeeAnn.Inadomi@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: maria.fernandez@mail.va.gov (maria.fernandez@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: janice.joyner@mail.va.gov (janice.joyner@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert L. Nabors (CN=Robert L. Nabors/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mehunker@opm.gov (mehunker@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet L. Crist (CN=Janet L. Crist/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: leamond_nancy@ustr.gov (leamond_nancy@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lmshein@opm.gov (lmshein@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon_J._Cowan@hud.gov (Jon_J._Cowan@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: satterfield-lee@dol.gov (satterfield-lee@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elwood Holstein (CN=Elwood Holstein/OU=OMB/O=EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sarah H. Gastfreund (CN=Sarah H. Gastfreund/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie.Wymer@hq.doe.gov (Natalie.Wymer@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Masha.Pastuhov.Pastein@sba.gov (Masha.Pastuhov.Pastein@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sbolivar@opm.gov (sbolivar@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: katherine_lapin@os.doi.gov (katherine_lapin@os.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Veda_J._Lamar@hud.gov (Veda_J._Lamar@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosemary Evans (CN=Rosemary Evans/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MONGA.FRANCESCA@epamail.epa.gov (MONGA.FRANCESCA@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Helaine.Klasky@do.treas.gov (Helaine.Klasky@do.treas.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anil Kakani (CN=Anil Kakani/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: seto-chung@dol.gov (seto-chung@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca Vigen (CN=Rebecca Vigen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Eleni Zis (CN=Eleni Zis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher M. Coffey (CN=Christopher M. Coffey/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brown.Corey@epa.gov (Brown.Corey@epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: park.hk@osd.pentagon.mil (park.hk@osd.pentagon.mil [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Clyde.Williams@usda.gov (Clyde.Williams@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sean_mcmahon@ios.doi.gov (sean_mcmahon@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bernetta.Hayes@sba.gov (Bernetta.Hayes@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DSilimeo@doc.gov (DSilimeo@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susana Cervantes (CN=Susana Cervantes/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP [ONDCP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachel_Samuels@ios.doi.gov (Rachel_Samuels@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GStreett@doc.gov (GStreett@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jana.Carter@DO.Treas.gov (jana.Carter@DO.Treas.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: michael.coen@fema.gov (michael.coen@fema.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rolf_A._Olson@hud.gov (Rolf_A._Olson@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCHWARZ.DENISE@epamail.epa.gov (SCHWARZ.DENISE@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: howard-elaine@dol.gov (howard-elaine@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cheryl.Montgomery@usdoj.gov (Cheryl.Montgomery@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen_M._Tankel@hud.gov (Stephen_M._Tankel@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: AronsohnPS@state.gov (AronsohnPS@state.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: michelle.a.smith@do.treas.gov (michelle.a.smith@do.treas.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terry_Bish@ios.doi.gov (Terry_Bish@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa.Cutler@hq.doe.gov (Lisa.Cutler@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: george.haddow@fema.gov (george.haddow@fema.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phil.Gambino@ssa.gov (Phil.Gambino@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James.Holleyx@mail.va.gov (James.Holleyx@mail.va.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David_Frank@ed.gov (David_Frank@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: myron.l.marlin@usdoj.gov (myron.l.marlin@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maxie.Hollingsworth@sba.gov (Maxie.Hollingsworth@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jon.P.Jennings@usdoj.gov (Jon.P.Jennings@usdoj.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justin.Paschal@usda.gov (Justin.Paschal@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brenda.daniels@ost.dot.gov (brenda.daniels@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rhoda_j._glickman@hud.gov (rhoda_j._glickman@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jacquie_m._lawing@hud.gov (jacquie_m._lawing@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ruskc@fca.gov (ruskc@fca.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: berkowsky.pamela@osd.pentagon.mil (berkowsky.pamela@osd.pentagon.mil [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: patrick_mcdermott@ed.gov (patrick_mcdermott@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sottenst@os.dhhs.gov (sottenst@os.dhhs.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: valdez-suzanna@dol.gov (valdez-suzanna@dol.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: drossi@ed.gov (drossi@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dblankl@doc.gov (dblankl@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose.Venzor_Jr@usda.gov (Jose.Venzor_Jr@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: maya.seiden@hq.doe.gov (maya.seiden@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: manson.brown@ost.dot.gov (manson.brown@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jcbua@opm.gov (jcbua@opm.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne_Shields@ios.doi.gov (Anne_Shields@ios.doi.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: wilson.reid@epamail.epa.gov (wilson.reid@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: kris.swedin@sba.gov (kris.swedin@sba.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian.Coyne@ssa.gov (Brian.Coyne@ssa.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: leslie_thornton@ed.gov (leslie_thornton@ed.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: gary.falle@hq.doe.gov (gary.falle@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: davidlane@doc.gov (davidlane@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: brudolph@usaid.gov (brudolph@usaid.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: neal.wolin@do.treas.gov (neal.wolin@do.treas.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andy.Solomon@usda.gov (Andy.Solomon@usda.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Helen_Veit@WHO (Helen_Veit@WHO [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa_Macspadden@hud.gov (Lisa_Macspadden@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosemary.Tapp@ost.dot.gov (Rosemary.Tapp@ost.dot.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tiffanie.Hegarty@mail.VA.GOV (Tiffanie.Hegarty@mail.VA.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: abellanca@doc.gov (abellanca@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heidi_A._Chapman@hud.gov (Heidi_A._Chapman@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Josh.Weisman@hq.doe.gov (Josh.Weisman@hq.doe.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas_S._Kantor@hud.gov (Douglas_S._Kantor@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: mbuford@doc.gov (mbuford@doc.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: CCHERNISH@ustr.gov (CCHERNISH@ustr.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SHERRER.JESSIE@epamail.epa.gov (SHERRER.JESSIE@epamail.epa.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott_Sherman@hud.gov (Scott_Sherman@hud.gov [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP on 03/09/2000
12:49 PM -----

