

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 23:14:28.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.6.00.6

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. KENTUCKY POST Letter: Time shouldn't be wasted on anti-gay bills
2. CINCINNATI POST Letter: A desire for marriage is hardly terrorism
3. ASSOCIATED PRESS Excerpts from GOP candidates' debate (gays in the military)
4. PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE Letter from guy who knows a big word AND how to use it in a sentence: Gay marriage oxymoron
5. VANCOUVER COLUMBIAN Letter: Bauer's gay hating off base
6. BOSTON GLOBE Letter from Articles reader Arthur Lipkin: Homophobia is a part of the military system

Kentucky Post, January 5, 2000

421 Madison Avenue, Covington, KY, 41011

(Fax 606-291-2525 ) (E-Mail: kredits@cincypost.com )

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

Letter: Time shouldn't be wasted on anti-gay bills

I write in response to and in support of the views expressed by Bill

Rice

("Reasons abound for gay civil-rights laws," Dec. 15). In his letter,

Mr.

Rice takes umbrage at a recently introduced bill that would bar agencies of the government from passing legislation that would assure that the civil rights of gay and lesbian persons are protected. State Reps. Tom Kerr and Joe Fischer, the Republican legislators who introduced the bill, obviously feel that such laws give special privilege to our homosexual brothers and sisters.

In his letter, Mr. Rice, a gay man, detailed at some length the discrimination and indignities he has had to suffer over the years because he

has refused to remain in the closet. Not being gay, I could not say better what Mr. Rice said, but I am privileged to know other gay persons as well as

Mr. Rice and I'm sure he has not exaggerated his experience.

One can't help wondering what voices or forces these two legislators are

reacting to and why. It would seem that there are many urgent needs to be considered and met in our relatively poor state that might occupy the time and talents of men elected to our public offices without this waste of giving

in to either their own or others' homophobic tendencies. I sincerely hope

that these two men don't feel that this is what will pass for "cutting edge" legislation.

Hopefully, less discriminatory voices within their party will prevail and such nonsense, that can only pander to the ignorance and phobias of many of their constituents, will be withdrawn or left to die a well-deserved legislative death.

? ED STIERITZ, Fort Thomas

Cincinnati Post, January 4, 2000

Cincinnati, OH

(E-MAIL: [postedits@cincypost.com](mailto:postedits@cincypost.com) ) ( <http://www.cincypost.com> )

Letter: A desire for marriage is hardly terrorism

I find Gary Bauer's saying that the Vermont Supreme Court's ruling on gay

couples is worse than terrorism to be quite odd. Terrorism usually involves

a group of people who feel that everyone should live and believe as they do,

no exceptions. They go to extreme measures to make their statement such as blowing up buildings or killing people.

In Vermont there are some gay people who simply want the same rights and

privileges enjoyed by married heterosexuals. They do not want to prevent straight people from marrying and they do not believe that everyone should be

gay. They believe that all adults need the right to be their true selves and

have the right to love the person they choose.

In fact it appears to me that they find value in the institution of marriage, or in other words committed relationships. I fail to see how this

constitutes a situation that is worse than terrorism.

In reality one could say that the opponents of the Vermont Supreme Court's ruling are the ones who emulate the terrorists. They believe that everyone should live and believe as they do. They are trying to force their

own limited view point on everyone else.

Yet the gay people are simply saying let everyone (gays and straights) make their own choices regarding life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness

as is guaranteed in the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, as well as the constitution of the state Of Vermont.

? EARL C. APEL, College Hill

Associated Press, January 6, 2000

Excerpts From GOP Debate

Excerpts from Thursday's debate among Republican presidential candidates

Gary Bauer, Texas Gov. George W. Bush, Steve Forbes, Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah, Alan Keyes and Sen. John McCain of Arizona, as transcribed by the Federal Document Clearing House. . . .

All candidates were asked about gays in the military.

MCCAIN: I would make sure that a policy that's working, and is working, and should work, is continued. I believe that when people like General Colin Powell, and other most respected men in America, come up with a policy that does work ? yes, it has troubles with it, yes, it needs some reviews or changes, or fine tuning. And I'll be glad to support such a thing.

BAUER: This administration, has watched as the Navy went from 600 ships to 325; as we went from 18 Army divisions to 10. They've sent men all over the world for dubious reasons. We don't have a missile defense system. We're cutting veterans' benefits. And what is Clinton and Gore worried about? Making sure that the gay rights movement is satisfied with who the joint chiefs of staff are.

KEYES: I keep asking myself where all the conservatives have gone. I'm sad, but "don't ask, don't tell" ? a military man ? my father was a military guy ? one of the nice things about military people is they're straight. It's kind of a what-you-see-is-what-you-get profession. Ask a question, get a straight answer. Get the truth. Get honesty. Get honor. ... I will return to the ban on homosexuals in the military.

FORBES: Open gays should not be in the military. The military is not an agency for social experimentation. They have a real mission and they should be allowed to carry it out. If they're willing to live within certain moral constraints, I think that's fine.

HATCH: I will not expect anybody in the military to live any way other than the way I live. I will set an example in the White House. And that's something we haven't had today. And to be honest with you, that's why the military has fallen apart. [huh?]

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, January 5, 2000  
Box 947, Pittsburgh, PA, 15230  
(Fax 412-263-2014 ) (E-MAIL: [letters@post-gazette.com](mailto:letters@post-gazette.com) )  
( <http://www.post-gazette.com/> )  
Letter: Gay marriage oxymoron

When are people in this country going to wake up and realize what is happening to it? I am referring to the ongoing assault on traditional American morals and values. The unbelievable decision by the Vermont Supreme Court ("Gay Couples Get Equal Rights in Vermont," Dec. 21) illustrates perfectly how today's liberals cannot win legislative battles and therefore must enlist the help of like-minded nitwits in the court system to further their destructive agenda.

The Vermont Supreme Court decreed that the Vermont Legislature must either legalize gay marriage or pass a law giving gays the same advantages as

a normal married couple. Talk about ridiculous! Marriage is between men and women. Period. The institution is one of the pillars upon which civilization is built. The mere notion that marriage be extended to gays is ludicrous, and fortunately Congress and 30 states have passed laws to that effect.

What is to stop people from claiming they're a homosexual couple, even if they're not, just to qualify for benefits? The shortsightedness and lack of logic shown by the justices on Vermont's Supreme Court is nothing short of incredible.

Of course, expressing an opinion like mine, which is shared by the overwhelming majority of Americans, will bring the inevitable shrieks from the left of "homophobe" and "bigot." That is nothing more than the battle cry of people who can't win an argument based on the merits.

? GARY J. HOUSTON, Squirrel Hill

Vancouver Columbian, January 6, 2000  
P. O. Box 180, Vancouver, WA, 98666  
(Fax 360-699-6033 ) (E-MAIL: editors@columbian.com )

Letter: Bauer's gay hating off-base

I couldn't help but feel outraged when I read the Dec. 28 story, "Bauer denounces gay rights ruling," in which Gary Bauer denounced the Vermont Supreme Court ruling that granted the same protection to gay people that religiously indoctrinated marriages receive.

This is a man who aspires to become president, and he wears his homo-hatred with pride. He has equated the judges' decision with terrorism.

Has he been quoted correctly? Is a judicial ruling that clearly separates church and state for the purpose of avoiding church-sponsored discrimination equal to terrorism?

The primary catalyst for gay hating comes from the church, with leaders like Bauer leading the charge. Why does this man have the audacity to assume that the rest of America wants to discriminate against gay people because he equates it to terrorism? Why shouldn't gay people have the same rights that everyone else takes for granted?

The Vermont Supreme Court answered that question. The government as well as the church has no business imposing constraints on people who want to spend their lives loving each other and to be free from radical religious doctrine. There should be no church-backed legislation that uniformly deprives any citizen in a free country to choose who they wish to have sex with if they are consenting adults.

The government and the church should both keep away from the anatomy and physiology of all Americans and do it permanently. Only then will we experience the joy of freedom.

? Larry Little, Vancouver

Boston Globe, January 6, 2000

Box 2378, Boston, MA, 02107

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

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

Letter: Homophobia is a part of the military system

What Bob Zelnick left out of his op ed piece on "Don't ask, don't tell" flawed from the start " (Jan.3) is that the military uses homophobia to create solidarity and spur machismo, especially among new trainees. Since anti-gay sentiments already prevail among adolescent males, homosexuals are an ideal target. Each youth distances himself from weak effeminacy in the process.

Moreover, the armed forces require an intense male bonding that seems to them contingent on the assumption of homosexual absence. The gay ban creates the fiction that any question of homosexuality in these manly attachments will have been ruled out in advance ? thus reassuring both recruits and their parents.

The military also routinely control the women's ranks with homophobia. Periodic lesbian purges have historically reduced the professional threat posed by competent females to their male counterparts.

Of course the just standard for soldiering is sexual conduct, not sexual identity. To claim otherwise is to blame the victim of prejudice.

Although there is evidence that racism still occasionally threatens unit

cohesion, no one would absurdly advocate excluding people of color from the military. Homophobia, like racism, is the problem that begs solution.

? Arthur Lipkin, Cambridge [[arthur\\_lipkin@gse.harvard.edu](mailto:arthur_lipkin@gse.harvard.edu)]

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> ( Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 15:01:57.00

SUBJECT: NC11681: Gore, Bradley support gays in military

TO: Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> ( Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The New York Times

6 Jan 2000

<http://www.nytimes.com>

Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military  
By RICHARD L. BERKE

Vice President Al Gore and his Democratic opponent, Bill Bradley, said tonight that if they were elected president they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.

Although both candidates had previously opposed the Clinton administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy their comments in the fourth Democratic debate of the primary season, here at the University of New Hampshire, were a strikingly forceful embrace of gay rights and were bound to come under attack by the Republican candidates.

Their remarks came in response to a question of whether they would support a "litmus test" on gays in the military in nominating members of the Joint Chiefs.

Of the two, Mr. Gore was the more expansive, saying he wanted to make the same sweeping changes toward allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military that President Harry S. Truman made toward racially integrating the armed forces.

"I think that would require those who wanted to serve on the Joint Chiefs to be in agreement with that policy," Mr. Gore said. "I would insist before appointing anybody to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that that individual support my policy, and yes, I would make that a requirement."

The vice president drew a distinction between applying a litmus test to Supreme Court justices and military officials, saying this was "not interfering with an independent judicial decision."

Mr. Bradley said simply that the commander in chief issued orders and soldiers followed them. He said that while many in the armed forces probably did not agree with President Clinton on some military matters, "My sense is that when you're president of the United States, military people are loyal to their commander in chief whatever the policy of the commander in chief calls for the country, and that's what I'd expect them to do if I'm president of the United States and we move toward gays in the military."

Mr. Bradley's aides said later that while he objected to the concept of litmus tests, they could not imagine that he would appoint anyone to the Joint Chiefs who did not back his policy.

Despite the candidates' agreement on homosexuals in the military, the debate tonight was punctuated by edgy exchanges as Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley picked at details of each other's past votes and present proposals.

Mr. Bradley portrayed the vice president as having been so trapped in a "Washington bunker" that he had lost the ambition to fight for proposals on health care and gun control. Mr. Gore suggested that his rival was living in an ivory tower and lacked the know-how to get things done.

But the exchange over a gay-rights litmus test for top commanders is almost certain to renew controversy in the military, where many high-ranking officers strongly oppose allowing gays to serve openly.

President Clinton had originally pledged to allow homosexuals to serve openly, but backed away from the plan after a near revolt by Gen. Colin L. Powell and other members of the Joint Chiefs early in his presidency. A result was "the don't ask, don't tell" policy, which Mr. Bradley and Mr. Gore say is a failure.

Retired members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military experts warned tonight that subjecting future members to a litmus test would hurt the armed services.

"Military officers certainly execute the orders of the president, but a litmus test beforehand would place an officer in an untenable position saying, 'Do you believe what I believe?'" said Gen. Carl E. Mundy, a retired commandant of the Marine Corps.

"I think it would be unworkable."

"An officer's judgment has to be tempered by his judgment of what's best for the armed forces, not for a political agenda," said General Mundy, who opposes allowing homosexuals to serve openly.

The candidates' comments tonight about homosexuals in the military underscored the degree to which Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley are intent on courting the liberal base of their party. In fact, earlier in the debate, neither candidate objected to being described as a liberal — a label that Democrats, including Bill Clinton, have eschewed in recent years.

"Liberal, progressive, whatever," Mr. Bradley said. "I'll accept whatever label you want because that's who I am."

Mr. Gore, who earlier in the day was endorsed by Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, said, "I really don't care what kind of label people apply to those positions and views." ... [snip]

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 12:09:44.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.6.00.2

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

TEXT:

1. NEW YORK TIMES Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military
2. THE RECORD (NJ) Reader responses to PFLAG billboard
3. ASSOCIATED PRESS OR: Activists take aim at Christian college's stance  
on  
homosexuality
4. ASSOCIATED PRESS VT: Senator says marriage would be better than  
domestic  
partnership
5. THE OKLAHOMAN Caption causes outcry in Owasso; Photo of police posing  
in  
briefs gets labeled gay
6. ASSOCIATED PRESS ME: King says gay rights issue needs voter, not  
lawmaker, approval

New York Times, January 6, 2000  
229 W. 43rd Street, New York, NY, 10036  
(Fax 212-556-3622 ) (E-MAIL: letters@nytimes.com )  
( <http://www.nytimes.com> )

Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military  
By RICHARD L. BERKE

Vice President Al Gore and his Democratic opponent, Bill Bradley, said tonight that if they were elected president they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.

Although both candidates had previously opposed the Clinton administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy their comments in the fourth

Democratic debate of the primary season, here at the University of New Hampshire, were a strikingly forceful embrace of gay rights and were bound to come under attack by the Republican candidates.

Their remarks came in response to a question of whether they would support a "litmus test" on gays in the military in nominating members of the Joint Chiefs.

Of the two, Mr. Gore was the more expansive, saying he wanted to make the same sweeping changes toward allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military that President Harry S. Truman made toward racially integrating the

armed forces.

"I think that would require those who wanted to serve on the Joint Chiefs to be in agreement with that policy," Mr. Gore said. "I would insist before appointing anybody to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that that individual support my policy, and yes, I would make that a requirement."

The vice president drew a distinction between applying a litmus test to Supreme Court justices and military officials, saying this was "not interfering with an independent judicial decision."

Mr. Bradley said simply that the commander in chief issued orders and soldiers followed them. He said that while many in the armed forces probably did not agree with President Clinton on some military matters, "My sense is that when you're president of the United States, military people are loyal to their commander in chief whatever the policy of the commander in chief calls for the country, and that's what I'd expect them to do if I'm president of the United States and we move toward gays in the military."

Mr. Bradley's aides said later that while he objected to the concept of litmus tests, they could not imagine that he would appoint anyone to the Joint Chiefs who did not back his policy.

Despite the candidates' agreement on homosexuals in the military, the debate tonight was punctuated by edgy exchanges as Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley picked at details of each other's past votes and present proposals.

Mr. Bradley portrayed the vice president as having been so trapped in a "Washington bunker" that he had lost the ambition to fight for proposals on health care and gun control. Mr. Gore suggested that his rival was living in an ivory tower and lacked the know-how to get things done.

But the exchange over a gay-rights litmus test for top commanders is almost certain to renew controversy in the military, where many high-ranking officers strongly oppose allowing gays to serve openly.

President Clinton had originally pledged to allow homosexuals to serve openly, but backed away from the plan after a near revolt by Gen. Colin L. Powell and other members of the Joint Chiefs early in his presidency. A result was "the don't ask, don't tell" policy, which Mr. Bradley and Mr. Gore say is a failure.

Retired members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military experts warned tonight that subjecting future members to a litmus test would hurt the armed services.

"Military officers certainly execute the orders of the president, but a litmus test beforehand would place an officer in an untenable position saying, 'Do you believe what I believe?'" said Gen. Carl E. Mundy, a retired commandant of the Marine Corps.

"I think it would be unworkable."

"An officer's judgment has to be tempered by his judgment of what's best

for the armed forces, not for a political agenda," said General Mundy, who opposes allowing homosexuals to serve openly.

The candidates' comments tonight about homosexuals in the military underscored the degree to which Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley are intent on courting the liberal base of their party. In fact, earlier in the debate, neither candidate objected to being described as a liberal ? a label that Democrats, including Bill Clinton, have eschewed in recent years.

"Liberal, progressive, whatever," Mr. Bradley said. "I'll accept whatever label you want because that's who I am."

Mr. Gore, who earlier in the day was endorsed by Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, said, "I really don't care what kind of label people apply to those positions and views." . . . [other topics]

The Record, January 6, 2000

150 River Street, Hackensack, NJ, 07602

(Fax 201-646-4135 ) (E-MAIL: LettersToTheEditor@bergen.com )

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

. . . ON SIGN OF SUPPORT

A Tuesday editorial said we can all benefit from the message of tolerance

for gays on two billboards along Route 80 and Route 17. Reader response:

I think it's a wonderful idea. I wish I had \$20,000. I would keep them

up for another month, at least.

? Ann Mary Allen, Maywood

Thank you so much for putting this on the editorial page. I am the mother of a gay son who, unfortunately, we lost several years ago. David is

deceased but not forgotten by his family and friends. He was loved very dearly, and he was a force for good. He contributed to the world and the people in it.

And I think that's true of most gay people. Many people don't realize that many other people around them are gay.

? Frances Camacho, Paterson

Question? If homosexuality is all around us, normal, and no big deal, then why the need for two huge billboards?

? Barry Scharch, Bogota

How can anyone of a normal mind be pro-lesbian or pro-gay? Have you ever

heard of AIDS?

?Joseph Bonazzo, Westwood

[The Record also included the fine guest editorial by the two men from the Rand Corporation who conducted the Pentagon study on gays in the military. We sent this editorial from the Los Angeles Times in Articles 1.3.004.]

ASSOCIATED PRESS, January 6, 2000

Activists take aim at Christian college's stance on homosexuality

EUGENE, Ore. (AP) -- Some counselors and gay-rights activists are taking aim at a new master's program in school counseling at Northwest Christian College, saying the college's stance on homosexuality makes it ill-suited to teach students who seek counseling jobs in public schools.

The state Teacher Standards and Practices Commission could decide this week whether to grant licensing to the two-year program, which began this week with 18 students.

NCC, a private school next to the University of Oregon campus, asks students to support a code of conduct that lists homosexual behavior as unacceptable.

Two years ago, a Christian lesbian was denied admission to the college after refusing to sign the code.

Gary LeClair, a Eugene gynecologist who holds a master's degree in marriage and family therapy from NCC, said it's naive to expect students required to abide by such a code to be sensitive to the needs of gay youths.

"Some student could think, 'I'm gay what do I do?', and the first person they encounter is a school counselor," LeClair said. "Such a person really needs to be as values-free as possible."

But NCC President James Womack said NCC is one of many private colleges that hold students to a code of conduct while also teaching a range of professional disciplines. "We're mainstream on this," he said.

Many religious institutions have struggled with the issue of gay rights.

NCC's turn came in 1998 when a Eugene lesbian, Kharma Amos, complained that she was denied admission to the college, which is affiliated with Disciples of Christ Christian Church.

The dispute threatened but did not derail the college's effort to win accreditation for its graduate program in marriage and family therapy.

The college last year, however, dropped its marriage and family therapy program, citing declining enrollment. LeClair contends that NCC dropped the program which resurfaced with the same faculty at the UO this fall after the college asked graduate students to sign the code.

Womack said the marriage and family therapy program was losing enrollment before any gay-related controversies surfaced. "It was a factor that simply made the inevitable happen a little sooner," he said.

The new school counseling program has already been accredited by a regional accrediting association. While licensure by the state is not legally required, "there's no market for your graduates if they're not licensed," said David Myton, executive director of the state Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

NCC officials and LeClair made arguments for and against licensing to a commission subcommittee last month. Meredith Brodsky, the subcommittee's chairwoman, said she's received about 15 e-mails from counselors, gay-right activists and others around the state expressing concern that NCC's program has a bias "that could be harmful to children."

Myton said teachers and counselors in Oregon are already required to be

knowledgeable about civil rights law and to display behavior that respects each individual.

He said NCC officials have been asked to provide additional information on course outlines and the final evaluation of students. Based on the information he has so far, Myton said he expects to recommend approval of NCC's program.

Regarding LeClair's testimony, "It would be an issue if someone said the institution had discriminated against him or her, but (LeClair) did not do that. Anything else he might report would essentially be hearsay."

Womack said the college has never received a complaint from a current or former student alleging discrimination based on sexual orientation. The college draws an important distinction between homosexuality and homosexual behavior, he said.

"I'd feel terrible if people felt that gay and lesbian students at our college were being harassed, because they're not," he said. "To characterize us as intentionally training bigots is not a fair characterization at all."

ASSOCIATED PRESS, January 6, 2000

Senator says marriage would be better than domestic partnership

MONTPELIER, Vt. (AP) A key Senate leader called for a serious debate on gay marriage itself, not just the domestic partnership alternative that many of his colleagues prefer.

Sen. Jeb Spaulding, a Washington County Democrat and chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee, is the most prominent Senate leader to date to advocate amending marriage statutes so gays and lesbians could marry.

"I realize that this is a highly charged and politically volatile issue, but I can't in good conscience just go with the flow and keep quiet on such a basic human fairness issue," Spaulding said in a letter to each of his 179 colleagues.

In an interview, Spaulding said Wednesday he wanted to challenge the idea that a consensus has developed against gay marriage and for creating a domestic partnership arrangement that would provide gay and lesbian couples all of the benefits of marriage without actually calling it that.

He argued that no such consensus had developed and it was unfair to suggest that it had.

"I'm hoping the Judiciary Committee in the House will take a more open approach," he said.

A number of political leaders, most prominently Gov. Howard Dean, quickly moved after the Supreme Court ruled on gay marriage to urge domestic partnership, which they and many others believe is a step just shy of marriage itself.

The court ruled on Dec. 20 that gays and lesbians were unconstitutionally being denied the benefits that flow to heterosexual couples because they

are  
able to marry.

The justices said the Legislature must change law to provide those benefits, although it did not say how. It suggested that marriage statutes could be amended to provide for gay and lesbian unions, or some kind of domestic partnership alternative could be developed.

Opening up marriage to gays and lesbians is seen as a politically dangerous step to take by many politicians and many have been happy to embrace a concept that they believe will accomplish the same thing without moving farther than they think the public is willing to go.

"My constituents have trouble accepting gay marriage. However, some of them accept civil rights," and would support domestic partnership, said Rep.

Michael Flaherty, D-South Burlington, an unofficial leader of a key swing group of House moderates.

"We can't get it through the building," Rep. Michael Vinton, D-Colchester, another of the moderates, said of gay marriage.

Sen. Richard Sears, D-Bennington and chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said he was leaning toward domestic partnership because he was concerned that the Legislature remain sensitive to the potentially big divisions that could develop.

"In some ways, it's a vote of conscience and life experience," Sears said. "One thing that I really want to avoid is tearing apart the state."

Although there is a lot of talk around the Statehouse about a domestic partnership system, few people know precisely what that would mean. Rep. George Schiavone, R-Shelburne, introduced a bill last year that would define marriage as a union between a man and woman only. He is adamantly opposed to gay marriage but might be willing to consider domestic partnership, depending on what it is.

"I don't think there can be (a consensus) until people see what that means," Schiavone said. "I'm in that group that says, 'Hey, I want to see what partnership is.'"

Spaulding said the fact that no one can say with certainty what domestic partnership is should be an argument for simply legalizing gay marriage.

"It seems ludicrous to me to have the exact same listing of rights and benefits for same sex and heterosexual couples, but have different names for the commitment process," he wrote to his colleagues. "I predict that a strictly semantic differentiation will please no one in the end and be extremely unwieldy as well."

THE OKLAHOMAN, January 6, 2000

P. O. Box 25125, Oklahoma City, OK, 73125 (Fax 405-475-3971 ) (E-MAIL: [yourviews@oklahoman.com](mailto:yourviews@oklahoman.com) )  
( <http://www.oklahoman.com/> )

Caption causes outcry in Owasso

Owasso police officers are the latest to be embarrassed by the unauthorized use of photographs.

Photographs of six officers clad only in boots, pumpkin print boxer shorts, caps and weapon belts standing in front of a squad car were mailed

to  
Tulsa-area media outlets and to city council members this week.

On the photo is a caption that reads: "Gay Officers Coalition: We're  
not  
marching in a parade, we're escorting it."

The photograph was taken as a gag to be given as a door prize for the  
best costume at the city's annual Halloween party. Officers were upset that  
the caption was added.

Interim City Manager Tim Rooney said the biggest problem with the  
picture  
is not so much the way the officers are dressed, but rather the "offensive  
wording."

He said that the city is "moving swiftly" to investigate any misuse of  
city property or whether the men should be disciplined for "conduct  
unbecoming a police officer" for posing for the photo taken while the men  
were off duty.

"We encourage our employees in various departments to have fun with  
their  
work within reason," Rooney said, "but the words added to the picture and  
distributed is offensive."

Rooney said that the photo reportedly mailed to media was accompanied  
by  
an unsigned letter with "malicious" content.

ASSOCIATED PRESS, January 6, 2000

King says gay rights issue needs voter, not lawmaker, approval

By Associated Press

AUGUSTA, Maine (AP) Lawmakers should place the gay rights law issue on  
the ballot for voters to decide in November rather than trying to pass a  
gay  
rights law themselves, according to Gov. Angus King.

King supports gay rights but criticized suggestions that lawmakers drop  
the referendum requirement and pass the amendment that would bar  
discrimination against homosexuals. Some gay rights supporters hinted that  
they may try to get the bill passed in the Legislature after they learned  
Tuesday that the Roman Catholic Diocese of Portland supports the bill.

The bill calls for a binding referendum to decide the issue.

King stopped short of promising to veto a gay rights bill without a  
referendum clause, but said it would be a mistake for lawmakers to pass one  
without voter approval.

King said having the Legislature overturn a "people's veto" would  
give  
gay rights opponents political ammunition to argue that lawmakers ignore  
the  
will of the people.

Residents voted 51 percent to 49 percent to overturn a gay rights law  
in  
1998. The current bill differs from the original law and includes  
exemptions  
for religious entities not engaged in contracts with the state.

King also noted that opponents of gay rights have promised to launch  
another "people's veto" referendum if the Legislature and the governor  
pass

a gay-rights law on their own, as they did in 1997.

"I want it to stick," and the best way to do that is to send the law to voters, King said.

King said he is optimistic voters will approve the gay rights amendment in part because he expects more people to cast votes in the 2000 presidential election. Only about 30 percent of Mainers voted in the special "people's veto" election.

Some supporters of gay rights acknowledged that it may be best to stick with the referendum plan.

"I think he's being practical," said Sen. Joel Abromson, R-Portland, the sponsor of the gay-rights bill.

Another supporter, Rep. Richard Thompson, D-Naples, seconded King's sentiments.

"If it's done that way, there's no second guessing the Legislature or the end result," he said.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 09:20:00.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.6.00

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

TEXT:

1. ATLANTA CONSTITUTION Letter: Gay marriage would be costly for all us heterosexuals
2. DES MOINES REGISTER Two letters blast Gary Bauer, including one from Alan Light
3. LAS VEGAS SUN Petition to ban same-sex marriages cheered (by one guy, anyway)
4. NEW YORK TIMES Excerpts about military policy from last night's Gore/Bradley debate in New Hampshire
5. MELBOURNE HERALD SUN (Australia) Three letters support Queen's decision to not let gays dance at her party (one resents that "trads" ? traditional couples ? have to reproduce not only themselves but us!)

Atlanta Constitution, January 4, 2000  
72 Marietta Street NW, Atlanta, GA, 30303  
(Fax 404-526-5686 or 526-5611 ) (E-MAIL: constitution@ajc.com )  
Letter: Gay marriage would be costly for us all

I'd like to commend Tom Teepen for his honesty regarding the primary agenda behind the push for gay marriage ("Same-sex partners deserve equal status," Viewpoints, Dec. 28). It's all about money and the benefits that are accorded to married couples.