Margaret M. Suntum
03/09/2000 12:39:41 PM

Record Type: Record

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

cc:

Subject: remarks of the President on prescription drug benefits

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

March 9, 2000

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
ON MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

The South Grounds

11:50 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Good morning. Thank you, Senator Daschle. Thank you, Senator Akaka, Senator Breaux, Senator Bryan, Senator Dorgan, Senator Sarbanes, and Senator Wyden, for joining us today. And thank you, Secretary Shalala, for the leading role you've played in the development of our proposal to provide a voluntary prescription drug benefit for seniors under Medicare.

I want to make a few comments on Senator Daschle's very fine statement and the principles he outlined. But first I'd like to say a word about another debate going on in the House today over the minimum wage. Once again, the Republican leadership has derailed what should be a simple vote on the minimum wage, with a maximum of political maneuvering. The vote is yet to be taken, but we all know the results are already in. The special interests will win and the national interests will wait.

We will raise the minimum wage, but not with the Republican bill that stacks the deck against our workers. It is loaded with poison pills that penalize workers and with risky tax cuts that threaten our prosperity and the future of Social Security and Medicare.

The combined actions of the majority in the House and the Senate on all their tax cuts is now far in excess of what I have recommended, and in excess of what we can afford and still pay down the debt and reform Social Security and Medicare, and continue to invest in education.

Congress should send me a bill I can sign, not one I'll have to veto; a clean, straightforward bill that raises the minimum wage by a dollar over two years. If you remember the incredible day we had yesterday with Cheryl Costas, there are 10 million people that deserve this, and they ought to get it.

By the end of the day, two things will be clear about the minimum wage -- we do have the votes to pass it, but the Republicans still have the votes to kill it. Today's vote, however, is not the final word, and I will continue to work with a bipartisan majority in the Congress that supports a real increase in the minimum wage.

Now, with regard to the statement Senator Daschle just made, the Senate Democrats have come today to say that they are together on principles for a voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit -- something so many seniors need and far too few have. There have been a lot of proposals on the table, a good number of good ideas. Today, we are moving forward together by uniting around common principles, setting standards that any prescription drug plan should meet. That is a significant step, moving us further toward the day when every older American has the choice of affordable prescription drugs.

More than three in five seniors and people with disabilities still lack prescription drug coverage that is dependable, coverage that

could lengthen and enrich their lives. Our budget would extend them that lifeline, and create a reserve of \$35 billion to build on this new benefit to protect those who carry the heavy burden of catastrophic drug costs.

Most important, our plan, as Senator Daschle said, embodies the essential principles articulated here today and embraced by the Senate Democrats. I think any plan Congress passes should do the same. It should be optional, affordable, accessible to all. It should use price competition, not price controls. It should boost seniors' bargaining power to get the best prices possible. It should be part of an overall plan to strengthen and modernize Medicare.

I think the bargaining power issue is especially important when we read story after story of American senior citizens crossing the border into Canada to buy drugs, made in America, in Canada, at much less cost. And if this is not done, then sooner or later, the voters of this country will vote with their feet, and the Congress will have to follow suit, and you will see huge numbers of people bringing those drugs in from Canada.

No American can understand why you can go to Canada and buy a drug made in America for dramatically less than you would have to pay for it in America. And if our seniors had the bargaining power they deserve under this proposal, that gap in prices would evaporate quite quickly.

We owe it to our people, especially to our seniors, to pass a good prescription drug plan. We shouldn't be satisfied with half measures. Keep in mind that a tax deduction would help only the wealthiest seniors, and a block grant, which some in the majority have proposed, would help only the very poorest. Neither alternative would do anything for the seniors with modest middle incomes between \$15,000 and \$50,000 a year.

As Secretary Shalala reminded me today, over half of the seniors who lack prescription drug coverage, especially a lot of them in rural areas -- and you have a lot of these members here who represent -- these senators -- states with significant rural areas -- over half of those without the coverage have incomes in excess of 150 percent of the poverty rate.

So I would like to, again, urge the majority to work with us on something that covers everyone, that people can buy into. There is no better time to get this done. The economy is strong; people have a sense of purpose over this, people talk to me about this everywhere I go. And we have an opportunity now not just to pay down the debt and extend the life of Social Security and Medicare, but to extend the lives of a lot of seniors by adding this prescription drug benefit. And I certainly hope we'll do it.

Thank you.

Q Mr. President, today is the day that the case of Elian Gonzalez, after many delays, is being heard in a court room in Miami. I would like your opinion on the subject. You've always said it must go to the courts. Do you think we'll get a solution soon?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I hope so. I can't believe it's in the young man's interest for this to be dragged out much longer. But it is in the courts, and I think while it's in the courts we shouldn't comment.

John.

Q Mr. President, we'd like to get your comments on the Bradley decision to pull out of the race and his decision to not release his delegates. We're curious to what you think about that.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I thought, first of all, he made a very fine statement. I heard most of it this morning before I had to pull away, and I was very moved by his statement and very grateful for the tone and tenor of it, and for his support for the Vice President.