That said, I am not in favor of my company offering health benefits to homosexual couples. Doing so would drive up the cost of benefits for my family. What if a gay man marries another with HIV? Under pre-existing conditions laws, my company would have to cover him.

I know it is politically incorrect to say these things. However, since gay advocates are quick to point out that AIDS is still a big problem in their community, I believe it is a valid point. Don't think for a second that insurance companies won't take this into account.

What people do in the privacy of their bedroom is their own business. It's when they start getting into my pocket that I get upset. This idea is a

Pandora's Box. Think about the potential consequences before giving privileges to people who define themselves as a protected class based on how they have sex and who they have it with.

? DAVID FLETCHER

Fletcher, of Charlotte, N.C., works in sales management.

DES MOINES REGISTER, January 6, 2000

Box 957, Des Moines, Ia., 50304  
(Fax 515-286-2511 ) (E-MAIL: letters@news.dmreg.com )  
THE REGISTER'S READERS SAY  
THOUGHTLESS TO LINK GAYS, TERRORISTS

On Dec. 19, at a border crossing in Vermont, federal authorities arrested a woman who they say is linked to a terrorist group in Europe and Algeria ("Woman Has Links With Terrorists," Dec. 24 Register).

The next day, in a controversial decision, the Vermont Supreme Court ruled that the state must grant the same protections to gay couples as it does to married heterosexual couples.

Gary Bauer, a little-known and underfinanced Republican presidential candidate, linked the two by saying, "I think what the Vermont Supreme Court did last week was worse than terrorism."

Worse than terrorism? If Bauer truly believes that's worse than terrorism, perhaps he should travel to Oklahoma City and talk to the families of the 169 people murdered in the bombing of the federal building. It might do wonders for his perspective.

How thoughtless of him to link the perpetrators of lawlessness to people who are trying for the benefits of lawfulness.  
? Alan L. Light, 2 Lake Pointe Rd., N.E., Iowa City, Iowa 52240-9105  
[LightAlan@aol.com]

Republican presidential candidate Gary Bauer said he could point to no better example of the decline of "family values" in the United States than a recent court decision in Vermont affirming same-sex marriage. If that is the best example he can find, he is looking in the wrong places.

Some of the finest people I know, and some of the finest parents I know, live in stable, committed, loving same-sex relationships and many of the most painfully abusive, dysfunctional families I have known have been textbook households with a male father and a female mother doggedly maintaining a nominally superficially Christian marriage.

There are no more guarantees that a same-sex relationship will be an unsound backdrop for raising children than there are guarantees that a mixed-sex relationship will be sound. The values that need to be reinforced at all levels of society today are the fundamentals of personal honesty, integrity, respect and ? yes ? love for our fellow man, woman and child. The values that Jesus sought to drive home time and again govern what lies at the heart of interpersonal relationships, not the outward form of family organizations.

When those fundamental family values receive the priority they deserve, Bauer's hair-splitting about the gender makeup of family units will fade to its rightful degree of insignificance.

? Edwin L. Clopton, 519 N. Governor St., Iowa City, Iowa 52245-3034

Las Vegas Sun, January 5, 2000  
Box 4275, Las Vegas, NV, 89107  
(Fax 702-383-7264 ) (E-MAIL: [letters@lasvegassun.com](mailto:letters@lasvegassun.com) )  
( <http://www.lasvegassun.com/> )

To leave a comment for the Where You Stand column call ( 702 ) 259-4044

Petition to ban same-sex marriages cheered

By Ed Koch, LAS VEGAS SUN <[koch@lasvegassun.com](mailto:koch@lasvegassun.com)>

Hours after an initiative petition drive was launched Tuesday to make gay marriage unconstitutional in Nevada, debate on the issue became loud and passionate.

A crowd of about 200 people, including ministers and other local church representatives, gathered in front of the Clark County Courthouse Tuesday to cheer the introduction of the petition.

Richard Ziser, chairman of the Coalition for the Protection of Marriage in Nevada, who earlier in the day filed the petition in Carson City, drew applause from the friendly crowd when he said the traditional concept of marriage "needs to be protected."

Later, during a taping of Tuesday's broadcast of "POV Vegas," the Las Vegas Sun's daily news talk show on Cox Cable channels 1 and 39, he faced opposition from a representative of the gay community, a former state senator and an American Civil Liberties Union attorney.

Afterward, on a KXNT 840-AM radio talk show hosted by Alan Stock, a vocal supporter of the constitutional ban, Ziser was back on friendlier turf. However, he faced opposition from fellow guest Lee Plotkin, political columnist for the Las Vegas Bugle gay publication.

Plotkin noted that the arguments against gay marriages are strikingly similar to those that kept interracial heterosexual marriages illegal in America until 1967, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled such laws unconstitutional.

The petition needs the verified signatures of 44,009 registered voters by June 20 to get on the November ballot. It must include 10 percent of the registered voters in 13 of the state's 17 counties. If the measure goes to the voters and passes, it must be approved a second time in 2002 by the voters to become a part of the Constitution.

Nevada law already requires a marriage be between a man and a woman, but Ziser wants to include the ban in the state Constitution. This, he and his supporters say, is needed so that Nevada won't have to recognize same-sex marriages if other states legalize them.

The concern is that without constitutional protection, Nevada, under the Full Faith and Credit Act ? a law that requires states to recognize each other's laws ? would have to recognize gay marriages that occurred in states that approve such unions.

During his speech before the courthouse crowd, Ziser said the issue is preserving the traditional marriage of men and women.

"Traditional marriages are the basic building block of society," he said.

"We do not need a judge in other states telling us what our laws should be," Ziser said. A recent court ruling in Vermont recognized a gay marriage.

Ziser said measures similar to the one being proposed have been passed in 31 states.

On "POV Vegas," Ziser had to defend his position before three other guests who did not agree with his point of view ? Vincent Frey, director of the Las Vegas Gay and Lesbian Community Center, former State Senator and current high school teacher Lori Lipman Brown and ACLU attorney Gary Peck.

"I feel this is an attack on people in long, committed relationships," Frey said. "I don't think the government should define what marriage is."

"Society has the right to protect its interests," Ziser responded, noting that his group views homosexual relationships as "not proper."

Outside the studio, Frey noted that despite the current law, some Nevada churches and synagogues perform "holy unions" for people of the same sex.

Brown, a heterosexual married woman who in 1993 as a state lawmaker got the longstanding law against sodomy off the books, said under such a constitutional change, a gay married couple from a state that recognized same-sex marriages could face harsh consequences traveling through Nevada.

For example, she said, a married gay couple from another state could get into an auto accident in Las Vegas and one of them who escaped injury would not be allowed to visit his dying partner, let alone make decisions like removal of life support systems ? a right that heterosexual married couples have.

Peck said he feels the initiative is an act of a majority taking action against a minority based on religious beliefs and called the proposed constitutional change "a divisive issue intruding into people's lives."

"We believe ... it is inescapably obvious (that the measure) is part of a broader agenda," Peck said. "To deny it is to deny reality."

After the "POV Vegas" taping, Peck said he thinks that if the initiative goes to the voters, it would not pass because of the fiercely independent nature of Nevadans.

"Nevadans do not tolerate intolerance," he said. "This is about leaving people alone. This is about treating people fairly."

If gay marriages were recognized in Nevada, Ziser said in Carson City, churches may not be able to decide who they marry and schools might be required to teach that same-sex marriages are legal.

The constitutional amendment, he said, would not affect companies that provide insurance benefits for same-sex partnerships.

Excerpts from the New York Times transcript at  
<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/010600wh-dem-debate-text.html>  
of last night's New Hampshire debate between Al Gore and Bill Bradley:

[Moderator Peter] JENNINGS. Allison King [New England Cable News  
political reporter] to Mr. Bradley.

KING. Mr. Bradley, Republicans eagerly embrace the conservative  
mantle,  
yet many Democrats have rejected the liberal label which has defined the  
party for generations. You have been called the most liberal candidate in  
this race: you support full disclosure for gays in the military, universal  
health care and stricter gun control. Do you reject the notion that you  
are  
a liberal and do you believe someone who holds fundamentally liberal views  
is  
at a disadvantage running for president?

BRADLEY. No, I don't think the views that I have espoused are a  
disadvantage running for president. I believe that when it comes to gay  
rights, it's fundamental human decency. When it comes to gun control, it's  
common sense that we have a registration and licensing system for guns just  
like we have for automobiles.

I think that you have to be who you are. And in this period of  
unprecedented prosperity, it seems to me that you ought to be fixing your  
roof while the sun is shining. And that means increasing the number of  
people in America with health insurance, decreasing the number of children  
in  
poverty, healing the racial divide, helping working families.

Now, whatever you want to call that, liberal, progressive, whatever,  
I'll  
accept whatever label you want because that's who I am and that's what I'm  
presenting to the American people. I think the issue is how strong are you  
willing to hold your convictions and how clearly can you articulate those  
convictions?

JENNINGS. Mr. Gore in this campaign there have been some questions on  
occasion on who you are.

GORE. Well I support the elimination of this don't ask-don't tell  
policy. I helped to pass the toughest new gun control measures in a  
generation. I believe that we ought to have total license I.D.'s for the  
purchase of new handguns. I think we ought to ban assault weapons and  
Saturday night specials and junk guns. I also am committed to the  
principle  
of high quality affordable health care for all. And I don't  
really care what kind of label people apply to those positions and views.

I  
accept whatever they want to call that. I think that the majority of the  
people in New Hampshire, especially in the Democratic Party, but the  
majority  
of all New Hampshire, I think supports those positions.

\* \* \*

JENNINGS. I'd like to ask you both a question about a litmus if I may.  
Mr. Bradley used the phrase ["litmus test"] and you both talked about gays  
in  
the military, you both believe that gays should have the right to serve  
openly in the military. President Clinton's had great difficulty, the  
Joint

Chiefs as well as the Congress have been a principle obstacle to that particular policy. If you become president ? I'll ask you one at a time, you first Mr. Gore ? if you become president, will you nominate members of the Joint Chiefs who only support your gay policy? In other words, will it be a litmus test?

GORE. I have rejected the notion of litmus tests on the Supreme Court by saying that there are ways to find out the kind of judgment somebody has without posing specific litmus tests.

I think that it's a little different where the Joint Chiefs of Staff are concerned because you're not interfering with an independent judicial decision. As commander and chief, a president is giving orders in effect or he is the superior of the officers that are reporting to the commander and chief in the chain of command.

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.

JENNINGS. So, if I understand you correctly, you would only nominate members of the Joint Chiefs if they supported your gay support ?

GORE. I would think ? here, I think that the new policy has to be implemented in a way that accomplishes the goal and yet recognized the practical challenges that the military leadership will have to confront in making that change.

I would insist, before appointing anybody to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that that individual support my policy. And, yes I would make that a requirement.

JENNINGS. Mr. Bradley, would you sir?

BRADLEY. I consider it much shorter words, I think. And that is when you're president you are commander and chief and you issue orders and soldiers are good soldiers and they follow your orders. A consultation process takes place certainly in which you hear their view, but when you follow and order, no matter ? I'm sure that there are people in the military today who don't agree with President Clinton on 50 things. But my sense is that when you're president of the United States, military people are loyal to their commander and chief whatever the policy is that the commander and chief calls for for the country. And that's what I expect them to do if I'm president of the United States and we move toward gays in the military, which I intend to do.

(Fax: + 61-3-9292-2944 ) (E-mail: [hsletters@hwt.newsltd.com.au](mailto:hsletters@hwt.newsltd.com.au) )

Letters: Queen's gay ban born of a different era.

In reply to Sarah Scopelianos (Herald Sun, December 31), who felt the Queen was out of touch in not allowing gay servants to dance with their partners at a Christmas function.

Not all of society shares your views.

Some of us were brought up in a different way, with different values.

It

is hard to change one's background after 70 or more years. We who were were

born in the '20s were living in a world vastly different from today.

Please try to understand the Queen's point of view.

We who do not share your way are not all out of touch.

? (Mrs) J. Snell, Reservoir, Melbourne.

Sarah Scopelianos said: "The Queen is out of touch with just about anything that society has come to accept. It truly amazes me how she is still our head of state."

Sarah was referring to the Queen's directive that homosexual couples would not be allowed to dance together at her Christmas party.

As the Voteline poll showed, 83 per cent were in favour of the Queen's decision (Herald Sun, December 28).

Fortunately Sarah, people like you have not taken control of the decision-making process and the Queen still upholds moral standards in keeping with the silent majority.

? Alan Salter, Moorabbin, Melbourne.

In response to Sarah Scopelianos, let me say I have no problem with the gay and lesbian society and I don't think the Queen has either. But it would

look rather silly to see male couples and female couples ballroom dancing in

a gathering that had more heterosexual couples than gays.

To say the Queen is out of touch is quite wrong, or have we now reached a

time when gay communities look upon traditional sex communities of this world

as queers?

I know that for years gay and lesbians were frowned upon and that has all

altered and they enjoy more freedom, but they still have not been able to perfect reproduction.

So traditional sex couples are left to produce not only trades but also gays. Remember the old pregnancy saying, "It takes two to tango" ? one of each sex.

? J. Edwin, Epsom, Melbourne.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: nytdirect@NYTIMES.COM ( nytdirect@NYTIMES.COM [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 04:21:33.00

SUBJECT: FrontPage

TO: FRONTPAGE@NEWSHOST.NYTIMES.COM ( FRONTPAGE@NEWSHOST.NYTIMES.COM [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

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

TEXT:

<html>  
<head><title>The New York Times Internet Inbox</title>  
<!--

\*\*\*\*\*

This is the New York Times Direct e-mail message you requested.  
If you can read this, you're probably not using an HTML-enabled e-mail client such as Netscape Messenger or Microsoft Outlook Express, and cannot properly view this message.

There is a text version of this e-mail available that can be viewed in any e-mail client. To begin receiving the text version, please go to

<http://search.nytimes.com/partners/iib/services/info.cgi?service=iib> and change your e-mail format from Graphics to Text.

If you need other assistance, write to [help@nytimes.com](mailto:help@nytimes.com). Please do not reply to this e-mail.

\*\*\*\*\*

-->

<base href="http://www.nytimes.com" target="nyt\_iib">  
</head>  
<body bgcolor=#ffffff>

<table bgcolor=#ffffff cellpadding=20><tr><td>  
<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0 width=585>  
<tr><td align=center width=585>  
<font size=-1>  
<b>Preview other sections from today's New York Times</b><br>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/artleisure"><NOBR>Arts/Living</a></NOBR></A> |  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/business"><NOBR>Business</NOBR></A>  
|  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/national/"><NOBR>National</NOBR></A>  
|

<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/world/"><NOBR>International</NOBR></A>  
> |  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/editorial/"><NOBR>Opinion</NOBR></A>  
|  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/front/"><NOBR>Page One Plus</NOBR></A>  
> |  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/sports"><NOBR>Sports</NOBR></A> |  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/tech/">Technology</A>  
<p>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/partners/iib/services/personalsearch.html">Pers  
onal  
Search</A> |  
<A  
HREF="http://search.nytimes.com/partners/iib/services/info.cgi?service=iib">Mod  
ify  
Preferences</A>  
</font>  
</td>  
</tr>  
</table>

<br><IMG SRC="/images/rule3.gif" ALT="horiz rule" WIDTH="582" HEIGHT="3" BORDER  
="0"><br><br>  
<BODY bgcolor=ffffff vlink=#444464 link=#000066>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>  
<td align=left valign=top width=480>  
<NYT\_BANNER version="1.0" type="main">  
  
</NYT\_BANNER>  
<br clear=all>

<NYT\_TOOLBARMAP version="1.0" type="main">  
<map name="maintoolbar2">  
<area shape="rect" coords="0,0,75,16" href="/yr/mo/day/"  
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to go to the Home Page';return true">  
<area shape="rect" coords="76,0,154,16" href="/info/contents/siteindex.html"  
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to see site contents';return true">  
<area shape="rect" coords="155,0,233,16" href="/search/daily/"  
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the current site';return true">  
<area shape="rect" coords="234,0,312,16" href="/comment/"  
onMouseOver="window.status='Click for discussion in the Forums';return true">  
<area shape="rect" coords="313,0,391,16" href="/archives/"  
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to search the archives';return true">  
<area shape="rect" coords="392,0,468,16" href="/marketplace/"  
onMouseOver="window.status='Click to visit the Marketplace';return true">  
</map>  
</NYT\_TOOLBARMAP>

<NYT\_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main">  
<a href="/images/maintoolbar2.map">

</a>  
</NYT\_TOOLBAR>

<br>

<NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="top" type="main">  
    <a href="http://images.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_nx.cgi/www.nytim  
es.com/iib/yr/mo/day/front@Top">  
        </a>  
</NYT\_AD>

</td>

</table>

</NYT\_HEADER>

<blockquote><blockquote>

<NYT\_TEXT version="1.0">

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0 align=right>

<td width=6 valign=top><br></td>  
<td valign=top bgcolor="999999" width=1><br></td>  
<td width=8 valign=top><br></td>

<td valign=top align=left>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/front/scan.html"></a><br>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/front/scan.html"><FONT SIZE="-1">FRON  
T PAGE IMAGE</A></font><br>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/library/photos/index.html"><FONT SIZE="-1">PHOT  
OS</A></font><p>  
<NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="">

<!--OAS AD="Right2"--> <br>  
<font size="-2">Advertisement</font>  
</NYT\_AD><P>

<b>Today's Sections</b>

<p>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/world"><FONT SIZE="-1">INTERNATI  
ONAL</FONT></A><br>

<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/national"><FONT SIZE="-1">NATION  
AL</FONT></A><br>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/national/regional/index.ht  
ml"><FONT SIZE="-1">N.Y. Region</FONT></A><br>  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/washpol/index.html"><FONT  
SIZE="-1">Politics</FONT></A><br>

[Obituaries](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/national/#obits)

[BUSINESS](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/financial/index.html)

[TECHNOLOGY](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/tech/index.html)

[Circuits](http://www.nytimes.com/library/tech/yr/mo/circuits)

[SCIENCE](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/national/science/index.html)

[SPORTS](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/sports/index.html)

[EDITORIAL](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/editorial/index.html)

[OP-ED](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/index.html)

[LETTERS](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/letters/index.html)

[ARTS](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/arts)

[HOME](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/style)

**Sunday Sections**

[ARTS & LEISURE](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/artleisure/index.html)

[AUTOMOBILES](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/auto)

[BOOK REVIEW](http://www.nytimes.com/books/yr/mo/day/home/contents.html)

[MAGAZINE](http://www.nytimes.com/library/magazine/home/index.html)

[TRAVEL](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/travel/index.html)

[REAL ESTATE](http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/realestate/index.html)

[WEEK IN REVIEW](http://www.nytimes.com/library/review/index.html)

<!--AOL COBRANDING-->

<!--OAS AD="Left3"-->

</td>

</table>

<!--ELEMENT DATE-->

<FONT SIZE="-1"><B>

<NYT\_DATE version="1.0" format="Day, Month DD, YYYY">Thursday, January 6, 2000<

/NYT\_DATE>

</B></FONT>

<P>

<font size=-1 color="#ab0000"><b>ON THE FRONT PAGE</b></font>

<p>

<NYT\_LIST>

<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>

<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/world/europe/010600russia-chechnya.html"><b>Chechen Rebels Lash Back at Russians in Grozny</b></a></font><br>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE>

<font size="-1">By MICHAEL R. GORDON </font><br>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<NYT\_SUMMARY>

Chechen fighters, under constant bombardment in their capital and ringed by Russian forces, sought to break out, forcing furious firefights on the outskirts of the city.

</NYT\_SUMMARY>

</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<p>

<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>

<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/yr/mo/day/news/national/cuban-boy.html"><b>Washington Decides to Send Boy Back to Father in Cuba</b></a></font><br>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE>

<font size="-1">By NEIL A. LEWIS</font><br>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<NYT\_SUMMARY>

The Clinton administration, hoping to end a diplomatic and political battle over the fate of Elian Gonzalez, said the 6-year-old boy should be sent back to Cuba to live with his father.

</NYT\_SUMMARY>

</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<p>

<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>

<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/tech/00/01/biztech/articles/06net.html"><b>'Tokyo Joe' Charged With Fraud</b></a></font><br>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE>

<font size="-1">By GRETCHEN MORGENSON </font><br>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<NYT\_SUMMARY>

The S.E.C. charged one of the Internet's best-known stock pickers -- known as Tokyo Joe -- with fraud, contending that he enriched himself at his customers' expense.

</NYT\_SUMMARY>

</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<p>

<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>

<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/politics/camp/010600wh-dem.html"><b>Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military</b></a></font><br>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE>

<font size="-1">By RICHARD L. BERKE</font><br>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<NYT\_SUMMARY>

Al Gore and Bill Bradley said that if they were elected president they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.

</NYT\_SUMMARY>

</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<p>

<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>

<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/politics/camp/010600wh-gop-mccain.html"><b>McCain Urged F.C.C. Action on Issue Involving Supporter</b></a></font><br>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE>

<font size="-1">By STEPHEN LABATON </font><br>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<NYT\_SUMMARY>

Senator John McCain, who has made fixing the corrosive influence of money in politics the cornerstone of his presidential

campaign, twice demanded that a regulatory agency take action that ultimately benefited a major contributor.

</NYT\_SUMMARY>

</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<p>

</NYT\_LIST>

<br>

<hr size=1>

<font size=-1 color="#ab0000"><b><a name=quote>ALSO IN TODAY'S TIMES</a></b></font>

<p>

<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>

<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/world/asia/010600china-lawyers.html"><b>In China's Legal Evolution, the Lawyers Are Handcuffed</b></a></font><br>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE>

<font size="-1">By ELISABETH ROSENTHAL </font><br>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<NYT\_SUMMARY>

Over the past decade, China has tried to overhaul its legal system, training thousands of new lawyers and passing laws that greatly expand their role in criminal cases.

</NYT\_SUMMARY>

</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<p>

<!-- ALSO IN TODAY'S TIMES -->

<!-- ALSO IN TODAY'S TIMES -->

<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>

<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/politics/010600congress-agenda.html"><b>Dueling Agendas Herald Fight for Control of Congress</b></a></font><br>

</NYT\_HEADLINE>

<NYT\_BYLINE>

<font size="-1">By ERIC SCHMITT </font><br>

</NYT\_BYLINE>

<NYT\_SUMMARY>

Democrats and Republicans sketched out competing legislative visions that will dominate the Congressional calendar and campaigns this election year.

</NYT\_SUMMARY>

</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<p>

<!-- ALSO IN TODAY'S TIMES -->  
<!-- ALSO IN TODAY'S TIMES -->  
<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>  
<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/national/regional/010600ny-pataki-edu.html"><b>Pataki Asks for Teacher Incentives</b></a></font><br>  
</NYT\_HEADLINE>  
<NYT\_BYLINE>  
<font size="-1">By RAYMOND HERNANDEZ</font><br>  
</NYT\_BYLINE>  
<NYT\_SUMMARY>  
New York Gov. George Pataki proposed a series of initiatives intended to strengthen the state's educational system, including tuition subsidies for college students who pledge to teach in public schools.  
</NYT\_SUMMARY>  
</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>  
<p>  
<!-- ALSO IN TODAY'S TIMES -->  
<!-- ALSO IN TODAY'S TIMES -->  
<NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>

<NYT\_HEADLINE>  
<FONT SIZE="+1 face="times"><a href="/library/national/science/health/010600hth-fda-supplements.html"><b>Rule on Ads for Diet Supplements Is Revised</b></a></font><br>  
</NYT\_HEADLINE>  
<NYT\_BYLINE>  
<font size="-1">By SHERYL GAY STOLBERG</font><br>  
</NYT\_BYLINE>  
<NYT\_SUMMARY>  
The makers of vitamins, herbs and dietary supplements may market products for natural conditions like morning sickness without proving they are safe or effective, the Food and Drug Administration announced.  
</NYT\_SUMMARY>  
</NYT\_INDEX\_ITEM>  
<p>

<a href="/yr/mo/day/front/corrections.html"><font size="+1><b>Corrections</b></font></a>  
<p>

<table border=1 cellpadding=6 cellspacing=0 width=430>

<td align=left>  
<font size=-1 color="#ab0000"><b>QUOTATION OF THE DAY</b></font>  
<br>



This little boy, who has been through so much, belongs with his father.

  
<br>

<a href="/yr/mo/day/news/national/cuban-boy.html">DORIS MEISSNER</a>, commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, on Elian Gonzalez.

</td>

</table>

</NYT\_TEXT>

<NYT\_FOOTER version="1.0" type="main">

</BLOCKQUOTE></BLOCKQUOTE>

<BR>

<table border=0 cellpadding=0 cellspacing=0>

<td align=left valign=top width=60><br></td>

<td align=left valign=top width=468>

<NYT\_AD version="1.0" location="bottom" type="main">

<!--OAS AD="Bottom"-->

</NYT\_AD>

<P>

<NYT\_TOOLBAR version="1.0" type="main" location="bottom">

<center><font size=2>

<A HREF="/"><B>Home</B></A> |

<A HREF="/info/contents/siteindex.html"><B>Site Index</B></A> |

<A HREF="/search/daily/"><B>Site Search</B></A> |

<A HREF="/comment/"><B>Forums</B></A> |

<A HREF="/archives/"><B>Archives</B></A> |

<A HREF="/marketplace/"><B>Marketplace</B></A>

<P>

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/late/">Quick News</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/front/">Page One Plus</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/world/">International</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/national/">National/N.Y.</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/business/">Business</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/tech/">Technology</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/science/">Science</A> |

<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/sports/">Sports</A> |

<A HREF="/weather/">Weather</A> |  
<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/editorial/">Editorial</A> |  
<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/oped/">Op-Ed</A> |  
<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/artleisure/">Arts</A> |  
<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/auto/">Automobiles</A> |  
<A HREF="/books/yr/mo/day/home/">Books</A> |  
<A HREF="/diversions/">Diversions</A> |  
<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/jobmarket/">Job Market</A> |  
<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/realestate/">Real Estate</A> |  
<A HREF="/yr/mo/day/travel/">Travel</A>  
<P>  
<A HREF="/subscribe/help/">Help/Feedback</A> |  
<A HREF="/classified/">Classifieds</A> |  
<A HREF="/info/contents/services.html">Services</A> |  
<A HREF="http://www.nytimes.com">New York Times</A>  
</center></font>  
</NYT\_TOOLBAR>

<p>  
<center>  
<font size="2" face="times"><a  
href="http://search.nytimes.com/partners/iib/services/info.cgi?service=iib">Get  
this page  
every day by E-mail with The New York Times Direct</a><p>  
</center>

<NYT\_COPYRIGHT version="1.0" type="index">  
<center>  
<font size=2><B>  
<a href="http://www.nytimes.com/info/help/copyright.html">Copyright 2000 The New  
York Times Company</a>  
</B></font>  
</center>  
</NYT\_COPYRIGHT>

</td>

</table>

</NYT\_FOOTER>

</td></tr></table>

</body>

</HTML>

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 22:19:01.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.6.00.5

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

TEXT:

1. ASSOCIATED PRESS Man charged with threatening Boston mayor and two other officials over city's closing of a gay health club
2. WASHINGTON TIMES Hysterical (in both senses of the word) quotes about how gays are trying to either take over or neutralize religion
3. VALLEY TIMES (CA) Letter: Gay unions won't hurt straights
4. WASHINGTON TIMES Letter from Pearl Harbor veteran: 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' has a long, successful history
5. DETROIT FREE PRESS Brilliant op-ed by 16-year-old Julia Travis: Let people serve and protect, whether they're gay or not

Associated Press, January 6, 2000

Man charged with threatening mayor and two other officials

A Swansea man upset about the city closing a gay health club has been accused of making death threats over the Internet to Boston Mayor Thomas Menino and two other city officials, prosecutors said.

James Caron, 37, faces three misdemeanor counts of making death threats.