The second thing that occurred to me was that if you looked at the issues he raised and the way in which he raised them, it recalled again how very much more substantive, in my judgment, the debate was on the Democratic side on the issues, and how much more agreement there was. On the Republican side, there was far more disagreement, I think, and it was far less rooted in issues that will really affect the American people and move forward. So I'm very grateful.

As to the delegates, I think that he knows the Vice President will have enough votes to win on the first round; he wants those people to be able to go to the convention pledged to him, they ran pledged to him. And then what typically happens at a convention is that if there is a united party, is at the appropriate time the vote is made unanimous.

But I can understand why a lot of them probably -- I imagine he was talking to -- a lot of them called him and said, look, we'd just like to go pledged to you. We're all going to be together. We're going to honor your wishes. We're going to support the nominee of our party. But this is, I think, a matter of pride for what they have accomplished to date. I don't think you should read too much into that. I certainly didn't. I thought he gave a very fine statement, and I wish him well.

Q Mr. President, your trip to Pakistan, is this some kind of an endorsement to the military government? That's what he said in Karachi. And also, if it's support for his government, how can you still, Mr. President, answer to Nawaz Sharif, who's in jail, and he came specially on a special trip to Washington on the 4th of July? And he did say that -- and I think Mrs. Sharif also wrote a letter to you, and you have spoken with all these leaders. Sir, what do you expect from this visit also?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, it's certainly not an endorsement of the military coup. I've made that clear -- we made it clear yesterday. But it is a recognition, in my judgment, that America's interests and values would be advanced if we maintained some contact with and communications with the Pakistani government. And I think that our ability to have a positive influence on the future direction of Pakistan, in terms of the restoration of democracy, in terms of the ultimate resolution of issues in the Indian subcontinent, and in terms of avoiding further dangerous conflicts will be greater if we maintain our cooperation.

After all, Pakistan was our ally throughout the Cold War. Since I've been President, Pakistan on more than one occasion has helped us to arrest terrorists, often at some risk to the regime. And as you pointed out, the then-Prime Minister Sharif pulled the Pakistani troops back across the line of control after a July 4th meeting with me last year. So I think it would be a mistake not to go, but it would be a grave mistake for people to think that my going represents some sort of endorsement of a nondemocratic process which occurred there; that's not true.

You, and then the little boy there.

Q You said that there will be some room for negotiation on the minimum wage issue in terms of -- obviously, your plan, the Democrats plan is for two years, the Republicans is for three years with a tax cut. Do you think ultimately we'll see a compromise?

THE PRESIDENT: I would like to see a bill we can all sign. Our side -- not just me, but our members of Congress -- we offered them some very helpful small business tax cuts. We're not unmindful of the fact that one of the reasons we've had this recovery is that every year we've had a record number of new small businesses starting, that not all of them make a lot of money, especially in the early years, and we responded to their desire to have small business tax incentives and cuts with a rather generous proposal, and we got nowhere. They, instead, put this highly regressive, overly expensive program through that would increase inequality in America at a time when we're trying to reduce it, and have nothing to do with the minimum wage.

There are also -- let me say, there are other provisions in this bill which actually try to make the rest of America's work force pay with reductions in worker protections in return for the minimum wage workers getting a pay increase, and I don't think that's right, either. We shouldn't be pitting one group of workers against another.

And are we willing to talk? Of course. Always. Keep in mind, I had the conferees here on the gun safety issues this week, and we're trying to get the conference up and going there, and we're working our hearts out on it. But we have to -- yes, we're willing to work on it. But I'm telling you, it is wrong, as well as this country is doing, with the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, more wealth being created than any time in history -- any time in the history of this country, any time in the history of the world -- not to raise the minimum wage. It's wrong.

Young man, did you have a question?

Q May I please have an autograph for my little sister?

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. (Laughter.)

Q There is a report this morning that there is a rise in the military of harassment, both physical and verbal, of gay and lesbian members of the military. First of all, are you concerned about that report? And do you believe that the military is doing enough to prevent

this from happening?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'd like to make a couple of points. I'm concerned about the report. I haven't read it, Secretary Cohen hasn't read it. We will read it and take appropriate action. I do want to point out that in the last several months the Pentagon has issued new guidelines for implementing the policies related to gays in the military, specifically designed to reduce harassment. They have started new training programs, and the Secretary of Defense has made it absolutely clear what the policy is and is not.

So if -- I expect -- let me just say, if this report is accurate, I would expect to see a substantial improvement this year. Substantial. But I also want to make sure that we study the report in the White House, that the Secretary of Defense studies it, and that we take any appropriate action that might be called for. But I knew nothing about the report until I read the morning press reports, so I can't comment further than that.

Q Mr. President, the census has started, after being politicized over the last couple of years. At some point, should this debate of statistical sampling versus pure enumeration be resolved so that there's a consistency between congressional funding -- between government funding and the congressional redistricting?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, it should be. But I think it ought to be resolved in favor of what will give us the most accurate count. Look, the only reason I favored statistical sampling is because the National Science Foundation said that was the most accurate way to count people, and that we undercounted large numbers of Americans in many states last year. I'm for whatever's most accurate.

And I don't think it should be a political deal. I remember one prominent House member -- who should remain unnamed, I think -- once suggested to me that I was taking a foolish position here, that I ought to be for hiring two, three, four million people who were overwhelmingly Democratic voters, in an election year, to go out and knock on doors and count people, that this didn't make any sense. And I said, if he thought that was such good politics, why was he on the other side of it? And he confessed that it was because he thought they would count fewer than were actually there, that the statistical sampling would give us larger numbers.