Each count carries a maximum six-month sentence.

Investigators searched Caron's home and found no weapons or other evidence that he intended to carry out the threat. He has no history of violence, said James Borghesani, a spokesman for the Suffolk County district attorney's office.

"They determined he presents no physical threat to the mayor or anyone else," Borghesani said.

Prosecutors say Caron posted a threatening message on the Web site gayuniverse.com to protest the October closing of The Safari Club, a gay health club in the city's South End neighborhood.

City health inspectors closed the club after it was cited for a number of health and license violations.

Prosecutors said the messages threatened Menino, Inspectional Services Commissioner Kevin Joyce, and Michael Kelly, gay/lesbian community liaison and South End neighborhood coordinator.

Caron was not arrested, but was scheduled to be arraigned in Boston Municipal Court on Jan. 26.

Caron did not immediately return a message left at his home Thursday afternoon.

Washington Times, January 6, 2000  
3600 New York Avenue NE, Washington, DC, 20002  
(Fax 202-269-3419 ) (E-MAIL: letter@twtdmail.com )  
( <http://www.washtimes.com/> )  
MOBILIZING RANKS

"Gays are increasingly turning to religious organizations to press their views with religious leaders and to mobilize their ranks on political matters.

...  
"After years of clashes with the Religious Right, major gay-rights groups are promoting the gay faithful. For example, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force in the past year helped organize the National Religious Leadership Roundtable . . . [which] aims to spread the views of pro-gay religious groups to their churches and to political leaders. . . .

"It's an attempt to fool the secular world into thinking that Christianity is divided on this subject, when in fact there is a 2,000-year track record here which cannot be contravened by fringe groups,' says Robert H. Knight, the cultural studies director at the Family Research Council. .

. Knight said he has noticed a definite uptick in the efforts by gay-rights groups to challenge religious denominations. 'Homosexual activists realize that the greatest impediment to their success is a vital, active church resistance. [Gay religious activism is] entirely tactical. I don't believe it's sincere in any fashion,' Knight added."  
? Shawn Zeller, writing on "Finding Their Religion," in the Jan. 1 issue of National Journal

WASHINGTON TIMES, January 5, 2000

Letter: 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' has a long, successful history

TV news, talk shows and newspapers have devoted many words to discussing gays in the military and the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

As a young second lieutenant fighter pilot stationed at Wheeler Field, Oahu, I watched bombs fall on U.S. territory the morning of Dec. 7, 1941. For the better part of three years following that eventful day, I island-hopped across the Pacific, firing shots in anger at the bad guys. This was followed by more than 20 years as a career military officer.

During this service, which spanned periods of war and peace, homosexuality was never an issue. It was neither in evidence nor an item of discussion. Since homosexuals have served in the military without vocal recognition, probably since the Revolutionary War, it is suggested that a "don't ask, don't tell" policy has been practiced successfully for a long, long time. Now our fearless leader and his "stand by your man" mate, Hillary Rodham Clinton, have determined that it has failed. If that's true, the

when  
and why it failed can be traced to two words ? political correctness.  
The advent of this culture has created many significant problems that  
are  
debilitating to our nation's well-being. This includes women in combat,  
but  
that is another dicey subject.  
? HARRY M. THOMPSON, Hilton Head, S.C., U0032592-010500

VALLEY TIMES, January 6, 1900 [that's what it says!]  
P. O. Box 607, Pleasanton, CA, 94566  
(Fax 510-847-2177 )  
(Online Mailer: [http://www.hotcoco.com/contact\\_us/letters.htm](http://www.hotcoco.com/contact_us/letters.htm) )  
Letter: Gay unions won't hurt straights  
Mary Arnold's letter of Jan. 3 ("Intolerant Column") shows a  
misunderstanding of the issue. In every denomination Roman Catholic,  
Protestant, and Jewish there are clergy who support equality for gay  
people.  
In the Roman Catholic church, there is Dignity. In my own denomination,  
the  
Episcopal Church, there are "out" gay priests, at least one "out" gay  
bishop  
and priests who perform holy union ceremonies. The "Christian viewpoint"  
includes many Christians who support gay people's right to marry.

Gays take nothing away from straights if gay unions are recognized as  
marriages. Heterosexual marriage will remain exactly what it has always  
been, and straight people who feel it is the only valid form of marriage  
can  
participate in it exactly as they always have.

The issue in Vermont, and on the ballot here in California, has nothing  
to do with religion. The only issue voters should consider is whether  
there  
is any compelling reason why the state should deny gays legal equality in  
this area. There is no legal or social requirement for marriage, except a  
difference in gender, which gay couples cannot meet; there is no social  
benefit of marriage which gay unions cannot provide. Studies have even  
shown  
that children raised in gay unions turn out just as well, in general, as  
those raised in straight marriages.

There is no rational reason to deny gay couples legal marriage. There  
are only fear, ignorance and prejudice.  
? Karen Winter, Livermore

DETROIT FREE PRESS, January 5, 2000  
321 W. Lafayette Blvd., Detroit, MI, 48231  
(Fax 313-222-6774 ) (E-MAIL: [editpg@freepress.com](mailto:editpg@freepress.com) )  
( <http://www.freep.com/> )

OTHER VOICES, YOUNG VOICES

Let people serve and protect, whether they're gay or not  
JULIA TRAVIS

"We live with you, care for you, help you, protect you, teach you, love  
you and need you. All we ask is that you let us."

These words, describing homosexuals, were spoken by Margarethe Cammermeyer, the highest ranked U.S. military officer ever to be discharged for homosexuality.

Unfortunately, descriptions like these are constantly necessary to remind

people that gays and lesbians are not a threat to society, but rather human beings who live, love and perhaps even serve in the military.

The U.S. armed forces does not embrace this group of people, however. Enacted in 1982, Army Regulation 135-175 says, "If a member states that he or

she is a homosexual, then that member will be removed from the military."

This is enforced even if no determination has been made that a person's homosexuality adversely affects his or her job performance.

So how is it that gays and lesbians pose a problem to the functioning of

the U.S. military? The Department of Defense's logic includes statements that describe homosexuals' mere presence in the military environment as "seriously impairing the accomplishment of the military mission." Yet they offer no specifics about how gays and lesbians are so threatening.

In fact, under the amended policy of "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue," it is OK to be gay or lesbian, as long as no one else knows about it. The military branches seem to think that a homosexual who is scared into

keeping his or her identity secret is a better service member than one who mentions his or her sexual preference.

As for the military's rule, "don't pursue" violations have risen from 235

in 1997 to 350 in 1998. "Don't ask" violations have risen 30 percent in 1998, and "don't tell" violations have remained constant in 1998. It is evident from these statistics that the current policy is ineffective.

The rule is also expensive. The U.S. General Accounting Office reported

that "in fiscal year 1990, recruiting and initial training costs associated with the replacement of personnel discharged for homosexuality were estimated

to be \$28,226 for each enlisted trooper and \$120,772 for each officer."

With military enlistment at their current low level, it seems frivolous to spend so much money on dismissing service members who are otherwise acceptable, and often exemplary.

It has been the claim of the U.S. armed forces that gays pose a threat to

various components of their operation. However, their concerns apply to heterosexuals as well. There is equal possibility that disruptive sexual behavior could occur between a man and a woman as between a same-gender couple.

So long as sexual acts are not interfering with a service member's duties, officials should have no right to expel a homosexual from the military because of his or her sexual preference.

The current policy is blind to the rights of homosexuals and the needs of

the military today. It forces an atmosphere of fear, fosters intolerance and

costs the United States money and good service members.

The U.S. armed forces should encourage tolerance and equality, and get

rid of their rules that discriminate against gays and lesbians.

? JULIA TRAVIS of Livonia is 16. Write to her in care of the Free  
Press  
Editorial Page, 600 W. Fort St., Detroit, MI 48226.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: The New York Times Direct <nytdirect@NYTIMES.COM> ( The New York Times Direct  
<nytdirect@NYTIMES.COM> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 04:32:29.00

SUBJECT: New York Times Front Page Headlines

TO: TXT\_FRONTPAGE@NEWSHOST.NYTIMES.COM ( TXT\_FRONTPAGE@NEWSHOST.NYTIMES.COM [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Good morning.

Here are summaries of today's top news from the front page  
of The New York Times.

-----

#### Chechen Rebels Lash Back at Russians in Grozny

Chechen fighters, under constant bombardment in their capital and ringed by Russian forces, sought to break out, forcing furious firefights on the outskirts of the city.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/europe/010600russia-chechnya.html>

-----

#### Washington Decides to Send Boy Back to Father in Cuba

The Clinton administration, hoping to end a diplomatic and political battle over the fate of Elian Gonzalez, said the 6-year-old boy should be sent back to Cuba to live with his father.

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/news/national/cuban-boy.html>

-----

#### 'Tokyo Joe' Charged With Fraud

The S.E.C. charged one of the Internet's best-known stock pickers -- known as Tokyo Joe -- with fraud, contending that he enriched himself at his customers' expense.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/tech/00/01/biztech/articles/06net.html>

-----

#### Both Democrats Endorse Gays in the Military

Al Gore and Bill Bradley said that if they were elected president they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/010600wh-dem.html>

-----

#### McCain Urged F.C.C. Action on Issue Involving Supporter

Senator John McCain, who has made fixing the corrosive influence of money in politics the cornerstone of his presidential campaign, twice demanded that a regulatory agency take action that ultimately benefited a major contributor.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/010600wh-gop-mccain.html>

-----

#### In China's Legal Evolution, the Lawyers Are Handcuffed

Over the past decade, China has tried to overhaul its legal system, training thousands of new lawyers and passing laws that greatly expand their role in criminal cases.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/asia/010600china-lawyers.html>

-----

#### Dueling Agendas Herald Fight for Control of Congress

Democrats and Republicans sketched out competing legislative visions that will dominate the Congressional calendar and campaigns this election year.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/010600congress-agenda.html>

-----

#### Pataki Asks for Teacher Incentives

New York Gov. George Pataki proposed a series of initiatives intended to strengthen the state's educational system, including tuition subsidies for college students who pledge to teach in public schools.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/regional/010600ny-pataki-edu.html>

-----

#### Rule on Ads for Diet Supplements Is Revised

The makers of vitamins, herbs and dietary supplements may market products for natural conditions like morning sickness without proving they are safe or effective, the Food and Drug Administration announced.

<http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/science/health/010600hth-fda-supplements.html>

-----

To view today's articles with your personal search terms or to sign up for personal search, see

<http://www.nytimes.com/partners/iib/services/personalsearch.html>

-----

You received these headlines because you requested The New York Times Direct daily e-mail service. To cancel delivery or change delivery options, see

<http://www.nytimes.com/nytdirect>

-----

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: delivery\_morning@slate.com ( delivery\_morning@slate.com [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 08:47:36.00

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

TO: robert\_lawrence@Harvard.Edu ( robert\_lawrence@Harvard.Edu [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

delivery\_morning@slate.com

01/06/2000 12:15 PM GMT

To: Robert Lawrence/FS/KSG@KSG

cc:

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 reeffers 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=356>

4

---

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=430>

7

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: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: dltranscripts\_sender@DTIC.MIL ( dltranscripts\_sender@DTIC.MIL [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 19:33:00.00

SUBJECT: DoD News Briefing - Mr. Crowley, PDASD PA and RADM Quigley, DASD PA

TO: DODTRANSCRIPTS-L@DTIC.MIL ( DODTRANSCRIPTS-L@DTIC.MIL [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

= N E W S   B R I E F I N G

=

= OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

= (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

= WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301

=====

DoD News Briefing

P.J. Crowley, PDASD PA and Craig Quigley, RADM, USN, DASD PA

Thursday, January 06, 2000 - 2:00 p.m. EST

Admiral Quigley: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. For those of you who I'd not had the opportunity to see since the new year, Happy New Year to you all.

Q: Same to you, Craig.

Admiral Quigley: I have three announcements today and then I'll take your questions. First Secretary of the Army Louis Caldera will lead a senior delegation to Korea on January 10th and 11th for talks with South Korean officials on the status of the No Gun Ri review. The trip will include a visit to No Gun Ri, where Secretary Caldera and other members of his delegation will visit the bridge site and meet with survivors and family members. And again, that's next Monday and Tuesday, the 10th and 11th.

Second, in our continuing effort, as Admiral Willard and Dr. Hamre and others have said over the past several days, when we continue for the next several days to check our various business systems, administrative systems, checking for the Y2K glitches, we would report those to you as they popped up, and another one popped up. The Defense Finance and Accounting Service in Charleston, South Carolina -- there are various DFAS offices around the country; this one is in Charleston, South Carolina -- experienced a Y2K system error on January 4th resulting in 230 vendor payment checks being issued with the date January 4, 1900. The error was caught by the quality assurance people there at the DFAS center. DFAS has issued replacement checks today. They are going out via overnight delivery to the vendors. In addition, DFAS has contacted all the affected vendors and will follow up to ensure that they have received the corrected checks.

Last, the Chinese People's Liberation Army Deputy Chief of Staff, Lieutenant General Xiong Guankai, will visit Washington DC from January 24 - 26 to meet with Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Walt Slocombe, in the third annual Defense Consultative Talks between China and the United

States. These meetings will discuss the framework and content for military to military relations between China and the U.S. this year. This is the first step in resuming military to military programs since they were suspended in May of 1999. Previous Defense Consultative Talks took place in Washington in December 1997 and Beijing in October 1998.

And with that, I will take your questions.

Q: What is the date of the visit of the Chinese?

Admiral Quigley: The 24th through the 26th.

Q: What is he again, Craig.

Admiral Quigley: Lieutenant General. I'll spell this and then pronounce it. X-I-O-N-G G-U-A-N-G-K-A-I, and it's pronounced "Shee-young Gwang-kye". He is the Deputy Chief of Staff of the PLA.

Yes, sir?

Q: Do you anticipate that they would discuss specifics such as a future visit by Secretary Cohen to Beijing?

Admiral Quigley: All of that would be incorporated. It would be anything that you could put in the mil-to-mil category, Bob, whether it's individuals like the secretary, the chairman, other -- commander-in-chief of the Pacific Command, others in that -- or ship visits, exchanges of any sort; it would all be on the table for discussion.

Q: Can you give us an estimate of when the secretary would like to visit Beijing and when you'd propose that he visit?

Admiral Quigley: No, not at this point. I mean, that's something that we hope to discuss during this meeting. But I don't think we're going in with any particular dates in mind. We'll -- that'll be part of the give-and-take during the three days of talks.

Q: All right -- 24th and 26th of this month?

Admiral Quigley: Twenty-fourth through the 26th of this month, right.

Q: And will he be available for us here at some kind of a debriefing or something?

Admiral Quigley: I asked that question myself, and I don't know the answer yet.

Q: Does he speak English?

Admiral Quigley: I don't know that one either. I will see if I can find out.

Q: We'll speak Chinese to him.

Admiral Quigley: Jim?

Q: There was a German newspaper report that some of the video from -- gun camera video of a misguided -- of a mishap during the Kosovo conflict was played for the public at something like three times normal speed. Is that report correct? And if so, why did that happen, and what was the impact?

Admiral Quigley: I have been largely away from the office this morning. Thankfully, P.J. Crowley has not, and he has had time to look into that in detail. So I will punt to my compatriot here on that issue.

Mr. Crowley: The short answer is, it is the normal way that the intelligence system processes gun camera footage that starts as 8mm gun camera footage, and that gets translated, through something called the Common Intelligence System, or CIS, which is a Unix-based computer software system, and then ultimately down to a PC, where analysts can study the video.

As that happens, there is an acceleration and a compression of the video, so in this particular case, the video started at the 8mm format at

roughly 15 seconds in length. When it went through first iteration to the CIS, it was compressed to 6.5 seconds. When it was further compressed to the PC, it got down to about the four-second clip that everyone saw on television on April 12th.

This is the way that the system works for all gun camera footage, so there was no manipulation by the authorities in Europe, and in fact I would say that there's nothing new here. Media that have already gone through this, with the air forces in Europe -- for example, Der Spiegel sent some experts down to Ramstein. We walked them through how the system works -- worked, and showed them, in essence, what happens as you go through these iterations. The computer itself starts to drop off frames to deal with the compression.

And so this is -- what was unusual about this video clip was you had the single point of reference being the train, and as you saw in the clip, the train at various points jumped slightly.

That's because the computer itself dropped frames out in order to deal with this requirement for compression. So this is the way that our intelligence system operates in terms of translating gun camera footage and getting it to the PCs where intelligence analysts can make quick assessments of the gun camera footage, you know, to benefit the operation.

Q: P.J., when this footage was first shown and briefed at NATO headquarters the next day, on the 13th, General Clark made the point that the weapon systems officer on the F-15 had only a second or so to see the train and possibly react, not enough time to have a reaction. If it turns out that there was actually more time, does that change that?

Mr. Crowley: No. Jamie, good question. It doesn't change the basic facts of what happened on April 12th. The pilot and the weapon system officer -- in fact, the weapon system officer is looking through a screen that is five inches by five inches. He's focused on the bridge, which is his target for that mission. And this in no way changes the basic facts that they were not able to divert the missile before the train came into their field of vision.

Q: Maybe you could clear up one other thing. On the clip that was released by NATO the next day, we saw the train on the screen crossing the bridge. And on the clip there were also white brackets and a cross-hairs in the middle. Which -- does the weapon systems officer on the plane see everything that was released in that video, or only what's in that bracketed area, the smaller area in the middle?

Mr. Crowley: Not being a pilot, I don't know that I'm particularly qualified. We can take that question and try to find out. My presumption is he's only seeing what's in the brackets, which is a miniaturized version of what we happened to see on television. But I would probably ask an expert before making that comment.

Q: Admiral Quigley, do you by any chance -- do you know if that is the case, or do you have to take that?

Admiral Quigley: The weapons systems officer or the pilot?

Q: Did they see everything that was in the field of vision on the video that was released, or only what was in the smaller area in the brackets?

Admiral Quigley: My understanding is the five-by-five area. We'll double-check.

Mr. Crowley: Yeah. Tim just handed me something. The weapon system officer does not see the entire panorama presented by the video file available on the Internet. The WSO, or "Wizzo," sees only the image

presented inside the four corner markers. So that's a five inch by five inch monochrome cockpit monitor.

Q: P.J., are you saying that this was not -- this video was not speeded up -- because the SHAPE folks say it was -- at least twice as fast as it actually happened?

Mr. Crowley: Well, Jack, in the -- you know, there is a compression and acceleration that goes through the normal process as this goes from 8 millimeters, through the CIS, to the intelligence analyst's PC. So, yeah, it roughly ends up being something like 2.7 times as fast.

Q: Now, they also said that other video, which we saw, was not speeded up the way this was: 2.7 this was; other video, not 2.7. So there was a difference in this presentation than in the other presentations.

Mr. Crowley: I can only attribute that to the speed with which we tried to get the video from the intelligence community so that we would all have the benefit of seeing it.

Q: (Inaudible) -- I don't know that anyone -- well, some -- never mind. I won't ask it that way.

So the issue is why didn't NATO, if in fact this was different, at different speed than was presented on other days, and this was one of those three big critical mistakes that NATO made; why didn't NATO tell us that this one was speeded up, whether by accident or not, where the other ones were not?

Mr. Crowley: Well, first of all, let me correct the premise in your question. This was not speeded up on purpose. There is a normal acceleration that goes in through this process of converting the gun-camera footage, you know, for the benefit of the intel analyst. You know, I --

Q: The other video that they showed was not. So this was at a different speed than the other video, which is commonly shown at these briefings. So it had the effect, whether it was intended or not, of speeding up the video by 2.7 times.

Mr. Crowley: It did speed up the video. But it didn't change the basic facts of the incident, which is that the pilot and weapon systems officer did not see the train come into their field of view and were not able to divert the missile.

Q: But back to the point of why didn't NATO tell us this? They knew it in October when they had a query from Der Spiegel and acknowledged to Der Spiegel, but to no one else, that, "Whoops! We showed you something that was nearly three times faster than we thought"?

Mr. Crowley: I would say, Jack, you know, the folks at Ramstein Air Base are standing by to walk any news media, who are interested in this story, as they did with Der Spiegel, through the entire process of how this transpired.

It happens that, for example, Frankfurter Rundschau was not interested in going through the same careful study that Der Spiegel was.

Q: Well wait a minute, P.J., can I just follow up on that? You're saying you're waiting for news media to show up. If you knew you had a mistake, honest though it was, you wouldn't come out on your own initiative and --

Mr. Crowley: I'm not saying -- Barb, I would say there was a mistake. Again, there was no manipulation of this video. This is the way that when start with what -- 8mm gun-camera footage and go through two -- material that goes to the desk of an intel analyst, this is what you

have. I can't speak to the difference between this video and other video that was shown during the Kosovo conflict.

Q: The question is why would neither NATO nor USAFE or the Department of Defense, once they knew that this situation was not what it was represented to be in public back in April, do you not think it's a problem with credibility to not overtly come out and say, and simply wait for people to come and ask you, even after you know?

Mr. Crowley: I would say, first of all, this has not been a major subject of media interest since the end of the Kosovo conflict. Secondly --

Q: Well --

Mr. Crowley: Well excuse me. Let me finish. Now, to the first news organization that looked at this, Der Spiegel, they went to Ramstein, we carefully walked them through this. We're not hiding anything. But by the same token, this is not an area that has been of significant news media interest up until now.

Q: P.J., I'm confused about some of the terminology you've used here today. You described the process by which the train video was used as the "normal" process. Is that --

Mr. Crowley: Remember what gun-camera footage is to allow the pilots, the weapon system officers, the intel analysts to have a quick review of a mission in a campaign. And so you take the 8mm gun-camera footage off the weapon system, you plug it into something called the Common Intelligence System, which is a UNIX-based system. That basically -- you first now take the video, load it into the computer, and then you ship that to the PC of the intel analysts. During the course of those two translations -- to use my word -- you've got this compression and acceleration.

Q: No, I understand that; I understood the technology of it, which seems fairly straightforward. My question is, you have characterized this as the "normal process" for the treatment of gun camera video. My question to you --

Mr. Crowley: Within the intelligence community; yes.

Q: Right. And -- I mean -- all right.

Is it the normal process for the distribution of gun-camera video, which is done all the time, which was done at the Gulf War, which was done in Kosovo, which is done out of training, it's done in a number of different contexts -- is the process you just described, this two-step production which results in a 2.7 percent acceleration of the video -- is that the normal process for the handling of gun camera video that is distributed to the public?

Mr. Crowley: Well, I can't speak to that, Roberto. I --

Q: Excuse me. Then let me ask you to take the query. Mr. Crowley: I understand the premise of your question, which I really can't answer, which is, at the point that you took gun camera footage from the intelligence analyst and prepared it to put it on and distribute it to -- and show it to the news media, if in fact in other cases we have then adapted that video to normal speed and did not do so in this case. I'm not equipped to answer that question.

Q: Can I just ask you -- this is a straightforward public affairs question.

Mr. Crowley: Sure.

Q: It is strictly within your department as to what your policy is on the distribution of gun camera video and in what format it's given to the public. Your explanation of these events is incomplete without

telling us whether this gun camera video and the process you describe as normal for intelligence purposes is the normal process for distribution to the public, so that, like, every bomb we've seen going down a stack and into a building for all these years is actually three times faster than it really happened.

Mr. Crowley: We will take the question whether in this particular case, we failed to do something we have done in other instances.

Q: Can you get the answer to that within this news cycle?

Mr. Crowley: Yes.

Q: Thank you.

Q: Can I follow up on that? If SHAPE knew about this in October, can you also tell us when the Department of Defense found out about this?

Mr. Crowley: We'll take the question.

Q: Is it the contention, P.J., by both NATO and the U.S. that regardless of how fast this gun camera video was replayed, that the weapons officer still only had one second in which to make that decision; that he saw the train only one second before impact, regardless of how fast this tape was replayed?

Mr. Crowley: It does not change the basic facts of the incident, which is that the pilot and weapon systems officer did not have time to divert the missile that had already been fired before the train came into their field of view.

Q: You're talking about the first AGM-130 shot. There was a second AGM-130 shot after the first.

Mr. Crowley: I think the clip that we're talking about, my recollection is that it's the first one.

Q: The first. But then, in the second, the train is now stopped on the bridge. It is obscured by smoke, perhaps, but it is on the bridge, and there's a second shot. And what are you saying about the weapons officer on that one?

Mr. Crowley: I'm -- we're dealing with the issue. I'm not here to do a mission debrief, I'm just here to say based on the Frankfurter Rundschau report there was no manipulation to this video, as we've talked about.

Q: But I guess one of the questions is, there were two pieces of video released that day, the next day. Are they both -- were they both subject to the same acceleration effect?

Mr. Crowley: I will presume yes. I don't know. You know, I didn't ask a question about the second piece of --

Q: And also, will you -- as long as you're taking questions and queries, we'd like to be, if possible, provided with a tape of this event that occurs in -- that's slowed down to what is real time and shows precisely what the pilot actually saw so that we can make an intelligent evaluation --

Mr. Crowley: Again, I would think that you basically saw what the pilot saw. You know, the speed doesn't alter the basic facts that the --

Q: You told me that they only saw what was in the brackets, and what the video that was released showed a much wider field. We'd like to be able to show the public what it is the pilots or the weapons systems officer saw in the actual time that he saw it so the people can make their own judgment about whether the statements that you've said are reasonable.

Mr. Crowley: I understand what you're looking to do. I'm not sure whether we have the ability to do that or not, but we'll look into it.

Q: On both -- on both tries.

Q: Have you asked SHAPE whether or not this situation occurred in any other released video?

Mr. Crowley: I think that's related to what you've already asked. We'll --

Q: You've shown other AGM-130s.

Mr. Crowley: We will see whether there was something that has been done to other video that, because of the speed of getting this out, was not done in this particular case. We've already taken that question. Yes.

Q: Has anyone done a frame by frame analysis that you can tell us exactly how much time the pilot had from the time the train entered the view and the time that the bomb was launched?

Mr. Crowley: Again, I don't think that we're here to get into a mission debrief of exactly what the pilot did and did not do, see and did not see.

Q: Whether they --

Mr. Crowley: The heart of this is simply whether this video was manipulated, and our answer is no, it was not, definitively not.

Q: Right. I understand that. But what you're standing on is saying that the basic facts haven't changed. But we feel misled. And so now we kind of want to have something concrete --

Mr. Crowley: Well, again, I think probably the best people to go through review of this particular episode, for example, would be General Leaf, who is the commander at Aviano, or one of the senior leaders at USAFE.

And they are prepared to go through this whole incident with you, if that's what you want to do.

Q: Well, General Clark used this video as evidence to support his contention that, look, the weapons officer did not have the ability to keep this from happening and the train from being hit --

Mr. Crowley: Let's stay -- let's --

Q: No, no, no, but that's -- he used --

Mr. Crowley: I understand, but let's stay where, you know, we here at this podium today can deal with. I cannot give you a mission debrief pertaining to the pilot's actions --

Q: But that's what General Clark did at the time --

Mr. Crowley: I understand that. You know, the report today is suggesting that we manipulated this video. We did not.

Jim?

Q: P.J., if I'm understanding right, you're telling us that intel officers are routinely looking on their computer screens at video that's been sped up and compressed. Frames, as I understand what you said, have been dropped out. Does it give anybody in this building concern that people are making judgments, whether in Kosovo or anywhere else, based on their examination of video that's going almost three times faster than real time, that has had frames cut out? I mean, as a layman, that gives me a lot of concern.

Mr. Crowley: Well, no. But the primary purpose of this is to judge the success of a particular mission. You know, were you aiming at the right target? Did you hit the target? Does that target need to be re-struck? So an analyst is going through to evaluate -- or based on the video, did you see any threats that you have to advise your crew members to be careful about if you're operating in the same area? So first and foremost, this is about helping analysts with -- who are making

recommendations on missions as part of the conflict.