I don't think this ought to be a political issue, not for us, not for them. We ought to try to find what is the most accurate way. And of course, then these constitutional issues have been raised, but I can't believe that can't be dealt with.

Q Sir, what's your response to Congressman Burton on the issue of these e-mails?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I just got the letter, and my understanding is that there will be a response to him, and that it will all be handled in an appropriate way. And I have referred all the questions to the Counsel's Office, but I think they will handle it just fine.

Q On prescription drugs, have you had any, in light of the principals here, have you had any conversation with the Republican leadership, either in the House or Senate, on this, and do you have any sense of how close you might be?

THE PRESIDENT: I haven't talked to them in the last couple of weeks. But earlier, I did, when we were getting the year started off. And I think that we might be able to do something. There is some interest there in doing something.

Now, some of the Republicans said they wanted to do a very limited program only for very low income seniors, and the problem for that, as I said, is that half the people that can't get coverage are above 150 percent of the poverty line. If you've got a substantial drug bill and you're 75 years old and you're living on \$15,000, that's not all that much money.

Look, this is again, this is like this gun issue. This is something that, if we want to get an agreement that moves the American people forward and makes this a more just and a more healthy society, we can get an agreement. Everybody wanted in agreement in '96 on welfare reform; we got it. We wanted an agreement on the minimum wage; we got it. We wanted an agreement on the balanced budget in '97, which had substantial tax cuts that benefited middle-class American families, and we got it. If they want an agreement, we'll sit down and we'll work through this, and we'll get an agreement. We can do this.

Q Will the pressures of an election work for or against getting something done on prescription drugs?

THE PRESIDENT: I think on balance, in favor, if we all work at it. That is -- that's what I think. Do you agree with that? I'm not -- see, I haven't given up on Medicare reform yet. I haven't given up on getting big things done here.

Q Mr. President, do you think that most Republicans who do vote for a higher minimum wage will do so confident in the knowledge that you would veto the bill, and that, in fact, they don't really want the higher minimum wage?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I've always been reluctant in politics to evaluate other people's motives. I think you have to judge their actions and evaluate what they do. I think it's a very hazardous thing, talking about people's motives. But my belief is, based on what I have heard said, is, I think some of them may be doing that, and some of them may really believe in both the weakening of worker protections that's in this bill and the shape and structure of their tax cut.

But I have to add up all these tax cuts they're passing, as well as evaluate them on the merits, and as I said, I can't allow one group of American working people to be pitted against another. I don't think a price for raising the minimum wage should be weakening worker protections for others in the work force.

So they may believe these things, but I don't, and I can't let it happen. I don't think it's right. And so if they believe in the minimum wage, the best thing to do is to send a straightforward minimum wage bill. If they want tax relief for small business, the best thing to do is sit down and negotiate with us and we'll give it to them, but it will be at a more affordable level in a more targeted way. But it will be very helpful, generous and positive. So I'd like to see that done.

But it's not just me -- the Congress, the Democrats in Congress have offered a small business tax relief package that I thought was quite good and one that wouldn't undermine our goal of paying the debt off and having the funds to save Social Security and Medicare. Thank you.

Q Mr. President, do you have anything to say to Congress on the Paez vote?

THE PRESIDENT: It's time, he's waited long enough. It's four years and it must be a happy day for all of us. I hope that, and I believe, we have the votes.

END 12:10 P.M. EST

Message Sent

To: _____

Brian S. Mason/WHO/EOP@EOP
Margaret M. Suntum/WHO/EOP@EOP
backup@wilson.ai.mit.edu
wh-outbox-distr@pub.pub.whitehouse.gov
Kathleen K. Ahn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Deborah Akel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/OA/EOP@EOP
Ralph Alswang/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eli G. Attie/OVP@OVP
Karen L. Barbuschak/OA/EOP@EOP
Mark H. Bartholomew/OA/EOP@EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark J. Bernstein/WHO/EOP@EOP
Todd A. Bledsoe/WHO/EOP@EOP
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen C. Burchard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP@EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Reich/OVP@OVP
Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
pcaplan@fbr.com
George G. Caudill/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP@EOP

Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin L. Coleman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lana Dickey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elliot J. Diringer/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Jackson T. Dunn/WHO/EOP@EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Bird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon Farmer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer Ferguson/OMB/EOP@EOP
Martha Foley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Rachel E. Forde/WHO/EOP@EOP
Paul D. Glastris/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dario J. Gomez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Toby C. Graff/WHO/EOP@EOP
Wendy E. Gray/NSC/EOP@EOP
John A. Gribben/WHO/EOP@EOP
William Hadley/OA/EOP@EOP
Michael A. Hammer/NSC/EOP@EOP
William C. Haymes/OA/EOP@EOP
Marty J. Hoffmann/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sheyda Jahanbani/NSC/EOP@EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP@EOP
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP@EOP
Wayne C. Johnson/OA/EOP@EOP
Joel Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
John_See@ed.gov
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jim Kohlenberger/OVP@OVP
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP@EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP@EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP@EOP
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP@EOP
Nathan B. Naylor/OVP@OVP
Ellen E. Olcott/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean P. O'Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP@EOP

Denver R. Peacock/WHO/EOP@EOP
TDIXON@smtgate.mac.whca.mil
Linda Ricci/OMB/EOP@EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robin M. Roland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP@EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christopher K. Scully/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ruby Shamir/OPD/EOP@EOP
Mark C. Sheppard/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jeffrey A. Shesol/WHO/EOP@EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP@EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP@EOP
Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer H. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maria E. Soto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Dana C. Strand/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michael J. Sullivan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sarah E. Gegenheimer/WHO/EOP@EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sylvia M. Mathews/OMB/EOP@EOP
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP@EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP@EOP
Thomas M. Rosshirt/OVP@OVP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP@EOP
Loretta M. Ucelli/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Janice H. Vranich/WHO/EOP@EOP
Setti D. Warren/WHO/EOP@EOP
Essence P. Washington/OPD/EOP@EOP
Robert S. Weiner/ONDCP/EOP@EOP
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP@EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP@EOP
Natalie S. Wozniak/NSC/EOP@EOP
carolmast@aol.com
dmilbank@tnr.com
john_see@ed.gov
skgmd@umich.edu
tingen-terri@dol.gov
usia01@access.digex.com
62955104@eln.attmail.com
newsdesk@usnewswire.com
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jason H. Schechter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Aprill N. Springfield/WHO/EOP@EOP
Alberto O. Feraren/OA/EOP@EOP

Hildy Kuryk/WHO/EOP@EOP
Pubs_Backup
Michael K. Gehrke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sally Katzen/OMB/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP@EOP
John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
MichaelT@ag.state.ar.us
Rachel A. Redington/WHO/EOP@EOP
Irma L. Martinez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sharon H. Yuan/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Michele Ballantyne/WHO/EOP@EOP
Melissa G. Green/OPD/EOP@EOP
Stephanie A. Cutter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Francisco J. Sanchez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Fern Mechlowitz/WHO/EOP@EOP
Anne W. Bovaird/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Matthew T. Schneider/WHO/EOP@EOP
David Vandivier/OMB/EOP@EOP
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
Beth Nolan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lindsey E. Huff/NSC/EOP@EOP
Bridget T. Leininger/WHO/EOP@EOP
Samir Afridi/WHO/EOP@EOP
Terry Edmonds/WHO/EOP@EOP
Kymberly M. Escobar/CEQ/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
sean.carr@cnn.com
Lisa Ferdinando/WHO/EOP@EOP
masonjulie@aol.com
Jason E. Hartke/WHO/EOP@EOP
Debra D. Alexander/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrienne K. Elrod/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lisel Loy/WHO/EOP@EOP
jonathan.kaplan@varsitybooks.com
Rebecca J. Salay/WHO/EOP@EOP
kit.judge@mail.house.gov
Abigail C. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jordanindc@aol.com
Deanne E. Benos/OPD/EOP@EOP
Jenni R. Engebretsen/WHO/EOP@EOP
Gilbert S. Gonzalez/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Stephen N. Boyd/WHO/EOP@EOP
Emily Karcher/WHO/EOP@EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sonya N. Hebert/WHO/EOP@EOP

Lindsay R. Drewel/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Erica_Lepping@ed.gov
Mark D. Magana/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brian A. Barreto/WHO/EOP@EOP
Christine L. Anderson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Victoria L. Valentine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lauren M. Supina/WHO/EOP@EOP
Adrian E. Miller/WHO/EOP@EOP
Justin G. Cooper/WHO/EOP@EOP
Renee Sagiv/WHO/EOP@EOP
Heather F. Hurlburt/WHO/EOP@EOP
Sean R. Dobson/OPD/EOP@EOP
Pamela P. Carpenter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP
Angela Blake/WHO/EOP@EOP
Eileen P. McCaughey/WHO/EOP@EOP
RSocarides@rlmnet.com
kamina@washpost.com
Mara A. Silver/WHO/EOP@EOP
Jennifer I. Hoelzer/NSC/EOP@EOP
Paul K. Orzulak/NSC/EOP@EOP
Ted Widmer/NSC/EOP@EOP
David Halperin/NSC/EOP@EOP
Alon J. Kupferman/WHO/EOP@EOP
William T. Glunz/WHO/EOP@EOP
John T. Liipfert/WHO/EOP@EOP
Helen L. Langan/WHO/EOP@EOP
Taneesha J. Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Erica R. Morris/WHO/EOP@EOP
Brooke B. Livingston/OMB/EOP@EOP
Lissa Muscatine/WHO/EOP@EOP
Carolyn E. Cleveland/WHO/EOP@EOP
Angela Blake/WHO/EOP@EOP
Lauren M. Supina/WHO/EOP@EOP
Linda Sinoway/WHO/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth E. Baylor/WHO/EOP@EOP
BARRY_TOIV@was.bm.com
George E. Lewis/OA/EOP@EOP
Pubs_Distribution
Seth J. Applebaum/WHO/EOP@EOP
Amy Weiss@was.bm.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-DEC-2000 07:41:02.00

SUBJECT: NEWS: Separation of Power Trips

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Thur., Dec. 7, 2000

--today's papers: Separation of Power Trips

--explainer: Yes, Related No. 1

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Hard-to-Find Wines Get Easy

When describing wine, "rare" connotes two meanings: outstanding for its type and difficult to find. A simpler way to put it is that a rare wine is special. The holidays are special, too. So treat yourself--or someone else--to a selection from the rare wine shop at wine.com.

http://www.wine.com/rareshop.jsp?link_from=msn_slateemail_rare_por

today's papers

Separation of Power Trips

by Scott Shuger

All the papers lead with yesterday's principal presidential election developments: Filings by both sides in preparation for today's Florida Supreme Court oral arguments on whether or not Al Gore is entitled to any further manual recounts of disputed ballots, and the Republican-dominated Florida legislature's decision to convene a special session very likely to produce a fall-back slate of Bush electors.