Q: So if they're looking at video to help them decide which targets to strike, that's not sped up as well? For example, the mistake that was made on the Chinese embassy -- were they looking at video that was run three times faster than normal and deciding that that wasn't the Chinese embassy, that it was a real target?

Mr. Crowley: Let's not stray too far afield here.

Jack?

Q: P.J., I'm concerned about some of the use of words here, P.J., and I just want to tell you how your statement appears to conflict with what they are saying in Europe. And maybe we can clear this up easily.

They are saying that the video was not intentionally manipulated, that they accidentally put out video that was 2.7 times faster than what they normally showed to the press briefing. They didn't intentionally do it. They did manipulate the video by accidentally putting this out. It wasn't intentional, they claim; there was no malice, there was no manipulation intended. But they did accidentally put it out at a different speed. That's a different story than what you are maintaining here.

Mr. Crowley: We have taken the question as to whether there is something that we have done in other instances, that we failed to do in this instance, which would get at whether, you know, this video is in some way different in its presentation than other examples that we showed during the various briefings during the Kosovo conflict.

I would argue with you that if it is a normal process of working through compression and acceleration of intelligence data that is reviewed by analysts, that's not manipulation. That is how, you know, you go through these various computer iterations and get to a product. The product was presented as the intelligence analyst normally would see it, and that is not a manipulation.

Now, whether we should have backed that down to a slower speed so it's seen in real time -- a fair question, and which we've already taken. But I, again, challenge the assumption that we have in some way manipulated this in a way of trying to mislead people. We have not.

Q: You said that this product is -- its primary purpose in the way it's -- not "manipulated" but -- excuse me -- the way it's formatted, is for strictly sort of war-fighting purposes, accessing damage, et cetera. In that instance, and in several other instances, both in Kosovo and in other conflicts, gun camera footage has been used by military leaders to make policy points about collateral damage, about the intent of the pilots and weapons officers in a certain incident, it's been used to clarify and explain rules of engagement. Is there some other formatting that is developed for that purpose? I mean, is this stuff really dual use, or is it inadequate for --

Mr. Crowley: Roberto, let me presume something here; that depending on the time it takes in order to make a presentation, I suppose a question is whether we were able to get our hands on the original 8mm footage, in which case you can make a dub from 8mm to VHS or to Beta so that it can be presented to you all, versus in this particular case where we acquired it once it had gone through this process that is normal for intelligence analysts. It may well be that because of the short circuit that we took, that meant that we, in essence, got a different product that we didn't realize. It's quite possible that in the normal routine of getting gun camera footage, as General Wald presented to you here many

times, we were working off of the original 8mm gun footage where the compression had not taken place.

Q: You are indicating knowledge of this question that you've taken. I mean, is that --

Mr. Crowley: I am just offering a possible explanation before you will allow me to get off the podium so I can go research the answers to --

Q: (Inaudible.)

Mr. Crowley: -- the many technical -- the many questions that we have already taken.

Q: But you can go and --

Mr. Crowley: (Inaudible.)

Q: All right. (Inaudible) -- I just might point out one thing; it's not really a question.

But you may recall, when this tape was briefed the next day by General Clark, when he began his briefing, he didn't have the tape. And he said that he hoped to have it before the end of the briefing. And at some point before the end of the briefing, the tape arrived. So --

Q: He said it was hung in his computer assistant. So --

Mr. Crowley: I think it's important to make one final point here.

In the intervening time, since the Kosovo conflict, I have heard no one suggest that this crew operated in error. I think everyone has understood that they launched a missile based on the field of view that they had at the time and that there was not sufficient time, once that missile was launched, to divert it once they saw the train. So, under the circumstances and the fog of war, I have heard no one blame this crew for making an error, based on the information that was available to them in the cockpit when they made the decision to launch the missile.

Q: That goes to the second missile also?

Mr. Crowley: Again, I have heard no -- you know, I think people understood, based on the information that this crew had in the cockpit at the time that they launched the missile -- and it was only after they launched the missile, that they saw the train come into view.

Q: A new subject?

Admiral Quigley: Other topics? Jamie?

Q: Regarding the Middle East peace talks, I was reading an account in the Jerusalem Post that said Israel's, I think, defense minister was planning to return for more meetings with Pentagon officials about military assistance linked to the peace process. Can you give us any idea of what kinds of requests Israel has made for military assistance from the United States and whether the U.S. is looking favorably on any of these requests?

Admiral Quigley: I won't be specific because it is very much a work in progress.

But it is safe to say we have had consultations, discussions with the Israelis, as to what they think might be necessary, if such a peace agreement with Syria is signed, to ensure their security posture within the Middle East. But as I mentioned, this is still very much a work in progress.

I would characterize it as discussions only at this point, and we remain hopeful that those talks -- the president has said repeatedly that the United States is committed to that Middle East peace process, and that will include substantive commitments of perhaps items or money or people over a period of time.

I think it's in our nation's interest, it's in the region's

interest, it's in the world's interest to have that part of the world, the Middle East, be a peaceful place. And we, the United States, have made a commitment to do that, to be a very substantive part of that process.

Q: Two quick follow-ups. Can you tell us whether Israel has asked for U.S. cruise missiles, such as has only been provided to Great Britain at this point?

Admiral Quigley: I won't characterize the discussions except to say that there have been some, but I would say that of course we would follow the legal process once there is a Syrian-Israeli peace agreement, hopefully. We can get specific at that point as to what items would be appropriate, what role and items the United States might contribute and, of course, we would do that in full consultation with the Congress and our allies around the world.

Q: And one last follow-up. Is there any consideration or contingency planning for U.S. troops to take part in any sort of peacekeeping force in the Golan Heights, or in any peacekeeping mission related to a possible peace agreement? Admiral Quigley: That would certainly remain an option. Again, the issue here is one of this is very much work in progress in Sheperdstown, and we'll see what develops from those talks, and take up the discussion from there. But I would say there is nothing that isn't on the table, Jamie. It's all fair to discuss. But by the same token, I would not leave you the impression that we have made a commitment to any particular thing or troop strength or monetary amount other than in a very general way, as the president has said, to be supportive of that process.

Q: Sir, speaking in a very general way, could you generally characterize the Israeli request as a lengthy and expensive shopping list for top-of-the-line weapons? Is that --

Admiral Quigley: I would characterize it as quite detailed, but I don't want to go into descriptors of length or dollar amounts or anything. But it is quite detailed.

We think we understand their position. And I think that's clear to the Israelis, that we understand what they're asking in return.

Q: When did they give you the list?

Admiral Quigley: I don't have that date, but it was recently; within the last few weeks, Pam, I would say.

Yes, Chris?

Q: A question on "don't ask, don't tell, don't harass." Under the current law -- let's go ahead to January 2001; a new president has been elected, and he decides, "I want gays to serve openly in the military." If he were to give that order, given the state of the current law, would that be a lawful order? What would happen if that were to take place?

Admiral Quigley: Well, I think the current policy of "don't ask, don't tell, don't harass" is rooted in law. And so a newly elected president would have to, I would think, go for -- I'd have to check my constitutional law process in more detail, but I would think the more likely way would be to go for a change in the law.

Q: So that as a chairman of the Joint Chiefs getting that order, what would the obligation of that chairman be?

Admiral Quigley: That's an issue for the next president to discuss with the next secretary of Defense.

Q: Admiral?

Admiral Quigley: Yes?

Q: Can you tell us, where are the negotiations on the Vieques

issue right now?

Admiral Quigley: "Ongoing" would be, in a phrase, to say.

Q: Is the Navy representative already down in Puerto Rico?

Admiral Quigley: No, he is not. He has not yet arrived. I don't have a timetable for that; perhaps the Navy might. But I am not aware of any announcements in that regard.

Yes?

Q: One follow-up on "don't ask, don't tell." Vice President Gore said last night that he would not appoint a member of the Joint Chiefs who did not support allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the U.S. military. What kind of a message does that send to -- the fact that the sitting vice president makes that statement, what does that send -- message it sends to commanders? And is that -- would that be a legitimate litmus test to have for a Joint Chiefs chairman?

Admiral Quigley: Well, the message it sends is that, clearly you have a political candidate, a candidate here for the office of president of the United States, that has stated his views. As we've said many times before, candidates for political office are certainly free to do that, and must do that in order to explain their views to the American people. But I would not speculate as to what that may or may not mean a year from now. I would go back to my answer to Chris's question; it's really appropriate for the next president to discuss that with the next secretary of Defense.

Q: Do you think that the next president, if he were to adopt that policy, would have any trouble finding a chairman of the Joint Chiefs, if that were a requirement?

Admiral Quigley: I would have no way to factually answer that question.

Q: A question on Goldwater-Nichols. The terms the chairman and vice chairmen serve are set by law. It's a little different from many other jobs, as I understand it. In other words --

Admiral Quigley: Two-year terms.

Q: For two-year terms. In other words, a president comes in and then he'll have whoever is chairman for --

Admiral Quigley: Some period of time; yes.

Q: -- most of a year, I think. So he's not actually going to be -- he won't have had the opportunity to apply any litmus test to the serving chairman of the Joint Chiefs; right?

Admiral Quigley: Well, that's true. That's true.

Q: Just to clear up one other point that Chris was getting to about lawful orders. Just to clarify the role of the Joint Chiefs and the chairman, if the civilian leadership makes a change in a policy -- just generally speaking; maybe it's not even this policy -- that is unpopular with the military, the military, obviously, doesn't have any choice but to carry out that policy; is that not correct?

Admiral Quigley: Correct. If you, as an individual -- the institution of the American military, we are committed constitutionally to civil control of the military in this country. It is a bedrock principle of our democracy. As an institution, that is true across the board.

As an individual, each one of us, for whatever policies that are set, you must have a private conversation with yourself, because at the end of the day you've got to be happy with the decisions that you have made. So very clearly, all policies across the board are not surprises; they are fully out there in the full light of day. You need to understand

them, think about them, and have a discussion with yourself, if you will. If it's a policy you cannot support, you are obliged to leave the service. So that's a very individualized question.

Jamie?

Q: Would senior officers, very senior U.S. military officers, if they were to not agree with policy, have the option of resigning?

Admiral Quigley: Of course. We all do.

Yes?

Q: But not, say, enlisted personnel or -- I mean, at what point do you -- obviously, if they were to adopt a policy that was unpopular, you couldn't have half the military say, "Okay, that's it. I'm out of here."

Admiral Quigley: No, we have seen members of the military, over the years, say, "I can't endorse this policy," or "I can't live with this policy" -- whatever that might be.

And if it's something -- there are means of leaving the service. Whether it's retirement or a resignation of a commission or an end to an enlistment or something like that, that we are reasonable about that. If a person has a legitimate request to leave service from a moral issue that they've been wrestling with about a policy that is in effect in the military, that is something that we evaluate very carefully and try our darnedest to come to an accommodation to meet that service member's expectations and needs.

Bill?

Q: Another subject entirely? Okay. Yes.

Admiral, a Cuban defector, former intelligence operative who defected to Spain, was here in Washington, I believe this last week, talking about Cuba, what he knew about the government of Cuba, said that the Cubans were involved in shipping guns and other kinds of arms, transshipping them to Colombia, trading for drugs with the FARC, basically doing barter with the FARC on this, and then transshipping those drugs through Cuba to the United States. Does the military have any knowledge of these type of activities by the Cubans?

Admiral Quigley: Bill, if we did, that would be based on intelligence reports, and that's a detail I can't get into, I'm sorry, from the podium in an unclassified way. Just let me use it as an opportunity to restate our support of the Colombian government as they do their level best to regain the safety and security of the nation of Colombia. It is in the entire world's interest to stop drug flow from Colombia to the world.

Q: And to follow, Mr. Macetti (sp) said that groups like the FALN, specifically, and other groups that were anti-American, anti-Navy, were being heavily influenced by the Cubans, cash-wise and otherwise. And is there any connection between the negativity on Vieques and the action of Cuban agents?

Admiral Quigley: Not that I'm aware, no.

Q: Not that you're aware of? Okay, thanks.

Admiral Quigley: Yes, ma'am?

Q: I'd like to ask about yesterday's talk between Secretary Cohen and the Japanese secretary of defense agency.

And in such talks Japanese secretary mentioned about a limitation of 15 years of limitation of the U.S. base in Okinawa as opinion of -- (inaudible) -- of Okinawa people. And I'd like to know how did the Secretary Cohen accept that issue of limitation? And also, I'd like to

know whether he is ready to talk about that in the future with Japan or not.

Admiral Quigley: I don't know if that topic came up between the two men in their discussions. If it did, it has not been -- I am not aware that either nation is ready to release the results or a final decision in that regard.

All topics are on the table when we meet with as close a friend as Japan. That is one of our most important bilateral security relationships around the world. But even in such a close relationship there are differences between good friends. And some of these issues are more difficult than others to work through and take more time than others to work through. When that issue is worked through, I'm sure that we will make an announcement in that regard. But in the meantime, I don't think it would be helpful to be -- give it a higher profile than it deserves because it is a tough one to work through for both nations.

Q: Related question.

Admiral Quigley: Sure.

Q: Did the topic of the Japanese desire to limit the reimbursement that they do for U.S. forces in Japan and perhaps put a cap on that, did that topic come up?

Admiral Quigley: I'll take that question. I don't know. I saw the report on that from I think two days ago. But I don't know if that came up.

Chris.

Q: Admiral, yesterday Korea time there was an incident that resulted in the evacuation of a U.S. military camp near north of Seoul because of apparently some sort of a bomb threat or bomb scare. Do you know whatever happened to that? Was there any bomb found, and was it -- did it turn out to be a credible threat, or -- do you know anything about that?

Admiral Quigley: We take all threats as credible. We can do nothing less. But there was no bomb found, and the people were returned -- allowed to return.

Q: The Chinese government has made a number of commitments to the U.S. government over the years, to the secretary of State and the secretary of Defense, that they will not export missile technology. Is it the impression of the U.S. government that they are living up to those commitments, or is there some question about that?

Admiral Quigley: We remain very concerned about any reports that they are not. To the best of our ability we will try to ascertain ground truth in that regard, Chris. But again, in order to do that we would use the capabilities of our intelligence organization, and it's not something I can go into. But we have made our views on that very clear to the Chinese government for many years and, indeed, in recent years have made it a very central discussion point with the Chinese government, our views on the importance of the nonproliferation of this very dangerous technology to other countries around the world.

Q: Are we going to get the secretary's speech piped back now, or is that --

Admiral Quigley: In minutes, if everything works.

Oh, thank you.

Staff: We have -- the line is up. We're a few moments -- there are probably a few moments we have so that if you wanted to take a break, you --

Admiral Quigley: Okay. Sorry, I went on too long.

Q: Oh, no.

Admiral Quigley: It should be just a few minutes before -- and for those -- someone has asked if it was television or audio. It's only audio. It'll be coming through the speakers in the overhead. It'll also be on channel 13, the Pentagon cable system. Again, just audio. But if you want to watch it there, your call.

-END-

This transcript was prepared by the Federal News Service, Inc., Washington, DC. Federal News Service is a private company. For other defense related transcripts not available through this site, contact Federal News Service at (202) 347-1400.

1

NOTE: This is a plain text version of a web page.  
If your mail program did not properly format this  
information, current Transcripts are online at  
<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/#BRIEFINGS>

=====

Virtual tour of the Pentagon

<http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/pentagon/>

=====

Unsubscribe from or Subscribe to this mailing list:

<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/subscribe.html>

=====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> ( LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 13:19:05.00

SUBJECT: Gore promises pro-gay litmus test for military's Joint Chiefs of Staff

TO: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu ( queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Gore promises pro-gay litmus test for military's Joint Chiefs of Staff  
By Dave Boyer  
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

DURHAM, N.H. -- Vice President Al Gore and former Sen. Bill Bradley rang in a new year of presidential debates last night with their testiest confrontation of the Democratic primary, clashing over their liberal credentials on gun control, homosexuals in the military and regulations to limit campaign donations.

Mr. Gore went so far as to pledge he would nominate to the Joint Chiefs of Staff only military officers who agree with his goal of overturning President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell" policy for homosexuals serving in the armed forces.

"I would insist, before appointing anyone to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that individual would support my policy," Mr. Gore said. "And yes, I'll make that a requirement."

Mr. Bradley used their fourth debate, held less than four weeks before New Hampshire's first-in-the-nation primary Feb. 1, to continue painting Mr. Gore as an out-of-touch Washington politician who gave up his political soul in the service of President Clinton.

"I think you're in a Washington bunker," Mr. Bradley said, facing the vice president on the stage at the University of New Hampshire. "I can understand why you're in a bunker. . . . I think the major objective in the White House in the last several years has been political survival. I understand that. But the reality is, the Democratic Party shouldn't be in the Washington bunker with you."

The contest came as a new poll released this week showed Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley in a virtual statistical tie.

But Mr. Gore tried to use his second-place status in other New Hampshire polls to his advantage, again urging Mr. Bradley to forgo paid political

advertisements and to hold two debates each week.

"The polls say you're ahead," Mr. Gore told Mr. Bradley. "I'm asking the people of New Hampshire to give me a come-from-behind victory here."

Mr. Bradley retorted, "You know, Al, your underdog pitch brings tears to my eyes."

Mr. Gore shot back that he hoped to bring tears to Mr. Bradley's eyes by beating him Feb. 1.

On the issue of homosexuals serving in the military, Mr. Gore said he would apply a "litmus test" for nominees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"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," Mr. Gore said. "And I think that would require those who wanted to serve . . . on the Joint Chiefs to be in agreement with that policy."

Mr. Bradley stopped short of Mr. Gore's "litmus test," saying he simply expected the Joint Chiefs would follow his orders if he were elected president.

"As president, you are commander in chief, and you issue orders, and soldiers are good soldiers, and they follow your orders," Mr. Bradley said. "I'm sure there are people in the military today who don't agree with President Clinton. . . . But my sense is, when you're president of the United States, military people are loyal to their commander in chief, whatever the policy the commander in chief calls for."

Mr. Bradley also said he considers homosexual rights "fundamental human decency."

Earlier in the day, Mr. Gore received the endorsement of New England's liberal icon, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Massachusetts Democrat, after heavy lobbying of Mr. Kennedy by the White House and the Gore campaign.

Mr. Kennedy said the vice president has "the ability, the vision and the experience to lead this nation wisely and well in the coming years."

Mr. Gore said he was "honored." But Mr. Bradley said the endorsement was typical of Mr. Gore's hold on "entrenched power" in the Democratic Party and said Mr. Gore was becoming "desperate."

"He has a president who is supporting him, loyal to him ??? as he was loyal to the president," Mr. Bradley said. "He rides on Air Force Two. That is entrenched power."

Mr. Gore holds a substantial lead over Mr. Bradley in national polls. The two Democrats will debate twice more in the next week.

Last night's debate took on an added sense of urgency, heightened by dozens of students who chanted slogans like "Gore Go Home" outside the debate hall.

Supporters of Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley appeared about evenly divided, including one bare-chested young man who sported a large red "B" painted on

his chest in the below-freezing temperatures.

Asked if they were afraid of being labeled "liberal," both men defended their positions on gun control, homosexual rights and increased federal spending on health care without actually using the word "liberal."

"I'll accept whatever label you want," Mr. Bradley said. "The issue is, how strong are you willing to hold your convictions?"

Said Mr. Gore, after listing his liberal stances, "I accept whatever they want to call that."

The debate opened with Mr. Gore having to defend his loyalty to the president during the Monica Lewinsky scandal and the subsequent impeachment, when he said Mr. Clinton would be regarded as one of the nation's "greatest presidents."

"I was critical of the president," Mr. Gore said. "As an American, I also defended the office of the presidency against an effort by partisan Republicans in the House and Senate to deliver a thoroughly disproportionate penalty for a serious and reprehensible personal mistake."

Said Mr. Bradley, "The vice president was, I think, vice president, which means that he was not critical of the president. I personally believe any time a public official, a president, lies, he undermines his authority and squanders people's trust. It's a sad period of our history, and I'm glad it's over."

Mr. Bradley also criticized the vice president on gun control, asking why he doesn't support, as Mr. Bradley does, registering and licensing all 65 million guns in the United States.

Mr. Gore said he supports licensing of all new handguns and wants to eliminate some weapons like "Saturday night specials," but he tempers his goals with the reality that the gun lobby is very powerful politically.

"We have to find a way to make our political system work," Mr. Gore said.

Mr. Bradley said Mr. Gore's gun-control stance was a leadership issue.

"Where would the country be if Franklin Roosevelt said Social Security is too difficult to do?" he asked.

The debate was sponsored by New England Cable News, New Hampshire Public Television and the Union Leader newspaper of Manchester. The moderator was ABC's Peter Jennings.

The six candidates for the Republican presidential nomination will debate at the same site tonight.

---

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> ( Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-JAN-2000 22:28:45.00

SUBJECT: [398] Inbox Select - Nov. 7, 2000

TO: Plaintext <newshour-pl@PBS.ORG> ( Plaintext <newshour-pl@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
\*\*\*\*\*

Welcome to Online NewsHour Select,  
e-mail selections delivered weekdays  
from web site of The NewsHour with  
Jim Lehrer on PBS.  
\*\*\*\*\*

January 7, 2000

\*DAILY NEWS SUMMARY  
<http://audio.pbs.org:8080/ramgen/newshour/news.rm?altplay=news.rm>

\*GAYS IN THE MILITARY  
The Pentagon reviews its policy on gays in the military amid criticism  
that it's not working.  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/military/jan-june00/gays\\_military\\_1-6.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/military/jan-june00/gays_military_1-6.html)

\*MIRANDA RIGHTS  
Is the right to remain silent a Constitutional right?  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/law/jan-june00/miranda\\_1-6.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/law/jan-june00/miranda_1-6.html)

\*TAXING ONLINE SALES  
Should Internet purchases be taxed?  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/january00/internet\\_tax\\_forum.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/january00/internet_tax_forum.html)

\*\*\*\*\*  
The Online NewsHour (<http://www.pbs.org/newshour>) is part of PBS Online  
(<http://www.pbs.org>) and is the companion Web site of The NewsHour with  
Jim Lehrer. The NewsHour is funded by ADM (<http://www.admworld.com>) and  
Travelers Group (<http://www.travelers.com>), including Salomon Smith  
Barney (<http://www.smithbarney.com/>).

\*\*\*\*\*  
If you would like to terminate your subscription to Online NewsHour  
Select send an email to [mailserv@pbs.org](mailto:mailserv@pbs.org) and in the body of the message  
type "unsub newshour-pl" (without quotes).

\*\*\*\*\*



Clinton entered office saying he wanted gays to be allowed to serve openly, but opposition in Congress and among military leaders left him

with no choice but to accept a compromise.

In remarks to reporters Thursday, Clinton said he still believes that gays and lesbians ought to be allowed to serve so long as they obey the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which prohibits homosexual contact.

``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," Clinton said. ``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 now."

The Democratic candidates' willingness to loosen strictures on gays in the military drew animated responses Thursday night as the GOP candidates debated.

Gary Bauer said the Democratic stance would further the ``radical homosexual agenda," and an Alan Keyes said, ``I will return to the ban on homosexuals in the military."

Texas Gov. George W. Bush said, ``I'm a don't ask, don't tell man."

Sen. John McCain said the policy could be fine-tuned, but he added, ``I cannot change a policy that's working."

Michael Dugan, who was a member of the Joint Chiefs as head of the Air Force until September 1990, said in an interview Thursday that he saw no problem with a president using a litmus test like that suggested by Gore.

On the other hand, Dugan said, military leaders would expect a president to put a high priority on maintaining good order and discipline in the military - a condition that would be undermined, in Dugan's view, if gays were given special treatment or permitted to flaunt their sexuality in ways that heterosexuals may not.

``If the policy is to allow gays in the military to do whatever they want, (Gore) is going to go through a lot of senior officers before finding someone" willing to serve on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Dugan said.

As it happens, the next president will have little immediate opportunity to apply any such litmus test anyway, unless he takes the unusual step of firing the service chiefs when he takes office in January 2001.

Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Henry H. Shelton was confirmed by the Senate just last fall to serve until September 2001, and the vice chairman's post would not become vacant until spring 2002 at the earliest.

Of the four service chiefs, Air Force Gen. Michael Ryan is due to leave first, in fall 2001. The Navy's chief, Adm. Jay Johnson, is scheduled to be replaced this summer and his successor would have just begun a four-year term when the next commander-in-chief takes office. The Army chief, Gen. Eric Shinseki, and Marine Corps Commandant Gen. James Jones just started their four-year terms last summer.

AP-NY-01-07-00 0258EST

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> ( LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 00:26:10.00

SUBJECT: Officers Riled by Comments on Gay Issue by Gore and Bradley

TO: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu ( queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: fenceberry@aol.com ( fenceberry@aol.com [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
New York Times  
January 7, 2000

Officers Riled by Comments on Gay Issue by Gore and Bradley

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON, Jan. 6 - When Clinton administration officials interviewed Gen. Charles C. Krulak for the job of commandant of the Marine Corps in 1995, he recalled today, no one asked for his views on any social issue facing the military. And there were certainly many brewing at the time, including women in combat and the integration of the sexes in boot camp.

And so General Krulak said he was dismayed with the way the two Democratic candidates for president, Vice President Al Gore and former Senator Bill Bradley, had so strongly endorsed allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military.

Mr. Bradley said he would expect his appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to carry out his policy. Mr. Gore went further to say it would be a "litmus test" for any appointee he selected.

Presidents, General Krulak said, have historically selected nominees based on their experience and military expertise, not on their views on political issues - particularly divisive social ones. To do otherwise, he said, "is in my opinion wrong."

"It has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness of gays in the military," said General Krulak, an opponent of allowing homosexuals to serve openly who retired as commandant last year. "It has everything to do with how a commander in chief goes about getting the best officers in the land."

The remarks by Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley - which came during Wednesday's debate in New Hampshire when they were asked if they would support a litmus test for nominees on the issue - have inflamed what is already shaping up as one of the most contentious issues in this year's presidential campaign.

Within the Pentagon, military officers widely and strongly oppose allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly in the armed services, saying their presence would be disruptive in the close quarters of military life, especially in combat.

While both candidates have previously expressed support for allowing gays to serve, General Krulak and other former chiefs said that Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley had crossed a boundary between social politics and military policy, which could undermine what they believe should be an apolitical selection process.

"I regard that as a ridiculous assertion, that that should be a qualification for office," said Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, who served as chief of the Air Force when Mr. Clinton settled on the current "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gays in the military in 1993. "I suppose winning the nation's wars should be the primary qualification."

While most officers say they would follow any president's lawful orders, or resign as a matter of principle, the former chiefs said senior officers needed to feel free to offer the best military advice, even if it contradicted the commander in chief's views.

"The job of the chiefs, and particularly the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is to give the president their best military advice," said Gen. John W. Vessey Jr., who served as chairman under President Ronald Reagan from 1982 to 1985. "To have the president give him the advice beforehand doesn't seem to make a lot of sense - whatever the issue."

The question of homosexuals in the military has roiled the Pentagon in the last decade. As a candidate in 1992, Mr. Clinton said he would end the military's ban and allow homosexuals to serve openly.

Once in office, however, he retreated after Gen. Colin L. Powell, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the chiefs of the other services publicly opposed the policy with a vehemence that some argued came close to insubordination.

Later that year Congress voted - by a veto-proof margin, as Mr. Clinton noted today - to block a complete lifting of the ban and instead to approve the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which allows homosexuals to serve as long as they do not declare that they are gay or engage in homosexual acts, which remain a violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

If elected, Mr. Gore or Mr. Bradley would almost certainly face a renewed political fight over the policy.

Despite the criticism from the former chiefs and from Republican candidates in a debate tonight in New Hampshire, Mr. Gore's aides trumpeted his remarks as a political coup in the fight for the support of the liberal Democrats who often hold sway in primary elections.

Richard Socarides, a former administration official who oversaw gay and lesbian issues for the White House, said Mr. Gore was right to demand

future commanders' support and criticized Mr. Bradley's position as "incredibly naive."

"In order to make this kind of fundamental change in this kind of very static institution, you need someone at the top who believes in it enough to make it a priority," he said. "If you don't have that, as we have not so far, it will not happen."

Aides in Mr. Bradley's camp clarified his views somewhat today.

During the debate, Mr. Bradley suggested that he did not expect appointees to agree with him philosophically but that he would expect them to carry out his policies. "I'm sure that there are people in the military today who don't agree with President Clinton on 50 things," he said.

Today, the aides declined to say whether Mr. Bradley would ask prospective appointees in advance whether they agreed with his position.

"He reserves the right to implement the changes as he sees fit," a spokeswoman, Kristen Ludecke, said. "The bottom line is he would abolish 'don't ask, don't tell.' He would certainly consult with the military community, but then he would expect the military to follow his orders as the commander and chief."

Within the Pentagon, opposition to a loosening of the restrictions on homosexuals remains deeply rooted among junior and senior officers.

General Vessey said that if Mr. Reagan had required a litmus test for candidates for the chiefs in the 1980's, he "would have had pretty slim pickings." General Krulak said Mr. Gore, in particular, could face the same problem today.

"I would say, knowing people who have held the position before and some who serve now, that there are some who would take themselves out of the running rather than submit to such a litmus test," General Krulak said.

Officers on active duty are loath to discuss issues like this, but one active general who spoke on condition of anonymity said Mr. Gore's position could raise legal difficulties. Unless Congress changes the law, the general said, asking a prospective nominee to support a change in the policy would amount to asking him to take a position in violation of current law, something all officers take an oath not to do.

"If this goes through, I think the country would be surprised by the number of officers who would walk," the general said.

When asked today, Mr. Clinton declined to discuss whether a litmus test would be appropriate.

"I'm going to leave the appointment process to the next president," he said.

-----  
The item above is being distributed as a free, non-profit informational service to a limited number of individuals who have expressed interest in

this topic for educational and research purposes only. Please do not redistribute or post copyrighted material anyplace on the Internet accessible to the public without attribution and permission from the author. Please note that distribution of this item does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the content; in fact, often items are distributed as "opposition research."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> ( Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 01:14:42.00

SUBJECT: [399] Online NewsHour Select -- Jan. 7, 2000

TO: Inbox Direct <newshour-d@PBS.ORG> ( Inbox Direct <newshour-d@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

- TMP947214311.htm===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

```
<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en">
<html>
<!-- #BeginTemplate "/Templates/InBox Direct.dwt" -->
<head>
<meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
<meta http-equiv="Keywords" content="NewsHour with Jim Lehrer">
<meta http-equiv="Organization" content="Online NewsHour">
<meta name="GENERATOR" content="Mozilla/4.51 [en] (Win98; U) [Netscape]">
<!-- #BeginEditable "doctitle" -->
<title>Online NewsHour Select -- Jan. 7, 2000</title>
<!-- #EndEditable -->
<script language="JavaScript">
<!--
```

```
function setWhite () {
    if ((navigator.appVersion.charAt(0)==3) && (navigator.appName=='Netscape'))
```

```
{
document.bgColor="#FFFFFF"
document.fgColor="#000000"
document.linkColor="#333366"
}
```

```
}
// -->
```

```
</script>
</head>
```

```
<body text="#222222" bgcolor="#FFFFFF" link="#660000" vlink="#660000">
```

```
<table border=0 cellspacing=0 cellpadding=0 width="500" >
```

```
<tr valign=BOTTOM>
```

```
<td width="234"></td>
```

```
<td width="150"></td>
```

```
<td align=RIGHT nowrap width="69"><!-- #BeginEditable "Date" --><font size=
```

```

-1>Jan.
    7, 2000</font><!-- #EndEditable --></td>
    <td width="5"></td>
    <td width="44"><a href="http://www.pbs.org/" target="_new"></a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="5"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td rowspan="2" width="234" valign="top"><!-- #BeginEditable "globe%20image
" --><a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/military/jan-june00/gays_military_
1-6.html"></a><!--
#EndEditable --></td>
    <td colspan="4" valign="top">
        <center>
            <b><font size="-1">E-mail selections delivered</font></b> <font size="-
1"><br>
            <b>weekdays from web site of</b> <br>
            <b><a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/">The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer<
/a></b>
            <br>
            <b>on <a href="http://www.pbs.org">PBS</a></b></font>
        </center>
    </td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="4" height="236" valign="middle">
        <p><!-- #BeginEditable "Story%202" --><font size="4"><b><a href="http://w
ww.pbs.org/newshour/bb/cyberspace/july-dec99/shopping_12-23.html"><font size="4
"><b>
        </b></font></a></b></font><!-- #EndEditable --> <br>
        <!-- #BeginEditable "Story%202%20blurb" --><a href="http://www.pbs.org/
newshour/bb/law/jan-june00/miranda_1-6.html"><font size="+1"><b>MIRANDA
RIGHTS </b></font></a><b><a href="focus2.html"><font size="4"><b><br>
        </b></font></a></b><b>Is the right to remain silent a Constitutional ri
ght?</b><!-- #EndEditable -->
        <p><!-- #BeginEditable "Story%203%20headline" --><font size="4"><b><font
size="4"><a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/january00/eldercare.html">F
ORUM:
        EXPLORING ELDERCARE</a></font></b></font><!-- #EndEditable --> <b><br>

        <!-- #BeginEditable "story%203%20blurb" -->What do we need to know about
t
        taking care of aging loved ones?<!-- #EndEditable --></b>
        <p>
        <p><b></b> </p>
    </td>
</tr>
<tr>

```

```

    <td colspan="5"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="5"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="5">
        <center>
            <br>
            <font size=-1><a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour">Home</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/search.html">Search</a>
            | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/newshour_index.html">NewsHour Index</a>
            | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/essays-dialogues.html">Essays &amp; Dialogues</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/shields&gigot/political_wrap.html">Shields & Gigot</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/">Forums</a>
            | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/media/">Media Watch</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/health/">Health Spotlight</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/behind_the_scenes.html">Off Camera</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/letters.html">Letters</a>
            | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/on2/">Online NewsHour Extra</a></font>
        </center>
    </td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="5"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="5"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="5"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td width="234">
        <center>
            <a href="http://form.netscape.com/ibd/cgi-bin/ibd-x.cgi"></a>
        </center>
    </td>
</tr>
<tr>
    <td colspan="5">
        <blockquote>
            <center>
                <font size=-1>To subscribe to other quality publications like this on

```

e,  
check out Netscape's <a href="http://form.netscape.com/ibd/cgi-bin/ibd-x.cgi">In-Box  
Direct</a>.</font>  
</center>  
</blockquote>  
</td>  
<td colspan="4">  
<center>  
<b><font color="#660000">The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer</font></b> <br>  
<b><font color="#660000">is funded by:</font></b>  
<p><a href="http://www.admworld.com"></a><a href="http://www.travelers.com"></a>  
</center>  
</td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
<td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
<td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
<td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
<td colspan="5">  
<center>  
<font size=-1>If you would like to terminate your subscription to Online  
e  
NewsHour Select via In-Box Direct, please visit the <a href="http://form.netscape.com/ibd/cgi-bin/ibd-x.cgi" target="\_top">Netscape  
Web site</a>, or send an e-mail to <a href="mailto:mailserv@pbs.org">mailserv@pbs.org</a>  
and in the body of the message type <b>"unsub newshour-d"</b> (without  
quotes).</font>  
<p><font size=-1>© Copyright 1999 MacNeil/Lehrer Productions</font>  
>  
</center>  
</td>  
</tr>  
</table>  
</body>  
<!--  
\*\*\*\*\*

Welcome to Online NewsHour Select, a companion service to The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer delivered daily to you via email. If you are reading this, your email c

lient may not be able to accept HTML email. To unsubscribe, send an email to [mailserv@pbs.org](mailto:mailserv@pbs.org) and in the body of the message type "unsub newshour-d" (without quotes).

A text-only version of Online NewsHour Select is available. To subscribe to it, send a message to [mailserv@pbs.org](mailto:mailserv@pbs.org) and in the body of the message type "sub newshour-pl" (without quotes).

\*\*\*\*\*

--> <!-- #EndTemplate -->  
</html>

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 13:04:01.00

SUBJECT: Transcript of Jim Lehrer NewsHour: Gays in the Military

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

TEXT:

1. JIM LEHRER NEWSHOUR (PBS) Gays in the Military; Margaret Warner discusses with four military officers whether "Don't ask, don't tell" is a good policy for the military, after a background report.

PBS JIM LEHRER NEWSHOUR, January 6, 2000 (Online transcript)  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/military/jan-june00/gays\\_military\\_1-6.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/military/jan-june00/gays_military_1-6.html)  
GAYS IN THE MILITARY

Margaret Warner discusses with four military officers whether "Don't ask, don't tell" is a good policy for the military, after a background report.

Then, participate in an Online Forum on the topic.

Online Forum

What should the U.S. military policy be toward homosexuals?

TOM BEARDEN: The Pentagon's policy on gay service is commonly called "don't ask, don't tell," and has been in effect since 1993. It was the result

of a hard-fought compromise between President Clinton, who had advocated allowing homosexuals to serve openly, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Congress, who opposed it. Congress passed a law rendering such service illegal.

The "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy says: "The Department of Defense will not ask, nor will members be required to reveal their sexual preference. Homosexual orientation is a personal and private matter and will not be questioned during service. However, homosexual conduct is not compatible with military service and will subject a member to discharge from the armed forces."

Provoking the latest round of political debate was the killing of Army Private Barry Winchell at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, last year, and the murder conviction and sentencing of 18-year old Private Calvin Glover last month. Soon after, in New York, Senate candidate and First Lady Hillary Clinton, speaking at a gay rights fund-raiser, said the policy had not worked. A week later, her husband agreed. In a radio interview, Mr. Clinton said the policy was out of whack and, as implemented, does not work. The issue was again raised at last night's presidential campaign forum in New Hampshire.

PANELIST: If you become President will you nominate members of the

Joint  
Chiefs who only support your gay policy? In other words, will it be a  
litmus  
test?

AL GORE: 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 on the position of... on the Joint  
Chiefs,  
to be in agreement with that policy, so yes.

BILL BRADLEY: My sense is that when you're President of the United  
States, military people are loyal to their commander-in-chief, whatever the  
policy is that the commander-in-chief calls for for the country, and that's  
what I expect them to do if I'm President of the United States and we move  
toward gays in the military, which I intend to do.

#### The President Comments

TOM BEARDEN: The President weighed in again today, standing in front of  
the Clintons' new home in New York.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: 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.

TOM BEARDEN: Among Republicans, George W. Bush, John McCain and Steve  
Forbes back the current policy. Their more conservative opponents, Gary  
Bauer

and Alan Keyes, have urged a return to the pre-1993 policy barring gays  
from

serving. Last month, after the Clintons first spoke, Defense Secretary  
William Cohen announced a three-month review of the policy, especially into  
allegations that gays were being singled out for investigation and  
harassment. But former Marine Commandant General Carl Mundy and other  
retired

officers have urged caution, warning that politically inspired changes  
could

provoke a backlash in the all-volunteer military. A recent study of  
professional officers indicated as many as 27 percent would leave the  
service

if gays were allowed to serve openly.

#### Four views on "don't ask, don't tell"

JIM LEHRER: Margaret Warner takes it from there.

MARGARET WARNER: Now, four views on "don't ask, don't tell," and  
whether

the policy needs to be changed. Michelle Benecke is co-executive director  
of

the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. She served in the Army as a  
Captain. Robert Maginnis is senior director of national security and  
foreign

affairs at the Family Research Council. He is a retired Army lieutenant

colonel and was part of the Pentagon's study group that came up with the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Lieutenant General Paul Cerjan is president of Regent University. He retired after 34 years in the Army, where his last post was as president of the National Defense University. And Major General Vance Coleman retired from the Army reserves in 1989; he served as an artillery officer in the Korean War, and he's now director of a community education foundation. Welcome all.

Michelle Benecke, President Clinton, the man who helped certainly spearheaded this policy to start with, now says it doesn't work. Is he right?

MICHELLE BENECKE, Servicemembers Legal Defense Network: This policy doesn't work. He is right. Military leaders continue to ask people about their orientation, to pursue suspected gay members, and to tolerate anti-gay harassment. In the last six years, my organization, Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, has assisted 2,000 military members who are hurt by this law. Harassment increased 120% alone last year in our cases. Discharges have increased 86% under this law.

MARGARET WARNER: This is just for being homosexual.

MICHELLE BENECKE: Right. And the reason discharges have increased is because people facing harassment in the military have no recourse but to leave. And finally, service members are being required to lie, even to their parents, their doctors and their best friends, as a condition of serving our military. No, this policy doesn't work.

MARGARET WARNER: General Cerjan, do you think the policy works?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.), U.S. Army: I think it absolutely works. It's got a few things around the edges that have to be cleaned up to enforce the policy. But let's remember, this is a law. It's not a policy. It was enacted by a Democratic Congress in 1993, and if anybody believes that commanders on the ground spend all their time trying to ferret out people who may be of homosexual orientation, they don't understand what it is to serve in the military today.

MARGARET WARNER: Well, when you say you think it works, what's your evidence? What do you mean it works?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): Well, if you take a look at the comment that Michelle just made about people leaving the service, 86% last year left the service voluntarily by identifying themselves as homosexual. Now, we don't know whether or not they left because they wanted to get out of the service or if they were in fact homosexuals. So, I think there's a little bit of questioning about these statistics.

MICHELLE BENECKE: I want to address that, Margaret, because we do know why they left. Our organization is the only entity that documents what is occurring under this law. And the fact is that our military leaders support those people who harass their fellow soldiers rather than supporting well-meaning officers and NCO's in the field who would rather treat their people fairly. That must end.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Colonel Maginnis....

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): I think that is a totally incorrect allegation.

MARGARET WARNER: Let me get - all right - there are two guests that haven't spoken yet. Colonel Maginnis, Bob Maginnis, do you think it's working?

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.), The Family Research Council: I've consistently said "don't ask, don't tell" since July of 1993 when President Clinton announced that this was the policy, having been inside I said it's not going to work, one day we'll be here declaring that. It causes homosexuals to pretend they aren't homosexuals. It causes the military to pretend it doesn't care about homosexuals serving and it gives the Congressmen a free ride. They don't have to deal with this tough issue. It's time that we return to the question. It's time that we make "don't ask, don't tell" consistent with what the law says that General Cerjan just pointed out.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Let me ask General Coleman, do you think it works?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.), U.S. Army Reserve: No. It absolutely does not work. I disagree with General Cerjan. You know, it's obvious it isn't working. What just happened at Fort Campbell.... the leadership -

MARGARET WARNER: Excuse me. You're talking about the beating death of a....

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): Absolutely. But the leadership was supporting the policy we wouldn't have things like that occurring. We wouldn't have this many people leaving the service as leave now. My guess is that they're leaving out of fear. When you cannot be yourself and you don't know if you're going to be physically damaged or killed, for that matter, because the commanders do not support the policy, it seems to me the thing to do is to run for safety and that is to leave the service. And that's sad when my country comes to that point.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): Margaret we need to be careful about painting the entire military on the terrible problem in one unit. That was a heinous crime committed down there and Glover is going to hopefully spend the rest of his life in jail for that murder. But at the same time we need to recognize nobody denies that homosexuals have served for the last 221 years in the military. It's: under what conditions may they serve? It's been declared because they are cohort that brings in some problems, the military says they're not going to contribute to cohesion and quality force that it demands, Congress agreed, they passed a very compelling law and therefore, just like we discriminate against a whole host of other people, we say that they should not serve openly.

What should be changed?

MARGARET WARNER: Okay. Three out of the four of you don't think it works.

Is there something to make the current policy more workable? Michelle

Benecke.

MICHELLE BENECKE: This law is a double standard and it's wrong. And ultimately Congress needs to replace it with a rule whereby everybody is simply treated the same, but in the meantime the least that the military leaders can do for the safety of our soldiers is to fulfill their promises to stop asking, to stop pursuits and to stop harassment. And to date they have not done so.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. General Cerjan, do you think it needs to be enforced in that way in a better way?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): I think that it's a leadership issue and you will find that commanders, generally speaking, will protect any soldier in the force who is harassed. Now, if you think you're going to continually try to ferret out those who have a homosexual orientation, I think that's exactly wrong. You cannot make a blanket statement that all commanders in the military, the complete cohort of officers and noncommissioned officers spend all their time trying to ferret out homosexuals; that's an incorrect statement.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Let me just get Bob Maginnis and then I'll come to you, General. What do you think, Bob Maginnis, is the way to make this policy work? You've alluded to it, but explain it a little more.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): Well, you know, Mr. Cohen is trying to do an inspection. They've already declared the policy works back in August. And, now they're adding don't harass. I'm afraid-- and I agree, we don't want to harass anyone. Nobody should be harassed. However that's going to chill the whole process. I think we're going to make commanders out there far more timid about initiating investigations. Therefore we have a protected class in the military. And that's not what the law says.

MARGARET WARNER: But what needs to be done?

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): What we need to do is return to the law. Congress has yet to have a single hearing on this issue since 1993. They need to hold the military accountable for what the law says and they need to reimpose the question which they can do based on that law.

MARGARET WARNER: You mean when you're recruited ask if they're gay. If they say they're gay, they're not recruited.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): We're hypocritical. We're saying anybody can come in that we haven't already asked a question on, please come in and you can serve. That includes homosexuals. We ought to stop being hypocritical about this.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. But, just so I understand, because I want to go to General Coleman, you're saying essentially gays should be allowed to serve in the military but only if they're in the closet.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): That's right. That's the condition under which even George Washington adhered to and for the last 220 years.

MARGARET WARNER: Okay. General Coleman, take it away. You think this can be fixed?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): No, I don't think. I think the law, as the General said, should not be there, period. We should go back to what the

Army was as an individual, whether black, white, blonde, blue eyed, gray haired, whatever, if I want to serve, I should be able to serve. And providing that service, I'll have to be able to be what I am. I should not have to pretend that I'm something that I'm not. It seems to me that the Army

is to fight and to win. I remember that from day one -- to fight and to win -- nothing about sexual orientation. So, we can train people to fight and win, no matter what their sexual preference might be, it seems to me that's the bottom line.

MARGARET WARNER: So you agree with both Democratic candidates who would like to see homosexuals able to serve openly?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): Absolutely.

MARGARET WARNER: All right.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): I served openly. I don't know why they shouldn't be able to.

MARGARET WARNER: You mean you as a black man?

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): That's right.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. General Cerjan, what about that?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): First of all I think race is not a choice. Homosexuality is. Having said that, let me talk about the comments made in that last night on the debates. It seems to me that there's a problem here since we're not talking policy, we're talking laws. So the law has to be changed in order for any President to appoint an individual who supports an openly homosexual policy. I think that's something for the lawyers to attend

to in terms of whether or not it's legal to get a chairman of the Joint Chiefs or a person to serve who is in direct contradiction to the law.

Basically, let me make one more comment.

MARGARET WARNER: Please do.

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): It really bothers me that we would spend 30-some odd years educating and training the leadership of this country to move into positions of vast responsibility as the chairman of the Joint Chiefs and chiefs of services to give that military advice to the President when we're about to put our sons and daughters in harm's way and we would eliminate the best and brightest because of a policy that says unless you support an openly gay policy in the military that only addressed 1.5 to 2% of the population does not play to what we're about and that's to win the nation's wars.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): One more comment if I may.

MARGARET WARNER: Yes.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): You know, it could be, General, that maybe the best and the brightest to lead this country to victory just might be gay.

For gays in the military

MARGARET WARNER: All right. Michelle Benecke, make the case for letting gays serve openly.

MICHELLE BENECKE: Gays do serve openly in some units and gays have served

openly in the past. Colonel Kim Meyer is one example; Marine Sergeant Justin

Elzin. Through experience we have learned that when people know other gay people, they lose their stereotypes. And by the way, prejudice shouldn't be a

reason to exclude people in the first place. The real issue is who do we want

in the military? Do we want Barry Winchells, someone who all of the testimony

shows was a dedicated soldier; his unit members took the stand and testified

they would go to combat with him without hesitation. That example, of any, should show that what breaks down unit morale is prejudice and hatred. We shouldn't want to recruit people like the man who killed PFC Barry Winchell.

We should want to recruit fair-minded Americans.

MARGARET WARNER: Bob Maginnis.

LT. COL. ROBERT MAGINNIS (Ret.): We should not make decisions based on hatred or discrimination, but we should make decisions on what is the best interest of the military and the armed forces of this country. You know, right now we recruit people with an eye on building cohesive teams. The cohesion is the glue that holds the units together. It overcomes terror and fear on the battlefield. Very few Americans understand that firsthand. And the reality is if that if you can't overcome that by camaraderie and cohesiveness, the trust and confidence that is built over a lot of time and a

lot of activity, then you're going to have an ineffective unit. The thing that we have discovered destroys that the most comes down to, you know, favoritism, sexual relationships, favoring one over another. We already have

problems where we mix young men and young women, and when we put young homosexuals together, you won't be able to distinguish one from the other.

And then you end up with sort of a problem the Australians and the Brits are

about to have and they try to prosecute all indications of sexual relationships like holding hands between a boy and girl. You know, we have to

focus once again on the importance of military readiness. What is our military all about? It's about preserving peace and fighting wars when it's required.

MICHELLE BENECKE: And Margaret, I would say "don't ask, don't tell" don't

pursue hurts military readiness. It hurts military readiness, because it's harassment and investigations that break down unit morale.

Against gays in the military

MARGARET WARNER: General Cerjan, what's your view on the military cohesion argument and whether letting homosexuals serve openly will affect that?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): Well, I think that across the board, as Colonel Maginnis said, you have a cohesion issue in terms of whether or not soldiers, sailors, airmen, believe in their leaders and whether or not they're willing to go forward when the test comes to walk into the crucible.

So I think the homosexuality issue affects that because, as we found out in so many instances that Michelle brought up, there is harassment out there and

that needs to be stopped. We need to apply an evenhanded policy as the policy

was written. But the thing that bothers me is that when we start taking look

at the readiness of the service and as General Coleman said to fight and defend and win the nation's wars, that means that we have to take every measure we can to insure that we have a combat-ready force.

MARGARET WARNER: But what are you saying exactly?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): Well, we're becoming a social engineering agency and that's not what the military was intended to do.

MARGARET WARNER: I'm sorry, but we're almost out of time. I want to make

sure I understand your point, General. Are you saying because there are straight members of the military who don't like homosexuals or find them distasteful or anathema, or whatever that affects unit cohesion or not?

LT. GEN. PAUL CERJAN (Ret.): I think it does. I absolutely believe it does because you have to believe in your leaders and, you know, this whole idea that you die for your country has been proven to be incorrect. You die for the soldier that sits next to you in the foxhole. And you have to believe

in, and there's a whole bunch of love-trust and understanding about what you're doing in terms of what you're doing in the unit. And so, consequently,

I think it affects unit cohesion.

MARGARET WARNER: All right. General Coleman, address that point.

MAJ. GEN. VANCE COLEMAN (Ret.): I suspect that any differences between individuals could affect unit cohesiveness. Let's not just look at homosexuality. That happens and I saw that when I was a younger officer, it happens with people that just don't like each other. It happens for various reasons, not because of homosexuality. So you can't just use that to say that

affects... you can't have it because it affects unit cohesion. If that were true, then I think a lot of other things that must be eliminated. I didn't like you again because you had red hair, I didn't know you because you were six feet tall or I didn't like you because you were heavy. I didn't like you

because you were different than I am. That was the thing that the integration

between blacks and whites back in the 1950s with President Truman. People had

the same arguments then. We overcame that because we learned to trust and to

respect each other. And I would say to you that prior to the leadership of the Army making homosexuality an issue, it was not an issue. Homosexuals fought side by side with straights. And there was no problem. It became a problem when the leadership made it a problem. General, I agree with you.

It's a leadership problem, not a soldier problem.

MARGARET WARNER: All right, gentlemen and Michelle Benecke, we're going to have to leave it there. Thank you all four very much.

It was the question on gays in the military that proved to be a lightning rod. The Republican view may have been summed up by Steve Forbes, the tycoon publisher, with his comment, "The military is not an

agency for social experimentation."

Other candidates, including Bush and McCain, said they were content with the existing policy.

When asked if he would ban appointing "openly gay" persons to senior military staff positions, Bush said firmly, "How would I know? I don't ask. Someone's sexual orientation is their business."

Religious activist Gary Bauer said he would not want homosexuals in the armed forces and denounced the Democratic stance as "the most idiotic answer I have ever heard." He also charged that the Democrats were pandering to the gay-rights movement.

Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah said he was "sick and tired" of the argument over gays in the military. Complaining that the armed forces were under-equipped and under-financed, Hatch demanded, "Is this all we have to worry about? We should be concerned about getting the best people we can." . . .

The candidates also explored the touchy topic of religion and politics, with Bush asked about his recent announcement that Jesus Christ was the figure he admired most.

"I gave an honest answer," he said. "It doesn't make me better than anyone who thinks differently ... If people don't want to accept this I don't care. It is me. It is who I am."

Asked what his attitude would be given his religious convictions in the Oval Office, Bush said, "I would say 'Dear God, help me in the Oval Office.' "

Bauer chimed in: "So would we."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: US Newswire <stanley@usnewswire.com> ( US Newswire <stanley@usnewswire.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 00:00:26.00

SUBJECT: TV TRACK 01 06

TO: tvtrack@mh.databack.com ( tvtrack@mh.databack.com [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

TV TRACK -- Network TV Headlines From Thursday, January 6, 2000

To: Television Writer

Contact: U.S. Newswire, 202-347-2770

WASHINGTON, Jan. 6 /U.S. Newswire/ -- The following headline summary of evening network news programs for January 6 was prepared by U.S. Newswire. Headlines are in the order that stories appeared on the broadcast and include the name of the correspondent, dateline, and running time.