Although Florida Republicans depicted the special session not as a Bush stratagem but merely as protecting the ability of the state of Florida--rather than the courts or the U.S. Congress--to select its presidential electors, the WP and NYT leads have a Florida Democratic legislator's divergent comment: "Sadly, I have to say that I believe this is orchestrated, and the only thing missing from the proclamation today was the postmark from Austin, Texas." The LAT lead has a similar quote from the same Democrat. The WP

describes the legislature's move as being announced at a "hastily called" press conference and says that previously its Republican leaders "had appeared cautious" about taking the step. But the Post notes that Monday's U.S. Supreme Court order emphasized to the Florida Supreme Court the primacy of state legislatures when it comes to voting law, and says that the legislature's action sends "an explicit message" about that to the lower court as it hears Gore's recount appeal. In making the same point, the NYT lead calls the legislature's move "a warning shot fired by one branch of state government toward another."

The WP, NYT and LAT leads summarize the briefs filed in the Florida Supreme Court case. They are another indication of how much influence the U.S. Supreme Court's words are having: each side charges the other with seeking to rewrite the election rules. The LAT at one point refers to the Bush brief's "none-too-subtle reminder" to the Florida court that the U.S. Supreme Court is not likely to tolerate an "adventuresome" (the paper's word) ruling.

The LAT says the Gore brief claims the current Bush margin in Florida is 103 votes. The WP and NYT note that the Gore papers say the case represents the "last chance for a legal judgment" regarding the election. The NYT lead reports that according to Gore's legal advisors, there will be no appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court on this case if they lose. Which means, the paper concludes, Gore's contest could end before the weekend. The WSJ main Florida story says however that not appealing this case doesn't mean Gore would automatically concede, reminding the reader that he's suggested he might wait for the resolution of three absentee ballot cases.

The Post lead gives middle play and the LAT lead gives high play to yesterday's rejection by a federal appeals court of the contention of lawyers for George W. Bush that the manual recounts Gore is seeking violate the constitutional rights of voters in jurisdictions where recounts are not being sought. The WSJ's main Florida story puts this decision in its first sentence and says it could clear the way for the Florida Supreme Court to order the recounts Gore wants.

The LAT lead reports that the slate of electors the Florida legislative leaders are proposing to send to the Electoral College are the very same people who were certified by state election officials. The paper adds that they include the two key legislators pushing for a special session.

The papers all report that yesterday, George W. Bush--after meeting with Condoleezza Rice, who is likely to be his national security advisor should he become president--warned terrorists against trying to take advantage of the election uncertainty and said that the "next administration, which I hope is the Bush administration, will do whatever it takes to send a chilling signal to terrorists." The LAT is the only paper that puts this in its lead. The WP puts it on Page 25, in a story whose first sentence calls Bush "the

prospective commander in chief," and which is accompanied by a photo caption (online at least) calling him "the probable president-elect."

Everybody fronts a Russian court's conviction yesterday of a U.S. businessman--and former naval intelligence officer--on spy charges. Edmond Pope was sentenced to 20 years in prison for buying reports on a Soviet-era high-speed torpedo. Pope claims the reports contained only public information. Everybody notes that various U.S. officials harshly condemned the verdict. Most of the coverage mentions that this is the first conviction of a U.S. citizen for spying since U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers was shot down in 1960, but nobody mentions that the U.S. government had denied espionage in that case too, or that Powers was, well, spying.

The NYT reefer some highlights from the just-published Rolling Stone Bill Clinton interview. The paper goes high with Clinton's view that the Republicans maneuvered him into the gays in the military controversy to keep him from having a honeymoon as a new President. During this part of the discussion, Clinton refers to "this dumb-ass 'don't ask, don't tell' thing" that "I worked out with Colin Powell." Clinton also endorses the decriminalization of marijuana and questions the strong distinction the law makes between crack and powdered cocaine. There's also his fond reminiscence of a visit he had with Richard Nixon at the White House shortly before Nixon died. The early edition of the WP runs a AP blurb on the interview that mentions none of this, but does mention that Clinton thinks he could have won a third term and that maybe the current restriction to two terms should be changed. The Post item ends with a quick reminder that Ronald Reagan said the same thing.

A little gem of a letter to the NYT raises an interesting point about this quotation from Sen. Phil Gramm that ran in the Times yesterday: "I've been waiting all my life to have a Republican president and a Republican Congress." The correspondent notes that before 1983, Gramm ran for Congress as a Democrat.

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=356>

4

Also in Slate

Press Box: Wankers and the Wall Street Journal

<http://slate.msn.com/code/PressBox/PressBox.asp?Show=12/6/2000&idMessage=6632>

The Breakfast Table: The race to assign blame for the coming recession.

<http://slate.msn.com/code/breakfast/breakfast.asp?Show=12/6/2000&idMessage=6629&idBio=219>

Election Roundup: Our complete election and recount coverage.

<http://slate.msn.com/Features/electionroundup/electionroundup.asp>

explainer

Yes, Related No. 1

By Emily Yoffe

Are Carter Eskew, an Al Gore strategist, and Tucker Eskew, a George W. Bush spokesman, related?

Yes! Normally Explainer explains how people with confusingly similar names are not related. But there is something ideologically eskew in the Eskew family: Carter and Tucker are second cousins--they share a paternal great-grandfather. (Neither is related, however, to former Democratic Florida governor and failed presidential candidate Rubin Askew.) Don't worry about a frosty Christmas for the Eskew clan, however. The political foes have only met once. And though Tucker Eskew got his first name from the last name of a great-great-grandmother, neither he nor another Bush spokesperson, Mindy Tucker, are aware of any genealogical connection. Nor does conservative TV pundit and writer Tucker Carlson, who also got his first name from a family surname, know of any common bloodlines among the three. Explainer doesn't buy it. Come on, Tuckers, go back to your family trees and find that first Republican who begat you all.