<STAB>

#### NETWORK TELEVISION NEWS HEADLINES

Copyright U.S. Newswire 2000

Thursday, January 6, 2000

#### ABC World News Tonight

- 1 Traditional Stocks Prosper As Investors Shift From Tech Stocks  
Aaron Brown      New York      2:05
- 2 SEC Charges Internet Stock Analyst With Manipulating Prices  
Bob Jamieson      New York      2:00
- 3 Foreign Car Companies Had Very Good Year In US Market  
Peter Jennings      New York      0:15
- 4 New Zealand Shreds \$1 Billion In Extra Cash Printed For Y2K  
Peter Jennings      New York      0:15
- 5 Bush & McCain Snipe Over Taxes; GOP Debate Tonight  
Peter Jennings      New York      0:25
- 6 Cuban-Americans Protest Return Of Cuban Boy To Father  
Ron Claiborne      Miami      2:15
- 7 Flights Delayed Across Northeast Due To Computer Glitch  
Peter Jennings      New York      0:15
- 8 CDC Says Number Of Legal Abortions At 20-Year Low  
Peter Jennings      New York      0:20
- 9 Braves Pitcher To Get "Evaluation" For Bigoted Comments  
Peter Jennings      New York      0:30
- 10 Employers Increasingly Monitors Workers' On-Line Behavior  
Jack Smith      Rochester, NY      3:05
- 11 Employers Can Access Workers' Medical Data, And Use Them To Fire  
Judy Muller      Los Angeles      2:10
- 12 Defense Secy Says Govt Will Pay For All Soldiers' Housing

|    |                                                            |                     |      |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------|
|    | Peter Jennings                                             | New York            | 0:20 |
| 13 | Navy Retaining Sailors It Would Have Once Kicked Out       |                     |      |
|    | John McWethy                                               | Aboard USS Nicholas | 2:05 |
| 14 | Russian Troops Now Fighting Chechens In Southern Mountains |                     |      |
|    | Peter Jennings                                             | New York            | 0:20 |
| 15 | Yeltsin Celebrates Orthodox Christmas Eve In Jerusalem     |                     |      |
|    | Peter Jennings                                             | New York            | 0:10 |
| 16 | Study Finds Monkeys Understand Numbers And Can Count       |                     |      |
|    | Ned Potter                                                 | New York            | 1:40 |

#### CBS Evening News

|    |                                                                  |                       |      |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------|
| 17 | Flu Virus Widespread, Hitting Hospitals Hard                     |                       |      |
|    | Jim Axelrod                                                      | New York              | 2:15 |
| 18 | Facts About The Flu And What You Should Look For                 |                       |      |
|    | Elizabeth Kaledin                                                | New York              | 2:15 |
| 19 | Flu Epidemic In 1918 Killed Half A Million In US                 |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:15 |
| 20 | NATO Tape Of Accidental Kosovo Missile Launch Was Sped Up        |                       |      |
|    | David Martin                                                     | Washington            | 1:55 |
| 21 | Powell Letter To Gore Accuses Campaign Mgr. Of Playing Race Card |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:45 |
| 22 | McCain & Bush Talk Of Ceasing Attacks But Continue Anyway        |                       |      |
|    | Bill Whitaker                                                    | New Hampshire         | 2:30 |
| 23 | Debate Commission Says There Will Be 3 Debates This Fall         |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:35 |
| 24 | Atlanta Pitcher To Get Psychological Testing For Remarks On Gays |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:25 |
| 25 | Cuban Americans Protest To Keep 6-Year-Old Boy In US             |                       |      |
|    | Byron Pitts                                                      | Miami                 | 1:50 |
| 26 | Abortions Decline To Lowest Level In 20 Years                    |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:20 |
| 27 | Russia Admits Chechen War Not Going As Planned                   |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:25 |
| 28 | Israeli-Syrian Talks Slow But US Is Hopeful                      |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:25 |
| 29 | Israelis Want To Get Out Of Lebanon & Have Plan To Do So         |                       |      |
|    | Richard Roth                                                     | Israel-Lebanon Border | 1:45 |
| 30 | La Nina Driving Force In US Flood Forecast                       |                       |      |
|    | Dan Rather                                                       | New York              | 0:35 |
| 31 | Boy's 911 Call Saved Him & His Dad On Colorado Mountain          |                       |      |
|    | Sandra Hughes                                                    | Los Angeles           | 2:00 |

#### NBC Nightly News

|    |                                                               |            |      |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------|
| 32 | Early Wave Of The Flu Is Hitting Hard Across US               |            |      |
|    | Robert Hager                                                  | Washington | 2:40 |
| 33 | Despite Bad Flu Season, Flu Shot Is Working                   |            |      |
|    | Robert Bazell                                                 | Washington | 2:00 |
| 34 | McCain Denies Helping Contributors Buy TV Station             |            |      |
|    | David Bloom                                                   | Durham, NH | 2:05 |
| 35 | Clintons Spend 1st Night In NY House; He Will Become Resident |            |      |

Brian Williams      New York      1:00  
36 Poll Finds 42 Percent Would Consider Buying An SUV  
Brian Williams      New York      0:25  
37 Car Companies Roll Out New Cars, Including Big SUVs  
Jim Avila      Chicago      3:00  
38 Dozens Arrested As Cuban-Americans Protest Decision On Boy  
Brian Williams      New York      0:25  
39 Videotape Showing NATO Bomb Hitting Serb Train Was Sped Up  
Jim Miklaszewski      Washington      2:15  
40 FBI-Investigated Threats Were Not Above Normal Around Y2K  
Brian Williams      New York      0:30  
41 Profile Of Gov. George W. Bush's Wife Of 2 Decades  
Lisa Myers      Austin, TX      3:10

#### PBS Newshour With Jim Lehrer

42 An Update on the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" Policy  
Tom Bearden      Washington  
43 Experts Explore the Effectiveness of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"  
Margaret Warner      Washington  
44 Highlights from Wednesday Night's Gore-Bradley Debate  
Jim Lehrer      Washington  
45 Experts Discuss the Validity of the Miranda Rights  
Gwen Ifill      Washington  
46 A Look at Companies Who Sell "Hip Hop Fashion" to Young People  
Spencer Michaels      Washington

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

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

<ETAB>

#### Unsubscribe Info

~~~~~  
To UNSUBSCRIBE from this list call U.S. Newswire, 202-347-2770  
Monday-Friday during business hours or send the following email  
message:  
To: majordomo@databack.com  
Subject: (blank)  
Message: UNSUBSCRIBE TVTRACK

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: delivery\_morning@slate.com ( delivery\_morning@slate.com [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 07:46:50.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 7, 2000

TO: robert\_lawrence@Harvard.Edu ( robert\_lawrence@Harvard.Edu [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
delivery\_morning@slate.com  
01/07/2000 12:43 PM GMT

To: Robert Lawrence/FS/KSG@KSG

cc:  
SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 7, 2000

--today's papers: Hooked on Debate--the week/the spin: Cuba Getting  
Junior

---

today's papers

Hooked on Debate

By Scott Shuger

The WP leads with yesterday's announcement by House Republican leaders that they would support a tax cut only one-seventh the size of the \$792 billion cuts package they put forward last year, which was vetoed by President Clinton. The paper quotes Speaker Dennis Hastert opining that there is a tax agreement with the White House in the offing. USAT goes with the feds' new anti-terror measures, including tighter performance standards for the companies that do airport security screenings and a plan to be announced today by Clinton to make government computers safer from attack. Its most novel aspect: a college scholarship program that would give students graduate and undergraduate tuition subsidies in return for post-graduate government service as information technology specialists. The NYT goes with the SEC's report stating that PricewaterhouseCoopers, the world's largest accounting firm, violated the rule prohibiting the firm's partners from having investments in companies it audits. As a result, says the paper, the government will check out the other major accounting firms' compliance. The story seems oversold (by the SEC and by the NYT): The paper reports that nearly half the violations resulted from complications relating to the merger that created the firm, and no examples are given of firm audits that were in any way rendered dubious by prima facie investment conflicts. The LAT leads with the White House decision to continue to delay implementation of the

NAFTA provision opening U.S. highways to Mexican trucks. The paper quotes unnamed senior trade and State Dept. officials explaining that the plan is to ensure that the matter is not resolved while Al Gore is running for president, thus keeping the Teamsters, who vehemently oppose the opening, from abandoning him. With the exception of the WP's fronting of the SEC story, none of the leads makes the others' fronts.

The WP and LAT front last night's GOP presidential candidate debate, which also tops the WSJ front-page news box, but the late metro edition of the NYT stuffs it. According to the coverage, the debates were highlighted by 1) George W. Bush's declaration going his father's famous pledge one better: "This is not only no new taxes. This is tax cuts, so help me God." and 2) Bush and John McCain arguing about campaign finance reform, with McCain defending the compatibility of his reform stance with his recently exposed letter writing to the FCC to force a decision concerning a TV station that one of his major contributors wanted to purchase, and Bush claiming that McCain's reform would "hurt the Republican cause." All six of the GOP debaters came out against open service of gays in the military, contradicting the stance favored the night before by Al Gore and Bill Bradley in their debate.

The papers report that when asked if he would take the mantra "What would Jesus do?" into the Oval Office, Bush replied, "I would take an expression into the Oval Office of, 'Dear God, help me!'" The NYT says Alan Keyes added, "So would we." The WP and LAT attribute the quip to Gary Bauer. The LAT reports that when Keyes criticized McCain for saying he liked Nine Inch Nails, McCain climbed down quickly, saying the band was a "poor choice."

The editorial pages seize on McCain's FCC letters, with the WP saying he "badly overstepped the rules," and the NYT calling the letters "improper." The WSJ says the real scandal is that unelected bureaucrats at the FCC have power over large swaths of the private economy and that the least our elected representatives can do is ride herd on them.

The WP reports in a story inside that the Pentagon disclosed yesterday that the explanation it offered during the Kosovo war of how a passenger train came to be bombed had a flaw. The official explanation at the time, that the U.S. pilot locked onto an empty railroad bridge, and only after that did the train very quickly come onto it, was buttressed by the Pentagon's showing of a nose-cone video. But, says the WP, the Pentagon now admits the video was shown to reporters at three times normal speed. The paper notes that all other bombing videos released to the press during the war were shown at normal speed. The Pentagon insists the speed selection was inadvertent. In other words, they're willing to admit to a mistake in a non-combat zone, when lots of supervisors are involved, with lots of lead-time, and involving simple technology but can't contemplate a mistake when none of these favorable conditions obtain.

The WP and NYT run wire service stories reporting that according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the number of legal abortions in the U.S. (for 1997, the latest year for which data is available) is at its lowest point since 1978. The WP story says that the CDC didn't try to figure out why the drop occurred. The NYT says it did and mentions among the factors "possibly different attitudes about the moral implications of abortion." Will there be more study of this last question by the CDC or is the government afraid to find out and/or publicize a possible result indicating an increasing belief that abortion is immoral?

USAT reefers, and the other papers run inside, Major League Baseball's decision that John Rocker must undergo psychological testing before it decides whether or not to discipline him for his recent disparaging remarks about gays and minorities. Today's Papers thinks this makes sense, since prejudice is a mentally disordered way of looking at the world. And hey, while we're at it, how about psychological testing for Jesse Jackson, Louis Farrakhan and Pat Buchanan?

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>

Moneybox: Weekend Cocktail Chatter

<http://www.slate.com/Code/Moneybox/Moneybox.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4324>

Were the Y2K Preparations in Vain?

<http://www.slate.com/Code/explainer/explainer.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4319>

The McCain Mutiny

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4320>

---

the week/the spin

## Cuba Getting Junior

By Matt Alsdorf and Jodi Kantor

The Immigration and Naturalization Service ruled that Eli n Gonz lez should be reunited with his father in Cuba. Gonz lez's Cuban-American relatives had argued that he should remain in the United States after he was rescued from a shipwreck in which his mother died. Protesters blocked traffic in Miami, and Gonz lez's family promised to appeal the ruling, charging that the INS was giving into blackmail by Castro. INS supporters countered that 1) the ruling was based solely on legal concerns; and 2) the only blackmail was Cuban-Americans' threats of political retribution against the Clinton administration. The INS's spin: He's being reunited with his family. Cuban-Americans' spin: He's being denied a better life in the United States.

Al Gore and Bill Bradley debated in New Hampshire. In their third meeting in a month, they clashed over health care and gun control and agreed on support for gays in the military. But most pundits said personality and leadership--not policy issues--were the true points of contention: Gore deemed Bradley "too intellectually removed" to deal with real-world problems; Bradley charged that Gore was not removed enough from the "Washington bunker" to generate creative solutions. The rosy Democratic spin: The frequent debates help both candidates practice "crisper critiques of one another and more polished defenses of their positions." The gloomy Democratic spin: The constant sparring over character issues makes them both less likable. (Slate's Jacob Weisberg offers his assessment of the debate in "Ballot Box," and William Saletan offers another take in "Frame Game.")

U.S. stock markets plunged. Tuesday's declines were the most severe in more than a year: The Dow Jones industrial average fell 3.2 percent, and the tech-heavy Nasdaq dropped 5.5 percent. Asian and European markets followed suit. The apparent cause: Investors waited for the new tax year to reap profits from recent stock gains. The counterintuitive causes: Wall Street darling Alan Greenspan was nominated for a fourth term as Federal Reserve chairman, and Y2K economic disruptions never surfaced--both of which increase the likelihood that the Fed will raise interest rates. Wall Street shrugged off the decline as a "necessary and expected" correction. Skeptics termed it an indication that investors are "even more confused than usual about what stocks are really worth these days."

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. ("International Papers" sums up the millennium coverage from around the globe.)

Israel and Syria began peace talks. Syria wants to regain control of the Golan Heights, which Israel captured in 1967. Israel wants security guarantees and the restoration of normal diplomatic relations. The initial discussions were deemed "rocky," with each side claiming that the other was not following the agenda. Israel and Syria called the impasse a "crisis" that threatened to derail the entire peace process. Skeptics charged it was manufactured to convince Israeli and Syrian citizens that their representatives bargained hard. The Clinton administration downplayed the dispute, saying 1) no one expected a breakthrough in the talks' first round; and 2) the difficulties show that "the two sides [are] getting into the knotty issues." Separately, Israel and Palestine agreed to a plan for Israeli troop withdrawals from parts of the West Bank.

Florida State won college football's national title. With a 46-29 Sugar Bowl victory over No. 2 Virginia Tech, the undefeated Seminoles became the first team to hold a No.1 Associate Press ranking throughout the entire season. Sportswriters were happy for 1) Florida State receiver Peter Warrick, the undisputed star of the game, who "redeemed" himself after last year's arrest and suspension for theft; 2) Florida State coach Bobby Bowden, who got his first undefeated season and second national championship in 40 years of coaching; and 3) the Virginia Tech players, who "put season-long criticism of their toughness to rest" with a valiant comeback attempt.

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."

Boris Yeltsin resigned. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin became Russia's acting president and is expected to win the presidency by a wide margin in March elections. In his surprise resignation speech, Yeltsin admitted his failings. Pundits agreed he had botched much of his job but also noted his shrewdness in 1) capturing the world's attention on New Year's Eve; 2) cutting his losses before his communism-busting legacy was further tainted by a money-laundering scandal or the war in Chechnya; and 3) designating his likely successor, who has immunized Yeltsin from prosecution.

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.

The Indian hijacking crisis was resolved. The still-unidentified Islamic terrorists released their 155 hostages after India agreed to free three of their jailed comrades. The hijackers were given 10 hours to leave Afghanistan and have presumably vanished into Pakistan. India accused Pakistan of backing the hijacking and giving shelter to the terrorists. Pakistan accused India of playing politics with the hijacking. The rest of the world again worried about a nuclear confrontation between the two countries. The Washington Post denounced Afghanistan and Pakistan for "trying to have it both ways on terrorism. They play host to terrorist groups, yet wax indignant when terrorists hijack an aircraft."

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: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 23:21:28.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.7.00.6

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

TEXT:

1. ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH Editorial: Let them serve
2. ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH Veterans' groups oppose Democratic candidates' position on gays in military
3. ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH Republican candidates debate over gays in military
4. ASSOCIATED PRESS Gore backpedals on comments about gay-positive "litmus test" for Joint Chiefs of Staff appointments
5. SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE Letter: Equality is the issue
6. USA TODAY Travel survey shows gay men and lesbians are a worldly lot

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 7, 2000  
900 N. Tucker Blvd., St. Louis, MO, 63101  
(Fax 314-340-3139 ) (E-MAIL: letters@postnet.com )  
( <http://www.stlnet.com> )  
Editorial: Let them serve  
GAY RIGHTS

The military's "Don't ask, don't tell" policy toward homosexuals has been a failure. Since 1993, gays and lesbians have been allowed to serve in the military as long as they aren't openly gay. President Bill Clinton, the Pentagon and Congress came up with this tortured logic, thinking it would make it easier for gays to serve their country.

Instead, gays are being booted out of the military faster than they were before the policy was put in place. The number of annual discharges increased from 682 in 1993 to 1,149 in 1998. Harassment is more common. Yet, gay soldiers must remain silent because to complain to a superior is tantamount to "telling," and telling means dismissal. That's why Army Pfc. Barry Winchell didn't say a word about his harassment before he was beaten to death by a homophobic soldier last year.

The two Democratic presidential candidates, Vice President Al Gore and former New York Sen. Bill Bradley, have declared that if elected they would throw out that policy and allow gays to serve openly. Both also said they would require their appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully support that policy. That is vital to any possibility of success.

It was the Joint Chiefs, headed by Gen. Colin Powell, who torpedoed President Clinton's effort to tackle the problem by refusing to go along with

his plans to allow gays to serve openly. The military leadership's arguments are familiar. Openly gay soldiers would diminish the military's effectiveness. Straight soldiers wouldn't accept gay compatriots. Morale and group cohesion would suffer.

Those were the same arguments used in the late 1970s and early 1980s to try to keep women out of service academies and cockpits. They were the same arguments against racially integrating the military. A 1942 report to the Secretary of the Navy on the consequences of integrating the service said the service should remain segregated because "the white man will not accept the Negro in a position of authority over him," and "the white man considers that he is of a superior race and will not admit the Negro as an equal."

To accept the military's argument for prohibiting gays in the military is to give in to the demon of discrimination in its latest incarnation: homophobia. It's time to end this absurd policy.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 7, 2000

Veterans' groups oppose Democratic candidates' position on gays in military  
By Timothy J. Burger Of the New York Daily News

WASHINGTON ? Key veterans' groups came out Thursday against a proposal by the two Democratic presidential contenders that Pentagon brass who would serve under them would have to endorse military service by openly gay soldiers.

"We would obviously be opposed in a big way to any litmus test," said Steve Van Buskirk, spokesman for the 1.9 million-member Veterans of Foreign Wars.

"If you're going to have any test at all, it's going to be to their ability to lead and to be a straight shooter on matters affecting readiness," said Steve Thomas of the American Legion, which is 2.8 million strong.

The veterans' organizations and some GOP leaders were reacting to a proposal by Vice President Gore and former New Jersey Sen. Bill Bradley in a Democratic presidential debate in New Hampshire on Wednesday.

Both said they not only favor liberalizing the widely criticized "don't ask, don't tell" policy ? which allows gays to serve without revealing their homosexuality ? but also would require their nominees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to back military service by avowed gays.

GOP Chairman Jim Nicholson ? a West Point graduate and ex-Army Ranger ? said, "The ridiculous litmus test that Al Gore has put forward" would have kept respected ex-Gen. Colin Powell from being chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

President Clinton, speaking to reporters outside the first family's new home in Chappaqua, N.Y., backed Gore and Bradley, but gave a taste of how hard it may be for his successor to open the military to declared homosexuals.

Recalling his own stinging defeat in 1993, Clinton noted, "Congress voted, by a veto-proof majority, against" his proposal to let gays serve if they did not engage in homosexual activity in the military.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 7, 2000

Republican candidates debate over gays in military

By Muriel Dobbin and Tom Hamburger Of McClatchy Newspapers

DURHAM, N.H. ? An unruly Republican presidential debate exploded in anger

Thursday over whether gays should serve openly in the armed forces.

It was one of several topics ? including tax policy, campaign finance reform and conservative values ? that turned the event into the liveliest GOP

encounter yet little more than three weeks from the pivotal New Hampshire primary.

All six candidates took issue with pledges made the previous evening by Bill Bradley and Al Gore during the Democratic debate that they would scrap the existing, "don't ask, don't tell" policy and allow homosexuals to declare their orientation without restraint by senior officers.

The divisive issue has assumed political significance that could resonate

through the general election, with Republicans and Democrats at odds.

It was the most vigorous of a series of lively exchanges that included only a brief flurry over the current problems arising from the disclosure that Sen. John McCain pressured the Federal Communications Commission to reach a decision that ultimately favored one of his campaign contributors.

Not even Bush, currently fighting McCain for the front-runner position in

the New Hampshire primary, took issue with the Arizonan's explanation that all he did was tell the FCC to take action after a two-year delay but didn't

tell them what action to take.

In what Bush sources said was a scripted decision, the governor announced, "I think John's explanation is fine." To the great relief of the

McCain camp, that was the last word on the subject during the hour-long program.

It was the question on gays in the military that proved to be a lightning

rod. The Republican view may have been summed up by Steve Forbes, the tycoon

publisher, with his comment, "The military is not an agency for social experimentation."

Other candidates, including Bush and McCain, said they were content with

the existing policy.

When asked if he would ban appointing "openly gay" persons to senior military staff positions, Bush said firmly, "How would I know? I don't ask.

Someone's sexual orientation is their business."

Religious activist Gary Bauer said he would not want homosexuals in the armed forces and denounced the Democratic stance as "the most idiotic

answer

I have ever heard." He also charged that the Democrats were pandering to the gay-rights movement.

Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah said he was "sick and tired" of the argument over gays in the military. Complaining that the armed forces were under-equipped and under-financed, Hatch demanded, "Is this all we have to worry about? We should be concerned about getting the best people we can."

...

The candidates also explored the touchy topic of religion and politics, with Bush asked about his recent announcement that Jesus Christ was the figure he admired most.

"I gave an honest answer," he said. "It doesn't make me better than anyone who thinks differently ... If people don't want to accept this I don't care. It is me. It is who I am."

Asked what his attitude would be given his religious convictions in the Oval Office, Bush said, "I would say 'Dear God, help me in the Oval Office.'"

Bauer chimed in: "So would we."

Associated Press, January 7, 2000

Gore Backpedals on Gay Policy

DES MOINES, Iowa (AP) ? Vice President Al Gore, under fire from military

brass and some of his own political allies, backpedaled Friday from a statement that he would require his appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to support his policy that gays should be allowed to serve openly in the military.

"What I meant to convey was I would not tolerate, nor would any commander in chief, nor would any president tolerate orders not being followed," he told reporters at a hastily convened news conference after a campaign rally at a Des Moines-area high school.

Gore spoke two days after his original comments at a debate and after two days of dissent from former members of the joint chiefs and from Sen. John Kerry, a Vietnam veteran campaigning for Gore in New Hampshire.

"I did not mean to imply that there should ever be any kind of inquiry into the personal political opinions of officers in the U.S. military," Gore said.

The vice president's remarks Friday evening matched those that that Bill

Bradley gave Wednesday night in New Hampshire, when the two men were asked if

they would use a litmus test for appointments to the joint chiefs agreements that gays should be allowed to serve openly in the military.

Gore said Wednesday: "I would insist before appointing anybody to the joint chiefs of staff that that individual support my policy and yes, I would make that a requirement." Gore has insisted he would allow gays to serve openly in the military.

Bradley, Gore's rival for the Democratic nomination, said that night that a litmus test was unnecessary because military officers follow orders from their commander in chief no matter what.

Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat, was not the only Gore supporter who took issue with the vice president's on remarks Wednesday.

At the high school where Gore campaigned Friday with his daughter Karenn, Carolyn Klein, 59, said such a requirement for the joint chiefs was wrong because people can work together even if they disagree.

"Not everybody agrees with me on my job either," the woman from Pella, Iowa said, adding she thought Gore was spending too much time on the question. "I think that's the least of our issues right now. We have so many problems to work on that he's making too much of that."

Kerry, a decorated Vietnam combat veteran, said Friday that he generally supports allowing gays to serve in the military, but that in some very rare situations, commanders should have flexibility to remove someone from a unit.

"Let's say tomorrow you're at war and you had an immediate mission need," he said. "You're going to have to allow some kind of capacity for people to make those kinds of command judgments."

Another military veteran, Arizona Sen. John McCain, called the Wednesday night pledge by Gore "a disgraceful statement" during a South Carolina GOP debate.

At the Pentagon, the Gore statements on the pledge of support were viewed as campaign talk.

"Candidates for political office are certainly free to do that and must do that in order to explain their views to the American people," said Rear Adm. Craig Quigley, a spokesman for Defense Secretary William Cohen said Thursday. "But I would not speculate as to what that may or may not mean a year from now."

San Francisco Chronicle, January 9, 2000  
901 Mission St., San Francisco, CA, 94103  
(Fax 415-896-1107 ) (E-MAIL: [chronletters@sfgate.com](mailto:chronletters@sfgate.com) )  
( <http://www.sfgate.com> )  
Letter: Equality is the issue

Elaine Elwell writes in her January 3 letter regarding gay partnerships,  
"The bottom-line question is: Do government registered homosexual partnerships have value to the nation equal with that of unions producing the nation?" Excuse me, but that is not the bottom-line question. The bottom-line question is summed up by the very first word she writes in her letter ? equality. The issue here is not cost, but equality. Would she deny wheelchair ramps and other accommodations provided to disabled persons by the Americans With Disabilities Act because they cost more? Would she deny

ethnic minorities the right to an equal quality of education because it cost more than having segregated schools?

And finally, what does she mean by saying homosexual unions don't "produce" the nation? The last I knew, homosexuals held jobs, paid taxes, bought goods and services and served in the military, just like heterosexuals.

? JODY BLOOMQUIST, San Francisco

USA TODAY, January 7, 2000

1000 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA, 22229

(Fax 703-247-3108 ) (E-MAIL: [Editor@usatoday.com](mailto:Editor@usatoday.com) )

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

SURVEY: Gay men, lesbians are a worldly lot

By Gene Sloan

When it comes to travel, gay Americans have "straight" Americans beat by a mile, according to a survey of 2,103 gay men and lesbians by San Francisco-based Community Marketing. The results show that 85% of gay men and lesbians took a vacation in 1999, compared with the national average of 64%, and they spent \$47.3 billion, or about 10% of the travel industry total.

The survey also found that gay travelers were more worldly, since 45% of them ventured overseas vs. the national average of 9%. Behind the differences: Gay travelers have fewer kids, leaving them with more discretionary income for travel, says Community Marketing president Thomas Roth. Complete survey results are available at [www.mark8ing.com](http://www.mark8ing.com).

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> ( Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 04:09:01.00

SUBJECT: NC11688: Wockner Wire #74: Ricky Martin/George Michael lovefest

TO: Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> ( Rex Wockner <rwockner@netcom.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Wockner Wire #74 is online at:

<http://www.planetout.com/wocknerwire/>

Topics this week:

- \* Ricky Martin likes George Michael's smile
- \* Clinton on DADT, coming out, and the Vermont ruling
- \* Liz knighted
- \* Matt Damon is straight and gayness is genetic
- \* Rupert Everett, Y2Gay
- \* Pedro's in love

(The Wockner Wire was formerly called  
The Wockner List and ran on Microsoft's  
Sidewalk.com Web sites.)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> ( Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 20:57:14.00

SUBJECT: [401] Online NewsHour Select -- January 8-10, 2000

TO: Plaintext <newshour-pl@PBS.ORG> ( Plaintext <newshour-pl@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

\*\*\*\*\*

Welcome to Online NewsHour Select,  
e-mail selections delivered weekdays  
from web site of The NewsHour with  
Jim Lehrer on PBS.

\*\*\*\*\*

January 8-10, 2000

**\*DAILY NEWS SUMMARY**

<http://audio.pbs.org:8080/ramgen/newshour/news.rm?altplay=news.rm>

**\*POLITICAL WRAP**

Mark Shields and Paul Gigot discuss this week's presidential debates,  
including candidates' statements about taxes and gays in the military.  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/shields&gigot/january00/sg\\_1-7.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/shields&gigot/january00/sg_1-7.html)

**\*E-AVESDROPPING**

Should your boss be reading the e-mail you send at work?  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/cyberspace/jan-june00/email\\_1-7.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/cyberspace/jan-june00/email_1-7.html)

**\*GAYS IN THE MILITARY**

What should U.S. military policy be for gays in the military? Two  
experts take your questions.  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/january00/gays\\_military.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/january00/gays_military.html)

\*\*\*\*\*

The Online NewsHour (<http://www.pbs.org/newshour>) is part of PBS Online  
(<http://www.pbs.org>) and is the companion Web site of The NewsHour with  
Jim Lehrer. The NewsHour is funded by ADM (<http://www.admworld.com>) and  
Travelers Group (<http://www.travelers.com>), including Salomon Smith  
Barney (<http://www.smithbarney.com/>).

\*\*\*\*\*

If you would like to terminate your subscription to Online NewsHour  
Select send an email to [mailserv@pbs.org](mailto:mailserv@pbs.org) and in the body of the message  
type "unsub newshour-pl" (without quotes).

\*\*\*\*\*

, Copyright 2000 MacNeil/Lehrer Productions

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 14:04:32.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.7.00.3

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

TEXT:

1. MILWAUKEE JOURNAL-SENTINEL Two good letters on same-sex marriage
2. FREDERICKSBURG (VA) FREE LANCE-STAR Love the sinner, hate the sin letter
3. WICHITA EAGLE Caller comments on gays in military and Vermont ruling
4. LEXINGTON HERALD-LEADER Letter: "Don't ask, don't tell" led to murder
5. COLUMBIA (MO) TRIBUNE Letter against same-sex marriage

Journal-Sentinel, Jan. 3, 2000

Box 371, Milwaukee, WI, 53201-0371

(Fax 414-224-5175 ) (E-MAIL: jsedit@onwis.com )

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

Letter: Marriage is union between people who are in love

We are responding to Jeff Waltz's Dec. 30 letter about marriage and homosexual unions in which he said that "the concept of marriage and having children is naturally intertwined" and "marriage is not just about two people." What era is Waltz living in?

Marriage is a union between two people who love each other - heterosexuals or homosexuals - and has never explicitly been meant to imply procreation, as Waltz stated. What about married couples who either choose not to have children or are unable to have them? Does this mean their marriage is invalid?

There are many couples today who do not have children. Many homosexual couples decide to have children either through adoption or artificial insemination, but this has nothing to do with the success of their marriage.

Waltz said that parenting is a "rewarding human experience" and men and women "were biologically created . . . for the purpose of procreation." Unfortunately, we were not "biologically created" for procreation - even with medical assistance - and choose not to adopt, so we will never know the "rewarding human experience" of parenting.

The dictionary states that marriage is a legal union between a man and a

woman. However, this definitely should be changed to allow for homosexual marriages. We feel deeply sorry for Waltz and others who share his beliefs. This thinking belongs in the 19th century - not the 21st.

-- David and Kim Yeghiaian, Milwaukee

Letter: Writer misunderstands human condition

Jeff Waltz obviously has naive views of marriage and he lacks understanding as to the human condition ("Marriage exists to create

children;  
homosexual unions defeat purpose," The Morning Mail, Dec. 30).

Assuming that two people cannot parent simply because they cannot procreate is ridiculous. Infertile parents successfully adopt and raise children every day, all over the world. I am sure these people would love to be informed that marriage and having children are "naturally intertwined," thus invalidating their attempts at child-rearing.

As the term "family" expands to include more situations, an expansion of understanding must follow. It is clearly an expansion taking place without Waltz.

-- Michael O'Connell, Wauwatosa

Free Lance-Star, January 6, 2000

P. O. Box 617, Fredericksburg, VA, 22401

(Fax 703-373-8450 ) (E-MAIL: letters1@flstarweb.com )

Letter: A good Christian cannot look the other way at sin

In the opinion of letter-writer David Pearson Jr. [?Judgmental attitudes

taken by Christians cause fear, hatred,? Jan. 3], I am ?misguided? as a Christian for simply standing by the word of God. True, God will judge every

person; the unsaved will be judged for their sins, and the saved according to

the works which they have done, good or bad.

I would rather offend man with the truth in the hope that he might be saved from the punishment of sin, than offend God by withholding the truth and allowing a soul to spend an eternity in hell, separated from God.

I agree that there are Christians, and those masquerading as such, who are misguided and therefore help to create fear and hatred of many groups, homosexuals in particular. The Rev. Fred Phelps is a prime example.

However,

there are also those with a seemingly gentle spirit, who claim to be in the service of God yet openly parade as allies to the gay cause. I believe

Jesus

referred to these individuals as strangers who entered in the sheepfold not by the gate, but by climbing over a wall.

?Love the sinner, hate the sin? is a biblical concept. Christians are to

speak the truth in love. Yes, homosexuals need to be loved, but what about tolerance? If tolerance is defined as ?looking the other way? or keeping silent?therefore condoning a lifestyle that leads to eternal damnation?then no way.

As a Christian, I know that God cannot bless those who live in open defiance of his word. But God loves each and every person and is patiently waiting, not willing that anyone should perish but that everyone might have eternal life through him.

-- Katrina Willard, Fredericksburg

Wichita Eagle, January 6, 2000

South Kansas Avenue, Wichita, KS, 66603

(E-MAIL: weedit@wichita.infi.net )( "OPINION LINE" - 316-436-1200, then enter 3517)

#### CALLER COMMENT

In response to the comment that hundreds of thousands of men and women didn't die in wars to give rights to homosexuals: It's just the opposite. Those men and women died so everyone would have equal rights under our Constitution. Segregation and discrimination were supposed to have gone out with slavery.

War veterans fought for everyone's rights; that includes homosexuals.

One caller said that the "Clintonesque Vermont Supreme Court" ruled that homosexual lifestyles should be accepted in society. Clinton didn't have anything to do with that decision. He was never elected to office in Vermont.

Herald-Leader, January 6, 2000

100 Midland Avenue, Lexington, KY, 40508

(Fax 606-255-7236 ) (E-MAIL: hleditorial@herald-leader.com )

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

Letter: Military policy responsible for soldier's death

There is no question that the Army's ``Don't ask, don't tell" policy killed Pfc. Barry Winchell. The lack of supervision in the Army killed Winchell. The lack of discipline in the Army killed Winchell.

The parents of Winchell and his killer, Pvt. Calvin Glover, should go to

Washington, D.C., and demand an apology from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

They

should go to retired Gen. Colin Powell's house and demand an apology.

It was Powell who, representing the reactionary elements of the military,

cut the legs from under President Clinton when he tried to end discrimination

against gays in the military. Now the chickens are coming home to roost.

Winchell was a good soldier. He gave Glover a good whipping in a fair fight. Glover refused to take his well-deserved whipping like a man. He chose

to kill Winchell with a baseball bat.

Glover is no demon. He's just a dumb kid. A knucklehead like him can be made into a good soldier or Marine.

If Army policy reflected common decency, Winchell would still be alive and Glover wouldn't be in a military prison. If Army leadership had common sense, this tragedy would not have happened.

Demand that Congress end ``Don't ask, don't tell."

-- Anthony Owens, Louisville

Daily Tribune, January 2, 2000

Box 798, Columbia, MO, 65205

(FAX: 573 815-1701) (E-MAIL: cdteditor@trib.net )

Letter: Benefits to gay couples subsidization of sex

Let me see if I understand your recent editorial: Two gay guys who live together in a "caring, committed relationship" should be entitled to the same

company-offered fringe benefits as a married couple because they're somehow comparable? I don't get it. Why should our society mandate such a thing?

My old college friend, who describes herself as an intentional old maid, now crippled with arthritis, lives with her unmarried schoolteacher sister. Their situation might be defined as a caring and committed relationship. My dad and my divorced 60-year-old brother share a house and will until one of them dies. Presumably, that's a caring, committed relationship. So what's the difference between mandated company fringe benefits for them and your gay couples? Oh, no sex. I guess you've decided that society has a duty to subsidize sexual relationships. If that's not the difference, then why not decide that any two people living together will do? I don't get the reasoning. Seems to me like sex gets enough attention without subsidizing it.

Marriage, on the other hand, needs all the help and encouragement it can get, since it is the basis of any future generations. There are no children except from heterosexual unions, regardless of the gobbledygook that passes for politically correct "thinking" these days, a sort of child-like game of "Let's Pretend."

-- Name withheld upon request

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 08:53:36.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.7.00

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

TEXT:

1. AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL Reader poll results show 83% believe blanket non-discrimination policy better than one that names gay and lesbian students; also, letters from readers about gay students ? including one from the fabulous Purdoms!
2. NEW YORK TIMES Military Officers Riled by Comments on Gay Issue by Gore and Bradley
3. ASSOCIATED PRESS Military Sees Revived Gays Debate
4. FOX NEWS Gay-Murder Suspect Says He Burned Synagogues

American School Board Journal, January 2000  
1680 Duke St., Alexandria, VA 22314  
(Fax: (703) 549-6719) (E-Mail: [szakariya@nsba.org](mailto:szakariya@nsba.org) )  
( <http://www.asbj.com> )

You Say

When gay students are victims of harassment by fellow classmates, should school boards consider passing a policy that specifically forbids harassment and discrimination of homosexual students?

Your answer: No. In fact, 83 percent of the respondents to our November poll say school districts should rely instead on the enforcement of a policy that forbids discrimination or harassment of any student without mentioning gay students specifically.

"We have a tendency to write policy for every instance," says a board member in Pennsylvania. "Discrimination for whatever reason is wrong. We should not single out any group for special treatment, which forces the district to identify and monitor one student or group of students at the expense of the remainder of the student body."

Many of you agree with this sentiment, saying all students deserve equal protection.

"Discrimination policies should not be specific to one area, but should be all-inclusive for any form of discrimination" writes a superintendent in California. "To specify just gay students could send the wrong message to students with regard to other minorities."

Enforcement of antiharassment and antidiscrimination policies must

apply  
to district staff, too, some of you point out.

"A zero-tolerance policy for bullying, harassment, and intimidation is the best answer," says a board member in Maine. "The climate needs to be safe and free from bullying ? by teachers and coaches as well."

That means addressing staff attitudes, adds a board member in California:

"Teachers and administrators can be uncomfortable with the whole idea of gay people. It must start at the top and move quickly down through the ranks so all staff members understand, model, and enforce the antidiscrimination policy."

Only 17 percent of you say antidiscrimination and antiharassment policies should specifically mention gay students.

"Lack of specificity is a loophole we do not need when we're protecting people from harassment," says a reader in South Dakota.

Disagreements over the wording of policies aside, one Indiana school board member sums up the real issue: "Most adults would resign if they were at risk of assault and battery on the job every day. Should we stand by while kids quit school because assault is tolerated by staff?"

Letter: Protect them all

We applaud your November article concerning schools' legal duty to protect gay students from harassment ("I Don't Feel Safe Here Anymore," by Rebecca Jones), because we often get calls from tearful parents whose children are about to give up on school.

You ask whether schools' antidiscrimination policies should specify antigay bias or merely forbid harassment and/or discrimination of any kind. Many school boards choose to be crystal clear, forbidding harassment and discrimination of any kind but also specifying that certain forms of harassment and discrimination are included, such as that based on race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and other categories. This policy makes clear to everyone exactly what will not be tolerated. It is not only the right thing to do, it also best avoids liability. A murky policy does not best prevent harassment, and thus does not best avoid liability.

Beyond the issue of prevention is the issue of meaningful discipline when prevention fails. If student harassers are disciplined under a nonspecific policy, they can legally challenge the discipline because the policy lacks adequate notice of what is prohibited.

Often in the public debate on this issue there will be a cry of "what's next?" ? the suggestion that the list of protection will get longer and longer. Well, all student are entitled to a safe environment that allows them to get a sound education. So if a school has a significant problem with harassment and discrimination against any particular group of children ? actions that make them feel unsafe and interfere with their education ? then that school should consider adding to the list to be crystal clear, no matter how long the list gets.

? David S. Buckel, Staff Attorney, Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., New York, NY

Letter: Roots of violence

Rebecca Jones' article brought up many painful issues from my adolescence. I am now in a same-sex relationship, and although I had no problems before with my sexuality, my high school experience was much the same as some of those in the article.

I am an intelligent person and have tremendous energy. It took my many years to see that. In high school, I was always a nerd, a spaz, a geek, and

a fag. A fag. I had no sexual tendencies back then. I wanted to have a girlfriend. I wanted to go to the prom. I wanted someone to notice that I was special and valuable. I wanted to be loved. Nobody, not even I, could have guessed that I would have ended up in a same-sex relationship; they just

called me a fag to hurt me, to denigrate me, to hit me where it hurt.

I look at what happened at Columbine and I understand. I hate violence in all its forms, but I have been there. I have felt the shame and the helplessness, the sadness and the emptiness. It takes no stretch of the imagination to see how the two boys who murdered at Columbine, who started out as prey for the school bullies, yearned to turn into hunters and killers.

Where were the teachers, the administrators, and the mechanisms that could have prevented Columbine? Why are the strong allowed to subjugate the

smaller, the quieter, and the helpless? The worst part of my experience was

that the faculty was in league with the physical and mental beatings. The attackers were the homecoming kings and queens, the heroes of the football and baseball teams, and the elite of the school clubs and service organizations. The "cream of the high school crop" were allowed free reign to victimize the "freaks, geeks, and nerds," whom they believed contributed nothing to the school or its reputation.

The violence in our schools is preventable. Not only are children dying

in the school violence we see on television; they are dying in a far more insidious manner that we don't see. Hearts, minds, and souls die every day because we are not sensitive or intelligent enough to nurture and protect them. But their bodies, their outer shells live on; and some of these children will become the kind of heartless, thoughtless, and mindless killers

that will strike again in another school. Count on it.

Every person we lose to violence, and every person we lose when a heart breaks, is a crime against humanity. It shouldn't have to take a Matthew Shepard, a James Byrd, or a Columbine High School to awaken us, to end this where its roots often begin ? in our schools. We are losing a war that we can win but don't yet want to. We should know better.

? Carl Martin Ostergaard, Jr., Mendham, NJ

Letter: People of faith

Thank you for your honest, balanced, and mostly thorough story about the

need to protect sexual minority students and the difficulties that a school

board can encounter when attempting to perform what we believe is a moral duty.

We do, however, have two complaints: While Louis P. Sheldon [founder and chairman of the Traditional Family Values Coalition] is a very good choice for representing those who oppose equal rights for sexual minorities, we felt

that the article gave the unfortunate and extremely inaccurate impression that his views were typical of people of faith in general. And while public

opinion obviously matters to elected officials, we live in a country which is

governed by a Constitution that guarantees separation of church and state.

Theological arguments, pro or con, should have no place in determining public

school policy.

? Barbara Lamond Purdom and Christopher Purdom, Coordinators, Interfaith Working Group, Philadelphia, Pa.

Letter: Insults and taunts

Thank you for covering the legal issues surrounding the recent permissive

attitudes toward harassment of students based on sexuality stereotyping.

Here in the Deep South, it is quite common to hear students use insulting terms such as "queer" many times within a few minutes. Most teachers and administrators, even in expensive private schools, tend to ignore such taunts.

It is most regrettable that parents must resort to costly legal actions to provide for safe and professional school environments.

I applaud your courage in finally dealing with this topic in an open manner. It has been neglected far too long.

? J. Leofsky, Montgomery, Ala.

New York Times, January 7, 2000

229 W. 43rd Street, New York, NY, 10036

(Fax 212-556-3622 ) (E-MAIL: [letters@nytimes.com](mailto:letters@nytimes.com) )

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

Officers Riled by Comments on Gay Issue by Gore and Bradley

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON ? When Clinton administration officials interviewed Gen. Charles C. Krulak for the job of commandant of the Marine Corps in 1995, he recalled today, no one asked for his views on any social issue facing the military. And there were certainly many brewing at the time, including women

in combat and the integration of the sexes in boot camp.

And so General Krulak said he was dismayed with the way the two Democratic candidates for president, Vice President Al Gore and former Senator Bill Bradley, had so strongly endorsed allowing homosexuals to serve

openly in the military.

Mr. Bradley said he would expect his appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to carry out his policy. Mr. Gore went further to say it would be a "litmus test" for any appointee he selected.

Presidents, General Krulak said, have historically selected nominees based on their experience and military expertise, not on their views on political issues ? particularly divisive social ones. To do otherwise, he said, "is in my opinion wrong."

"It has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness of gays in the military," said General Krulak, an opponent of allowing homosexuals to serve

openly who retired as commandant last year. "It has everything to do with how a commander in chief goes about getting the best officers in the land."

The remarks by Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley ? which came during Wednesday's debate in New Hampshire when they were asked if they would support a litmus test for nominees on the issue ? have inflamed what is already shaping up as

one of the most contentious issues in this year's presidential campaign.

Within the Pentagon, military officers widely and strongly oppose allowing gay men and lesbians to serve openly in the armed services, saying their presence would be disruptive in the close quarters of military life, especially in combat.

While both candidates have previously expressed support for allowing gays

to serve, General Krulak and other former chiefs said that Mr. Gore and Mr. Bradley had crossed a boundary between social politics and military policy, which could undermine what they believe should be an apolitical selection process.

"I regard that as a ridiculous assertion, that that should be a qualification for office," said Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, who served as chief of the Air Force when Mr. Clinton settled on the current "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gays in the military in 1993. "I suppose winning the nation's wars should be the primary qualification."

While most officers say they would follow any president's lawful orders,

or resign as a matter of principle, the former chiefs said senior officers needed to feel free to offer the best military advice, even if it contradicted the commander in chief's views.

"The job of the chiefs, and particularly the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is to give the president their best military advice," said Gen. John

W. Vessey Jr., who served as chairman under President Ronald Reagan from 1982

to 1985. "To have the president give him the advice beforehand doesn't seem

to make a lot of sense ? whatever the issue."

The question of homosexuals in the military has roiled the Pentagon in the last decade. As a candidate in 1992, Mr. Clinton said he would end the military's ban and allow homosexuals to serve openly.

Once in office, however, he retreated after Gen. Colin L. Powell, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the chiefs of the other services publicly opposed the policy with a vehemence that some argued came close to insubordination.

Later that year Congress voted ? by a veto-proof margin, as Mr. Clinton noted today ? to block a complete lifting of the ban and instead to approve the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which allows homosexuals to serve as long

as they do not declare that they are gay or engage in homosexual acts,

which  
remain a violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

If elected, Mr. Gore or Mr. Bradley would almost certainly face a renewed  
political fight over the policy.

Despite the criticism from the former chiefs and from Republican candidates in a debate tonight in New Hampshire, Mr. Gore's aides trumpeted his remarks as a political coup in the fight for the support of the liberal Democrats who often hold sway in primary elections.

Richard Socarides, a former administration official who oversaw gay and lesbian issues for the White House, said Mr. Gore was right to demand future commanders' support and criticized Mr. Bradley's position as "incredibly naive."

"In order to make this kind of fundamental change in this kind of very static institution, you need someone at the top who believes in it enough to make it a priority," he said. "If you don't have that, as we have not so far, it will not happen."

Aides in Mr. Bradley's camp clarified his views somewhat today.

During the debate, Mr. Bradley suggested that he did not expect appointees to agree with him philosophically but that he would expect them to carry out his policies. "I'm sure that there are people in the military today who don't agree with President Clinton on 50 things," he said.

Today, the aides declined to say whether Mr. Bradley would ask prospective appointees in advance whether they agreed with his position.

"He reserves the right to implement the changes as he sees fit," a spokeswoman, Kristen Ludecke, said. "The bottom line is he would abolish 'don't ask, don't tell.' He would certainly consult with the military community, but then he would expect the military to follow his orders as the commander and chief."

Within the Pentagon, opposition to a loosening of the restrictions on homosexuals remains deeply rooted among junior and senior officers.

General Vessey said that if Mr. Reagan had required a litmus test for candidates for the chiefs in the 1980's, he "would have had pretty slim pickings." General Krulak said Mr. Gore, in particular, could face the same problem today.

"I would say, knowing people who have held the position before and some who serve now, that there are some who would take themselves out of the running rather than submit to such a litmus test," General Krulak said.

Officers on active duty are loath to discuss issues like this, but one active general who spoke on condition of anonymity said Mr. Gore's position could raise legal difficulties. Unless Congress changes the law, the general said, asking a prospective nominee to support a change in the policy would amount to asking him to take a position in violation of current law, something all officers take an oath not to do.

"If this goes through, I think the country would be surprised by the number of officers who would walk," the general said.

When asked today, Mr. Clinton declined to discuss whether a litmus test would be appropriate.

"I'm going to leave the appointment process to the next president," he said.

Associated Press, January 7, 2000

#### Military Sees Revived Gays Debate

WASHINGTON (AP) ? Talk on the Democratic presidential campaign trail about liberalizing the policy on allowing homosexuals to serve in the military is seen from inside the Pentagon as little more than that: talk.

"Candidates for political office are certainly free to do that and must do that in order to explain their views to the American people. But I would not speculate as to what that may or may not mean a year from now," Rear Adm. Craig Quigley, a spokesman for Defense Secretary William Cohen, said Thursday.

Former Sen. Bill Bradley and Vice President Al Gore both had said Wednesday night they would make sure that homosexuals could serve openly. Gore added a new twist, however, when he said he would not nominate anyone to the Joint Chiefs of Staff who did not agree with his position on gays serving.

Gore has criticized the current "don't ask, don't tell" policy, set in law by Congress in 1993, that permits gays and lesbians to serve as long as they don't openly state their sexual preferences.

Presidents don't normally set litmus tests for members of the Joint Chiefs, whose collective opinions are conveyed to the president by the Joint

Chiefs chairman, by law the president's chief military adviser. A president usually takes for granted that the four service chiefs will carry out his orders.

If the next president decided he wanted to change the law on gays in the military, he almost certainly would face the same firestorm of dissent in Congress that greeted President Clinton in the early weeks of his first term.

Clinton entered office saying he wanted gays to be allowed to serve openly, but opposition in Congress and among military leaders left him with no choice but to accept a compromise.

In remarks to reporters Thursday, Clinton said he still believes that gays and lesbians ought to be allowed to serve so long as they obey the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which prohibits homosexual contact.

"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," Clinton said. "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 now."

The Democratic candidates' willingness to loosen strictures on gays in the military drew animated responses Thursday night as the GOP candidates debated.

Gary Bauer said the Democratic stance would further the "radical homosexual agenda," and an Alan Keyes said, "I will return to the ban on homosexuals in the military."

Texas Gov. George W. Bush said, "I'm a don't ask, don't tell man."

Sen. John McCain said the policy could be fine-tuned, but he added, "I cannot change a policy that's working."

Michael Dugan, who was a member of the Joint Chiefs as head of the Air Force until September 1990, said in an interview Thursday that he saw no problem with a president using a litmus test like that suggested by Gore.

On the other hand, Dugan said, military leaders would expect a president to put a high priority on maintaining good order and discipline in the military ? a condition that would be undermined, in Dugan's view, if gays were given special treatment or permitted to flaunt their sexuality in ways that heterosexuals may not.

"If the policy is to allow gays in the military to do whatever they want,

(Gore) is going to go through a lot of senior officers before finding someone" willing to serve on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Dugan said.

As it happens, the next president will have little immediate opportunity to apply any such litmus test anyway, unless he takes the unusual step of firing the service chiefs when he takes office in January 2001.

Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Henry H. Shelton was confirmed by the Senate just last fall to serve until September 2001, and the vice chairman's post would not become vacant until spring 2002 at the earliest.

Of the four service chiefs, Air Force Gen. Michael Ryan is due to leave first, in fall 2001. The Navy's chief, Adm. Jay Johnson, is scheduled to be replaced this summer and his successor would have just begun a four-year term when the next commander-in-chief takes office. The Army chief, Gen. Eric Shinseki, and Marine Corps Commandant Gen. James Jones just started their four-year terms last summer.

Fox News, January 7, 2000

<http://www.foxnews.com/national/010600/arson.sml>

Gay-Murder Suspect Says He Burned Synagogues

SACRAMENTO, Calif. ? A man being held on charges of shooting a gay couple

to death in their bed admitted Thursday that he was also behind June arson attacks on three Sacramento-area synagogues, a local newspaper said.

Benjamin Matthew Williams, 31, told reporters from the Sacramento Bee that he helped execute the June attacks with the help of as many as eight other white supremacists.

But he denied that his younger brother, 29-year-old James Tyler Williams, was involved in the crime.

"It was the state capital," Williams was quoted as saying in a report posted on the Bee's Web site (<http://www.sacbee.com>). "It just seemed to be a good hit."

The older Williams told the Bee in November that he killed Gary Matson and Winfield Mowder on July 1 in their home in Happy Valley, near Redding, because he believed their homosexuality violated the laws of God.

In that interview too, he denied any participation by his younger

brother, who is also being held on two counts of first-degree murder. Prosecutors have said they will seek the death penalty in the case. Both brothers, landscapers from the Redding area, have entered not-guilty pleas.

While neither man has been officially charged with the June 18 arson attacks in Sacramento, they have been investigated in connection with the crime, which destroyed books and caused about \$1 million in damage.

The Bee said Thursday that Williams, in a jailhouse interview, admitted personally assembling the gasoline-and-oil firebombs and personally setting the most extensive blaze, which gutted a large portion of Congregation B'nai

Israel. Other teams of white supremacists acted simultaneously to light the other fires, he said.

"I knew I was crossing the Rubicon. It was the cusp of my life where I was putting my faith in my beliefs," Williams told the Bee, adding that the culprits had agreed to keep their identities hidden from one another.

The Bee said that law enforcement officials were skeptical about portions of Williams' admission, saying that it appeared he was trying to protect his brother from prosecution.

The older brother, who has admitted holding anti-Semitic and white-supremacist views but has no prior criminal record, told the Bee in November he was willing to be executed to become a "Christian martyr" whose death could spur more attacks on Jews, gays and members of other minority groups.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> ( LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 00:26:11.00

SUBJECT: GOP presidential candidates give their views on gays in the military

TO: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu ( queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
New York Times  
January 7, 2000

Following is the text of the Republican presidential candidates debate last night at the Johnson Theater of the University of New Hampshire in Durham, N.H., as recorded by The New York Times:

<snip>

Q. Senator McCain. Last night on this very stage, both Democratic candidates for president said that they would require appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to support allowing gays to openly serve in the military. Would you do the same or would you insist that your appointees oppose allowing gays to openly serve in the military?

MCCAIN. My appointees on the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Q. That's correct.

MCCAIN. I would make sure that a policy that's working and is working and should work was continued. I believe that when people like General Colin Powell and other most respected men in America come up with a policy that does work - yes it has troubles with it, yes if it needs some reviews or changes, fine tuning, and I'll be glad to support such a thing. But, I cannot change a policy that's working. And remember, there's something unique, and that is we give the very lives to hands of the military leaders. And our military leaders are the ones whose advise we should rely on.

Let me say something about God if I could - a little self serving. I'm the only candidate for president who's actually conducted church services. In prison I was named the room chaplain. Not because more religious than any of my fellow cell mates but because I had been to a prep school and to the naval academy and I knew all the services. But we had some wonderful experiences in prison, but one of the sermons that I gave - and I'm a great sermoner as you know that prepared me for public life - is the parable according to when Jesus held up the coin when asked if they should pay taxes. And I said, quoted, render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's, render unto God that which is God.

When I'm in the Oval Office, I obviously have a relation with God but I'm rendering unto Caesar as well.

Q. Gary Bauer. O.K. Gary.

BAUER. This the second debate I've been in today. I had the good fortune at lunch today to run into Vice President Gore and I went over and gave him my good wishes and then I suggested to him that that answer last night was one of the most idiotic answers I've ever heard. This administration -

Q. Which answer?

BAUER. The answer on requiring the Joint Chiefs of Staff to answer the demands of the gay rights movement in order to serve this country.

This administration, Tim, has watched as the Navy went from 600 ships to 325. As we went 18 Army divisions to 10. They've sent men all over the world for dubious reasons. We don't have a missile defense system. We're cutting veterans benefits. And what is Clinton and Gore worried about? Making sure that the gay rights movement is satisfied with who the Joint Chiefs of Staff are.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have one purpose. To keep the United States out of war and if they fail that, to win any war we're getting into. And our party ought to find our voice and say that we will not put that kind of requirement on our military.

Q. Governor Bush, I see your nodding your head. Would you appoint someone to the Joint Chiefs of Staff who openly advocated openly allowing gays to serve in the military?

BUSH. No.

Q. Would you appoint an openly gay person to a senior staff or cabinet position?

BUSH. How would I know. I don't ask. Somebody's sexual orientation is their personal business as far as I'm concerned.

Q. If he or she said, I am gay and proud of it and think that it's an acceptable lifestyle.

BUSH. It depends upon what their politics are Tim. Depends on what their views are. But I agree with John and Gary said about the military. I'm a Don't Ask, Don't Tell man. The purpose of the military is to fight and win war. And to be able to deter war.

KEYES. Excuse me. I keep asking myself where all the conservatives have gone. And I'm sorry but Don't Ask, Don't Tell - a military man, my father was a military guy. One of the nice things about military people is they're straight. It's kind of a what-you-see-is-what-you-get profession. Ask a question, get a straight answer, get the truth, get honesty, get honor. What you see is what you get, doesn't mean dissemble. It doesn't mean don't ask, don't tell. It means stand forward and be what you are. If we think that having homosexuals in the military is bad for discipline, bad for morale, then we ought to stand against it. I know that rank and file

military people do and I pledge as president of the United States that I will return to the ban on homosexuals in the military. And I think that's where we need to be.

RUSSERT. Does anyone agree with Mr. Keyes?

KEYES. Excuse me, I'm not done. You let the other folks, no, you let the other folks finish. Let me finish.

RUSSERT. Mr. Keyes, we've got to share the time.

KEYES. One last point.

RUSSERT. You raised the proposition, let me -

KEYES. I don't think anybody will mind, Mr. Russert.

RUSSERT. Does anybody agree -

KEYES. One last point.

RUSSERT. Let me finish first and then you can come back. Does anyone agree with Mr. Keyes that gays should be banned from the military totally?

MCCAIN. I believe the policy is working today. It is accepted by the military. The military leaders support it and they say that it will work and we have to rely on these people for this kind of advice and counsel.

FORBES. Open gays should not be in the military. The military is not an agency for social experimentation. They have a real mission and they should be allowed to carry it out.

RUSSERT. Go ahead, Mr. Keyes, quickly, please.

KEYES. As I was saying, one last point, because I think that the point just made about social experimentation is exactly correct. But more important than that, I think it's about time we all faced up to the truth. If we accept the radical homosexual agenda, be it in the military or in marriage or in other areas of our lives, we are utterly destroying the concepts of family and sexual and responsibility without which the traditional family cannot survive. We must oppose it in the military. We must oppose it in marriage. We must oppose it if the fundamental institution of our civilization is to survive. And I think those candidates up here unwilling to face that fact and playing games with this issue are doing so irresponsibly at the price of America's moral foundations.

RUSSERT. Thank you, Mr. Keyes. Let me move on to an issue.

HATCH. No, no, don't you move on. I'm going to say a word here.

RUSSERT. Real fast.

HATCH. No, not real fast. I'm going to stay here and take some time myself. Let me tell you something. You know me, Tim.

RUSSERT. I'm paying for this microphone, mister.

HATCH. And I'm taking this microphone, I'll tell you that right now. Let me tell you something, I'm getting sick and tired of this kind of an argument. First of all, our military ought to do what they're supposed to do and that is protect us and our national security interests. And whatever it takes to do that, we ought to do it. Now, I don't care who serves in government, but they got to be at the top level and they got to be the best people we can get. And if they're willing to live within certain moral constraints I think that's fine. But let me tell you something, I will not expect anybody in the military to live any way other than the way I live. I'll set an example in the White House. And that's something we haven't had today. And to be honest with you, that's why the military is falling apart. Since the end of the Cold War our deployment's are up 400 percent. I have to say readiness is down from 68 percent where Reagan got it down to less than 30 percent. Our navy, we used to be 562 ships, there are now 305, and not all of those are seaworthy. Our equipment isn't being maintained. We're not recruiting like we should. We have 15,000 billets at sea unfilled. We've got a lot of problems and it's because of the lack of leadership in the White House and I intend to give you the leadership if you'll give me the chance. I have the experience. I have the record of accomplishment. I have an ability to get both sides together. I've done it time after time for 23 years. Everybody knows it and I think it's time to give me the chance and I hope the people in this country will give me the chance.

<snip>

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> ( Online NewsHour <newshour-inbox@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 23:11:19.00

SUBJECT: [400] Online NewsHour Select -- Jan. 8 - 10, 2000

TO: Inbox Direct <newshour-d@PBS.ORG> ( Inbox Direct <newshour-d@PBS.ORG> [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

- TMP947295324.htm===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