Previously in this series, Explainer looked at people who appeared to be related but weren't. Some of those tackled were the McCulloughs and Macaulays, the Gessens, Glennys, and Kaczynskis, the Cohens (three Stephens, four Richards), the Rays (two Elizabeths), the Hirschfelds (Abe and Al), the Strausses (Robert and R. Peter), the Broders (Jonathan, John M., and David), the Moores (three Michaels), and the Samuelsons (Paul, Robert, and Larry).

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

<http://slate.msn.com/code/thefray/thefray.asp?t=explainer>

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-DEC-2000 07:50:38.00

SUBJECT: NEWS: Final Recountdown?

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
SLATE NEWS: Fri., Dec. 8, 2000

--today's papers: Final Recountdown?

--international papers: All South African Politics Are Local

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Hard-to-Find Wines Get Easy

When describing wine, "rare" connotes two meanings: outstanding for its type and difficult to find. A simpler way to put it is that a rare wine is special. The holidays are special, too. So treat yourself--or someone else--to a selection from the rare wine shop at wine.com.

http://www.wine.com/rareshop.jsp?link_from=msn_slateemail_rare_por

today's papers

Final Recountdown?

by Scott Shuger

Everybody leads with yesterday's hour-plus of oral arguments before the Florida Supreme Court. Bush and Gore lawyers were there on the question of whether the lower court judge who tried Al Gore's contest lawsuit erred when he rejected Gore's request for a manual recount of some 14,000 disputed ballots. The USAT lead notes right away that the hearing came one month after Americans voted. The WP front has its hostage-crisis-style counter set at "Day 30."

The WP lead says in its first paragraph that several of the court's seven justices appeared "open to Gore's argument" that he was unjustly denied the recount. The NYT lead, in its first paragraph, refers to "repeated skepticism" from several justices about whether the court should get involved at all. The NYT says that the lead Bush attorney, Barry Richard, "left somewhat less battered" than his Gore counterpart, David Boies. The headline over the WSJ story, referring to the late November session leading up to the court's

previous unanimous ruling that Gore had a right to some recounting, reads: "THIS TIME, FLORIDA HIGH COURT CASTS COLDER EYE ON GORE'S QUEST."

The Times and WSJ main story on the hearing note that early on when one justice asked Boies why the Florida Supreme Court should even be able to review the lower court's ruling, Boies seemed surprised. After a pause, they report, he replied that the U.S. Constitution did not intend for legislatures to act as judicial bodies, and hence that election case rulings could be appealed like any others.

Everybody notes that in their questioning, the judges expressed concern about their powers to order a recount in light of the recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling admonishing the Florida court to be sure not to tread on the Florida legislature's primacy in making voting law. And the coverage also notes they expressed concern about there not being enough time to conduct a recount anyway.

The papers also report another point where the judges pressed Boies hard: why, some wondered, were they being asked only to authorize a recount only of some ballots. Boies responded that the contest statute entitled the losing candidate to make such choices. But (especially in the NYT lead) reading to the very end reveals plenty of pressure from the bench on the Bush position too, especially regarding the trial judge's decision not to look at the ballots entered into evidence and his related view that a recount was permissible only if there was a reasonable probability that it would change an election's outcome. Very near the bottom, the Times lead quotes one judge saying she was "really having a problem" with that standard.

The coverage says that the Florida high court could issue a decision today, and ditto for decisions in two Florida county trials about the status of absentee ballots, which might radically switch the state's vote totals. And it's widely reported that the Florida legislature meets today to begin working on its alternative slate of electors. Although the papers generally reflect the idea that therefore the end of Gore's case might be today, the LAT lead says that one of Gore's Florida attorneys did not rule out further legal action, even though early in the week Gore and Boies had suggested otherwise.

Bush attorney Richard gets appreciative profiles on both the WP front and inside the NYT, both of which note with amazement how many Bush cases he's handling simultaneously. But it's the Times piece that wryly notes the risk he runs: he has to make sure he remembers which case he's on, since in some cases Richard has argued that votes that violate a technical rule should not be counted while in others he's argued that they should.

The WSJ fronts a long feature about the difficulties Procter & Gamble has experienced trying to build an overseas market for tampons. Despite their ubiquity in the U.S., Canada and Western Europe, tampons are, the story says, used by only 100 million of

the world's 1.7 billion potential customers. Biggest problems: 1) The fear of toxic shock syndrome, which was connected with one discontinued high-absorbency product, and which the company says can be avoided when using others by replacing a used tampon after 8 hours; 2) Especially in predominantly Catholic countries, the fear that through using them, a woman "might lose her virginity." The story reminds that when tampons were first introduced in the U.S. in 1936, some priests objected to them.

The NYT goes inside with a clarification made by Rolling Stone about its Bill Clinton interview. Seems the magazine got it wrong when it quoted Clinton as referring to "this dumb-ass 'don't ask, don't tell'" policy about gays in the military. After the White House complained that Clinton had not used the vulgarism, the magazine discovered that a stenographer had taken 'don't ask' to be 'dumb-ass.'

The LAT lead says that Al Gore watched the televised court proceedings and George W. Bush did not. Then the paper describes Bush as "saying he was too busy to pay any mind to the proceedings in Florida." But this is a rather sweeping and unjustified description of Bush, who merely said he was in meetings during the hearing. And one which is immediately refuted by the story's next sentence: "He did acknowledge getting a briefing later from James A. Baker III, his Florida point man."

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

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

For a glossary of newspaper terms used in Today's Papers, click here:

<http://www.slate.com/code/Explainer/Explainer.asp?Show=9/7/99&idMessage=356>

4

Also in Slate

Readme: George and Justice

<http://slate.msn.com/Readme/00-12-07/Readme.asp>

Framegame: Take It Like a Mandate

http://slate.msn.com/framegame/entries/00-12-07_94796.asp

Chatterbox: Faithless Elector Watch--Ask Doctor Faithless!

<http://slate.msn.com/code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=12/7/2000&idMessage=6644>

international papers

All South African Politics Are Local

By June Thomas

South African voters mildly rebuked the ruling African National Congress in Tuesday's local elections by avoiding the polls and giving the opposition Democratic Alliance unanticipated levels of support. The ANC captured 60 percent of the vote by Wednesday evening, and the opposition Democratic Alliance attracted around 29 percent in the second municipal election since the end of white rule. (This contest marked the debut of a streamlined local government system that reduces the number of municipalities from 843 to 284 and creates six metropolitan "megacities.")

The Democratic Alliance--formed in June by the merger of the New National Party (the renamed mainstay of the apartheid system), the Democratic Party (traditionally the party of white liberalism), and the Freedom Alliance--was poised to take Cape Town, while the ANC will control the five other megacities. Turnout was estimated at only 48 percent of registered voters, prompting a political scientist to tell South Africa's Star that ANC supporters were "registering a gentle protest. Voters are not ready to switch to other parties like the DA. They're simply saying to the ANC: 'You are our organisation and, please, you should work for us.' "

The Democratic Alliance established a small presence in black areas, taking 5 percent of the vote in Soweto and 7 percent in Alexandra, according to party leader Tony Leon, even after former President Nelson Mandela denounced its supporters as "black stooges of a white party which can never run this country again." A writer in the Cape Argus declared the DA had "successfully tapped into disillusionment with the ANC national government during the campaign." In an editorial published on the day of the election, Britain's Guardian speculated that "[y]oung black township voters, who have no memory of the apartheid struggle ... may join with mixed-race and white voters in backing the opposition." It concluded, "Such developments would be welcome in terms of bridging the racial divide and maintaining a pluralist democracy. And they would serve as a timely reminder that all governments, whatever the past context, have a present-day duty to deliver."

Britain's Independent also welcomed the arrival of a viable South African opposition:

[I]t is important that the ANC--despite and because of its glorious historic contribution--should not simply become the party of power. ... In the early years after the collapse of apartheid, South African elections were, above all, about moral issues--in effect, the triumph of good over evil. Now, life is much messier than that. That new grubbiness is to be welcomed. Ten years on, normality has arrived.

The South African Independent reported that one local council seat was decided by the toss of a coin, when, even after several recounts, the candidates were tied with 2,266 votes each. The piece's headline may contain a subliminal message: "Flip of coin means no beating about the bush."

Foreigners fume about GatorWait: Name your president-elect, the international press is telling the United States. In an editorial titled "Dignity versus desperation," the Age of Melbourne asked, "At what point does the cheated underdog become the begrudging spoiler? It may soon be time for [Vice President Gore] to concede defeat for the good of country; the nation cannot remain frozen in political stasis indefinitely." Britain's Daily Telegraph was less subtle, declaring of Gore, "He increasingly resembles the house guest who has overstayed his welcome and ignores all intimations to that effect, such as railway timetables left ostentatiously on his bed."

Department of transportation: Britain's railways are currently in a state of disarray because of speed restrictions imposed after several recent crashes. In a form of journalistic torture, the Daily Mirror sent a reporter on a train ride from the northernmost tip of Scotland to the southernmost point of England. The paper's conclusion: "In 1829, inventor George Stephenson launched the world's first train, the Rocket, which travelled at 36 mph. In 2000, it took Brian Reade 22.5 hours to travel from John O'Groats to Land's End ... an improvement of 1.7 mph in 171 years." In Japan, the trains run on time but, the Financial Times reports, sexual molestation of women passengers has become such a problem that a Tokyo-based company will introduce late-night women-only carriages through the New Year rush. Apparently, "Attempts in the 1980s to introduce women-only carriages failed because women who had to get on to normal cars complained that they became greater targets for [molesters]." In Australia, "surf rage" has become so widespread that an official Surfers Code of Ethics has been released to help educate inexperienced surfers about the polite way to ride the waves. According to Hong Kong's South China Morning Post, "In a bid for international understanding and surfing peace, the rules are also being translated into Portuguese, Japanese, and Hebrew." Let's hope they never make it into Welsh. A piece in the Guardian described the "road hazard" caused by long Welsh words. The government has recently approved the use of illuminated electronic signs on British motorways to communicate "complex, lengthy and changing messages ... with which conventional painted signs cannot cope." In Wales, signs would have to display the text in both English and Welsh, and researchers are concerned that drivers will take too long to read the messages, leading to "potentially fatal" delays. The piece concluded, "The worst case scenario involves the first Anglesey exit of the A5 dual carriageway--to Llanfairpwllgwyngyllgogerychwyrndrobwllllantysiliogogoch."

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

<http://slate.msn.com/code/thefray/thefray.asp?t=internatpapers>

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

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

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

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

Copyright (c) 2000 Microsoft and/or its suppliers. All rights reserved.