```
<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en">
<html>
<!-- #BeginTemplate "/Templates/InBox Direct.dwt" -->
<head>
<meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
<meta http-equiv="Keywords" content="NewsHour with Jim Lehrer">
<meta http-equiv="Organization" content="Online NewsHour">
<meta name="GENERATOR" content="Mozilla/4.51 [en] (Win98; U) [Netscape]">
<!-- #BeginEditable "doctitle" -->
<title>Online NewsHour Select -- Jan. 8 - 10, 2000</title>
<!-- #EndEditable -->
<script language="JavaScript">
<!--
```

```
function setWhite () {
    if ((navigator.appVersion.charAt(0)==3) && (navigator.appName=='Netscape'))
```

```
{
document.bgColor="#FFFFFF"
document.fgColor="#000000"
document.linkColor="#333366"
}
// -->
```

```
</script>
</head>
<body text="#222222" bgcolor="#FFFFFF" link="#660000" vlink="#660000">
```

```
<table border=0 cellspacing=0 cellpadding=0 width="500" >
<tr valign=BOTTOM>
<td width="234"></td>

<td width="150"></td>
<td align=RIGHT nowrap width="69"><!-- #BeginEditable "Date" --><font size=
```

```

-1>Jan.
      8, 2000</font><!-- #EndEditable --></td>
      <td width="5"></td>
      <td width="44"><a href="http://www.pbs.org/" target="_new"></a></td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td colspan="5"></td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td rowspan="2" width="234" valign="top"><!-- #BeginEditable "globe%20image
" --><a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/shields&gigot/january00/sg_1-7.ht
ml"></a><!-- #EndEditable
--></td>
      <td colspan="4" valign="top">
        <center>
          <b><font size="-1">E-mail selections delivered</font></b> <font size="-
1"><br>
          <b>weekdays from web site of</b> <br>
          <b><a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/">The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer<
/a></b>
          <br>
          <b>on <a href="http://www.pbs.org">PBS</a></b></font>
        </center>
      </td>
    </tr>
    <tr>
      <td colspan="4" height="236" valign="middle">
        <p><!-- #BeginEditable "Story%202" --><font size="4"><b><a href="http://w
ww.pbs.org/newshour/bb/cyberspace/july-dec99/shopping_12-23.html"><font size="4
"><b>
        </b></font></a></b></font><!-- #EndEditable --> <br>
        <!-- #BeginEditable "Story%202%20blurb" --><a href="http://www.pbs.org/
newshour/bb/cyberspace/jan-june00/email_1-7.html"><font size="+1"><b>E-AVESDROP
PING
        </b></font></a><b><a href="focus2.html"><font size="4"><b><br>
        </b></font></a></b><b>Should your boss be reading the e-mail you send

        at work?</b> <!-- #EndEditable -->
        <p><!-- #BeginEditable "Story%203%20headline" --><font size="4"><b><a href=
f="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/january00/gays_military.html">GAYS
        IN THE MILITARY</a></b></font><!-- #EndEditable --> <b><br>
        <!-- #BeginEditable "story%203%20blurb" -->What should the U.S. militar
y
        policy be for gays in the military? Two experts take your questions.<!--
- #EndEditable --></b>
        <p>
        <p><b> </b>
      </td>
    </tr>

```

```
<tr>  
  <td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
  <td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
  <td colspan="5">  
    <center>  
      <br>  
      <font size=-1><a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour">Home</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/search.html">Search</a>  
        | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/newshour_index.html">NewsHour Index</a>  
        | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/essays-dialogues.html">Essays &amp; Dialogues</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/shields&gigot/political_wrap.html">Shields  
          & Gigot</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/forum/">Forums</a>  
        | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/media/">Media Watch</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/health/">Health  
          Spotlight</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/behind_the_scenes.html">Off  
          Camera</a> | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/letters.html">Letters  
</a>  
        | <a href="http://www.pbs.org/newshour/on2/">Online NewsHour Extra</a></font>  
      </center>  
    </td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
  <td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
  <td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
  <td colspan="5"></td>  
</tr>  
<tr>  
  <td width="234">  
    <center>  
      <a href="http://form.netscape.com/ibd/cgi-bin/ibd-x.cgi"></a>  
    </center>  
  </td>  
</tr>
```

e,
   
 check out Netscape's <a href="http://form.netscape.com/ibd/cgi-bin/ibd-x.cgi">In-Box Direct</a>.</font>
   
 </center>
   
 </blockquote>
   
 </td>
   
 <td colspan="4">
   
 <center>
   
 <b><font color="#660000">The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer</font></b> <br>
   
 <b><font color="#660000">is funded by:</font></b>
   
 <p><a href="http://www.admworld.com"></a><a href="http://www.travelers.com"></a>
   
 </center>
   
 </td>
   
 </tr>
   
 <tr>
   
 <td colspan="5"></td>
   
 </tr>
   
 <tr>
   
 <td colspan="5"></td>
   
 </tr>
   
 <tr>
   
 <td colspan="5"></td>
   
 </tr>
   
 <tr>
   
 <td colspan="5">
   
 <center>
   
 <font size=-1>If you would like to terminate your subscription to Online NewsHour Select via In-Box Direct, please visit the <a href="http://form.netscape.com/ibd/cgi-bin/ibd-x.cgi" target="\_top">Netscape Web site</a>, or send an e-mail to <a href="mailto:mailserv@pbs.org">mailserv@pbs.org</a> and in the body of the message type <b>"unsub newshour-d"</b> (without quotes).</font>
   
 <p><font size=-1>© Copyright 1999 MacNeil/Lehrer Productions</font>
   
 >
   
 </center>
   
 </td>
   
 </tr>
   
 </table>
   
 </body>
   
 <!--
   
 \*\*\*\*\*
   
 Welcome to Online NewsHour Select, a companion service to The NewsHour with Jim

Lehrer delivered daily to you via email. If you are reading this, your email client may not be able to accept HTML email. To unsubscribe, send an email to [mailserv@pbs.org](mailto:mailserv@pbs.org) and in the body of the message type "unsub newshour-d" (without quotes).

A text-only version of Online NewsHour Select is available. To subscribe to it, send a message to [mailserv@pbs.org](mailto:mailserv@pbs.org) and in the body of the message type "sub newshour-pl" (without quotes).

\*\*\*\*\*

--> <!-- #EndTemplate -->

</html>

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> ( LGBT Activists List <Doug.Case@sdsu.edu> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 00:26:12.00

SUBJECT: Clinton says hard to change military gay policy

TO: queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu ( queerpolitics@abacus.oxy.edu [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Reuters, January 6, 2000

Clinton says hard to change military gay policy

By Deborah Charles

CHAPPAQUA, New York (Reuters) □ President Bill Clinton said on Thursday the next president will need Congress's consent to let homosexuals serve openly in the military, despite vows to overturn current policy by the Democrats seeking his job.

"I believe that the next president, if he wants to change the policy, will have to get the Congress to change the law," Clinton told reporters.

Clinton spoke outside his new house in the New York City suburbs after he

and first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton spent their first night there.

During a Democratic presidential campaign debate on Wednesday night in New Hampshire, Vice President Al Gore and former New Jersey Sen. Bill Bradley both said they would seek to overturn the present "don't-ask-don't-tell" policy.

Critics say the policy has led to an unintended increase in expulsions of

gay and lesbian soldiers. Clinton in December acknowledged that the policy was not working as intended, after Mrs. Clinton, who is running for U.S. Senate seat from New York, called for its elimination.

The current policy was adopted by Congress and signed by Clinton in November 1993 after Clinton's proposal to end a military ban on homosexuals drew heated objections from Congress and top military officials.

Under the policy, gays and lesbians can still be expelled for conduct including declaring their sexual orientation, but the military is not allowed

to ask recruits about their orientation.

Gore said he would follow the example of former President Harry Truman, who used presidential order to bring about racial desegregation of the military after World War II.

Gore and Bradley both said they would not appoint top military chiefs who

were unable to support ending the ban on gays and lesbians.

However, Clinton said, Congress had made it harder to follow Truman's example, by writing the "don't-ask, don't tell policy" into law, after voting heavily against ending the ban on homosexuals.

"I don't think that the military and the president have the authority to

do it (change the policy)," Clinton said.

Clinton said he would try during his remaining year in office to make the current policy work as intended. He predicted that changes announced last August by Defence Secretary William Cohen "will significantly improve the present situation over the next few months."

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Slate Magazine <delivery\_morning@slate.com> ( Slate Magazine <delivery\_morning@slate.com> [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-2000 07:40:36.00

SUBJECT: SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 7, 2000

TO: msievert@nsf.gov ( msievert@nsf.gov [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

> -----

> From: Slate Magazine[SMTP:DELIVERY\_MORNING@SLATE.COM]

> Sent: Friday, January 07, 2000 7:33:29 AM

> To: msievert@nsf.gov

> Subject: SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 7, 2000

> Auto forwarded by a Rule

>

SLATE NEWS: Fri., Jan. 7, 2000

--today's papers: Hooked on Debate

--the week/the spin: Cuba Getting Junior

---

today's papers

Hooked on Debate

By Scott Shuger

The WP leads with yesterday's announcement by House Republican leaders that they would support a tax cut only one-seventh the size of the \$792 billion cuts package they put forward last year, which was vetoed by President Clinton. The paper quotes Speaker Dennis Hastert opining that there is a tax agreement with the White House in the offing. USAT goes with the feds' new anti-terror measures, including tighter performance standards for the companies that do airport security screenings and a plan to be announced today by Clinton to make government computers safer from attack. Its most novel aspect: a college scholarship program that would give students graduate and undergraduate tuition subsidies in return for post-graduate government service as information technology specialists. The NYT goes with the SEC's report stating that PricewaterhouseCoopers, the world's largest accounting firm, violated the rule prohibiting the firm's partners from having investments in companies it audits. As a result, says the paper, the government will check out the other major accounting firms' compliance. The story seems oversold (by the SEC and by the NYT): The paper reports that nearly half the violations resulted from

complications relating to the merger that created the firm, and no examples are given of firm audits that were in any way rendered dubious by prima facie investment conflicts. The LAT leads with the White House decision to continue to delay implementation of the NAFTA provision opening U.S. highways to Mexican trucks. The paper quotes unnamed senior trade and State Dept. officials explaining that the plan is to ensure that the matter is not resolved while Al Gore is running for president, thus keeping the Teamsters, who vehemently oppose the opening, from abandoning him. With the exception of the WP's fronting of the SEC story, none of the leads makes the others' fronts.

The WP and LAT front last night's GOP presidential candidate debate, which also tops the WSJ front-page news box, but the late metro edition of the NYT stuffs it. According to the coverage, the debates were highlighted by 1) George W. Bush's declaration going his father's famous pledge one better: "This is not only no new taxes. This is tax cuts, so help me God." and 2) Bush and John McCain arguing about campaign finance reform, with McCain defending the compatibility of his reform stance with his recently exposed letter writing to the FCC to force a decision concerning a TV station that one of his major contributors wanted to purchase, and Bush claiming that McCain's reform would "hurt the Republican cause." All six of the GOP debaters came out against open service of gays in the military, contradicting the stance favored the night before by Al Gore and Bill Bradley in their debate.

The papers report that when asked if he would take the mantra "What would Jesus do?" into the Oval Office, Bush replied, "I would take an expression into the Oval Office of, 'Dear God, help me!'" The NYT says Alan Keyes added, "So would we." The WP and LAT attribute the quip to Gary Bauer. The LAT reports that when Keyes criticized McCain for saying he liked Nine Inch Nails, McCain climbed down quickly, saying the band was a "poor choice."

The editorial pages seize on McCain's FCC letters, with the WP saying he "badly overstepped the rules," and the NYT calling the letters "improper." The WSJ says the real scandal is that unelected bureaucrats at the FCC have power over large swaths of the private economy and that the least our elected representatives can do is ride herd on them.

The WP reports in a story inside that the Pentagon disclosed yesterday that the explanation it offered during the Kosovo war of how a passenger train came to be bombed had a flaw. The official explanation at the time, that the U.S. pilot locked onto an empty railroad bridge, and only after that did the train very quickly come onto it, was buttressed by the Pentagon's showing of a nose-cone video. But, says the WP, the Pentagon now admits the video was shown to reporters at three times normal speed. The paper notes that all other bombing videos released to the press during the war were shown at normal speed. The Pentagon insists the speed selection was inadvertent. In other words, they're willing to admit to a mistake in a non-combat zone, when lots of supervisors are

involved, with lots of lead-time, and involving simple technology but can't contemplate a mistake when none of these favorable conditions obtain.

The WP and NYT run wire service stories reporting that according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the number of legal abortions in the U.S. (for 1997, the latest year for which data is available) is at its lowest point since 1978. The WP story says that the CDC didn't try to figure out why the drop occurred. The NYT says it did and mentions among the factors "possibly different attitudes about the moral implications of abortion." Will there be more study of this last question by the CDC or is the government afraid to find out and/or publicize a possible result indicating an increasing belief that abortion is immoral?

USAT reefers, and the other papers run inside, Major League Baseball's decision that John Rocker must undergo psychological testing before it decides whether or not to discipline him for his recent disparaging remarks about gays and minorities. Today's Papers thinks this makes sense, since prejudice is a mentally disordered way of looking at the world. And hey, while we're at it, how about psychological testing for Jesse Jackson, Louis Farrakhan and Pat Buchanan?

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>

Moneybox: Weekend Cocktail Chatter

<http://www.slate.com/Code/Moneybox/Moneybox.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4324>

Were the Y2K Preparations in Vain?

<http://www.slate.com/Code/explainer/explainer.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=431>

9

The McCain Mutiny

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/6/00&idMessage=4>

320

---

the week/the spin

## Cuba Getting Junior

By Matt Alsdorf and Jodi Kantor

The Immigration and Naturalization Service ruled that Elián González should be reunited with his father in Cuba. González's Cuban-American relatives had argued that he should remain in the United States after he was rescued from a shipwreck in which his mother died. Protesters blocked traffic in Miami, and González's family promised to appeal the ruling, charging that the INS was giving into blackmail by Castro. INS supporters countered that 1) the ruling was based solely on legal concerns; and 2) the only blackmail was Cuban-Americans' threats of political retribution against the Clinton administration. The INS's spin: He's being reunited with his family. Cuban-Americans' spin: He's being denied a better life in the United States.

Al Gore and Bill Bradley debated in New Hampshire. In their third meeting in a month, they clashed over health care and gun control and agreed on support for gays in the military. But most pundits said personality and leadership--not policy issues--were the true points of contention: Gore deemed Bradley "too intellectually removed" to deal with real-world problems; Bradley charged that Gore was not removed enough from the "Washington bunker" to generate creative solutions. The rosy Democratic spin: The frequent debates help both candidates practice "crisper critiques of one another and more polished defenses of their positions." The gloomy Democratic spin: The constant sparring over character issues makes them both less likable. (Slate's Jacob Weisberg offers his assessment of the debate in "Ballot Box," and William Saletan offers another take in "Frame Game.")

U.S. stock markets plunged. Tuesday's declines were the most severe in more than a year: The Dow Jones industrial average fell 3.2 percent, and the tech-heavy Nasdaq dropped 5.5 percent. Asian and European markets followed suit. The apparent cause: Investors waited for the new tax year to reap profits from recent stock gains. The counterintuitive causes: Wall Street darling Alan Greenspan was nominated for a fourth term as Federal Reserve chairman, and Y2K economic disruptions never surfaced--both of which increase the likelihood that the Fed will raise interest rates. Wall Street shrugged off the decline as a "necessary and expected" correction. Skeptics termed it an indication that investors are "even more confused than usual about what stocks are really worth these days."

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. ("International Papers" sums up the millennium coverage from around the globe.)

Israel and Syria began peace talks. Syria wants to regain control of the Golan Heights, which Israel captured in 1967. Israel wants security guarantees and the restoration of normal diplomatic relations. The initial discussions were deemed "rocky," with each side claiming that the other was not following the agenda. Israel and Syria called the impasse a "crisis" that threatened to derail the entire peace process. Skeptics charged it was manufactured to convince Israeli and Syrian citizens that their representatives bargained hard. The Clinton administration downplayed the dispute, saying 1) no one expected a breakthrough in the talks' first round; and 2) the difficulties show that "the two sides [are] getting into the knotty issues." Separately, Israel and Palestine agreed to a plan for Israeli troop withdrawals from parts of the West Bank.

Florida State won college football's national title. With a 46-29 Sugar Bowl victory over No. 2 Virginia Tech, the undefeated Seminoles became the first team to hold a No. 1 Associated Press ranking throughout the entire season. Sportswriters were happy for 1) Florida State receiver Peter Warrick, the undisputed star of the game, who "redeemed" himself after last year's arrest and suspension for theft; 2) Florida State coach Bobby Bowden, who got his first undefeated season and second national championship in 40 years of coaching; and 3) the Virginia Tech players, who "put season-long criticism of their toughness to rest" with a valiant comeback attempt.

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."

Boris Yeltsin resigned. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin became Russia's acting president and is expected to win the presidency by a wide margin in March elections. In his surprise resignation speech, Yeltsin admitted his failings. Pundits agreed he had botched much of his job but also noted his shrewdness in 1) capturing the world's attention on New Year's Eve; 2) cutting his losses before his communism-busting legacy was further tainted by a money-laundering scandal or the war in Chechnya; and 3) designating his likely successor, who has immunized Yeltsin from prosecution.

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.

The Indian hijacking crisis was resolved. The still-unidentified Islamic terrorists released their 155 hostages after India agreed to free three of their jailed comrades. The hijackers were given 10 hours to leave Afghanistan and have presumably vanished into Pakistan. India accused Pakistan of backing the hijacking and giving shelter to the terrorists. Pakistan accused India of playing politics with the hijacking. The rest of the world again worried about a nuclear confrontation between the two countries. The Washington Post denounced Afghanistan and Pakistan for "trying to have it both ways on terrorism. They play host to terrorist groups, yet wax indignant when terrorists hijack an aircraft."

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: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-JAN-2000 20:22:25.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.8.00.5

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

TEXT:

1. CONTRA COSTA TIMES Letter: Christ didn't exclude gays from humanity
2. VALLEY TIMES (CA) Letter: Don't give small group special rights
3. PORTLAND (ME) PRESS HERALD Maine's Gov. Angus King insists on popular vote on gay rights rather than law passed by legislature
4. PORTLAND PRESS HERALD Editorial: Mainers should vote on civil rights proposal; Church endorsement of civil rights for gay and lesbian citizens doesn't negate the need for a vote.
5. ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH Military Matters column: Reality of military life means fairness for gays takes back seat

Contra Costa Times, January 7, 2000  
Box 5088, Walnut Creek, CA, 94596  
(Fax 925-933-0239 )  
(Online mailer: [http://www.hotcoco.com/contact\\_us/letters.htm](http://www.hotcoco.com/contact_us/letters.htm) )  
( <http://www.hotcoco.com> )

Letter: Christ didn't exclude gays from humanity

In his letter, Steven Leininger denounces the so-called "gay agenda" while trying to convince readers that discrimination is good and moral. He feels that "God and decency" are "bad words" in Davis, because the school board will no longer allow the Boy Scouts to recruit in schools there.

Leininger angrily refers to "deviancy." He forgets that many Americans feel that intolerance and prejudice are deviant.

Christ told us to treat others as we wish to be treated. He did not exclude homosexuals from this commandment, thereby magically excusing the Boy Scouts. To ignore this commandment is to condone immoral behavior.

Although I'd have to agree that the Boy Scouts do many good things, promoting anti-gay bigotry is not one of them. Labeling such an action as "virtuous" and "good" does not make it so. To support an organization that excludes Americans for something they cannot change is to support bigotry. Bigotry and prejudice are not good things, they are evil.

While the Boy Scouts promote the immorality of prejudice and discrimination, they should be banned from recruiting in all schools.

When they stop reinforcing hatred against other Americans, they should be welcomed back.

? John Michael Blair, Clayton

Valley Times, January 8, 1900 [that's what it says]  
P. O. Box 607, Pleasanton, CA, 94566

(Fax 510-847-2177 )

(Online Mailer: [http://www.hotcoco.com/contact\\_us/letters.htm](http://www.hotcoco.com/contact_us/letters.htm) )

Letter: Don't give small group special rights

Re: Paul O'Kane's letter regarding most Californians' opposition to gay marriage. The Constitution does protect the rights of all people. What many oppose is giving a minority group special rights based on sexual orientation.

Last time I checked we had a representative system of government.

Granted, we must always be sure the majority doesn't squash the minority,

but we can't let a small group of people dictate policy either.

To attack Sen. Pete Knight for authoring an initiative to "target a group

of people and say they are unequal" is absurd. Knight is trying to protect something he believes is threatened. When did standing up for your convictions become a crime? When did that become the basis for fostering "fear and ignorance" that "perpetuate events such as the Holocaust"?

The fact that Knight has a gay son and still authored the initiative demonstrates that he does not allow his son's personal life to dictate his actions. To accuse him of forsaking his son while throwing in an anti-Christian remark is ridiculous.

Christian love is not making everyone feel good about themselves. It's not about building self-esteem or being sure not to offend anyone. It is not

blind love that ignores the behavior and actions of those around us.

Christian love means telling the truth about and proclaiming Jesus Christ.

Jesus taught to hate the sin, not the sinner, but he also stated quite clearly what is right and what is wrong. As a Christian I must act accordingly.

? David Browning, Livermore

Portland Press Herald, January 6, 2000

Box 1460, Portland, ME, 04101

(Fax 207-791-6924) (E-MAIL: [letters@portland.com](mailto:letters@portland.com) )

( <http://www.portland.com/news/news.shtml> )

King: Put Gay Rights on Ballot

Bypassing voters with legislation could set the bill up for another "people's

veto," the governor warns.

By PAUL CARRIER Staff Writer

Gov. Angus King has strongly criticized recent suggestions that the Legislature should try to put a gay-rights law on the books instead of sending the issue to the voters.

King, who supports gay rights, stopped short of pledging to veto a "no referendum" gay-rights bill when asked about it Wednesday. But he said it would be "a mistake both strategically and in principle" for the Legislature to enact a gay-rights law on its own, without voter approval.

The procedural issue arose Tuesday when the Roman Catholic Diocese of Portland, which sat out an earlier attempt to pass a gay-rights law, announced that it is backing a compromise bill the Legislature will take up this year.

The bill calls for a binding referendum to decide the issue, but some supporters hinted Tuesday that they may ask the Legislature to enact a gay-rights law outright.

King said Wednesday he believes the Legislature should place the issue on the November ballot, in part because voters vetoed an earlier gay-rights law during a referendum in February 1998. If a policy set by voters is to be changed, King said, then lawmakers should let the voters decide instead of presuming to make the decision for them.

He said there is "a principle here that is important to maintain" and that it would be a mistake "to have the Legislature overturn something that the people said within the last two years." To do so, he said, would give opponents political ammunition to argue that the Legislature was ignoring the will of the people.

King also noted that opponents have promised to launch another "people's veto" referendum if a gay-rights bill passes. Opponents collected enough voters' signatures to force the 1998 referendum, in which voters killed the earlier law.

"Passing a bill without a referendum clause that ended up going to the people and being repealed again would be a disaster," said King. "I want it to stick," he said of the gay-rights bill, and he said the best way to do that is to send the issue to the voters to "get it resolved once and for all."

Another referendum defeat, he said, "would be a tremendous setback" that might block passage of a gay-rights law for another decade.

King said voters probably would approve a law this November if the Legislature asked them to because the coming presidential election guarantees a much higher turnout than was the case with the special election in which the earlier law was repealed.

Only about 30 percent of adult Mainers cast ballots in that single-issue election, fueling speculation that the outcome was skewed because gay-rights opponents flocked to the polls, while moderates and liberals didn't.

In the wake of King's comments and opponents' threats to force a referendum, some gay-rights supporters acknowledged Wednesday that they may have to stick to the original plan.

"I think he's being practical," Republican Sen. Joel Abromson of Portland, sponsor of the gay-rights bill, said of King.

Another supporter, Democratic Rep. Richard Thompson of Naples, who co-chairs the legislative committee that will consider the bill, said the Legislature "should send it out to referendum and resolve everything. If it's done that way, there's no second guessing the Legislature or the end result."

? Staff Writer Paul Carrier can be contacted at 622-7511 or at: [pcarrier@pressherald.com](mailto:pcarrier@pressherald.com)

Portland Press Herald, January 6, 2000

Editorial: Mainers should vote on civil rights proposal

Church endorsement of civil rights for gay and lesbian citizens doesn't negate the need for a vote.

That leading proponents of a law protecting the civil rights of gay and lesbian citizens have reached an accommodation with the Roman Catholic Diocese of Portland offers hope to the cause of fairness in Maine.

For too long homosexual men and women in Maine have lacked statewide protection from discrimination in the areas of employment, public accommodations, housing and credit. The agreement reached with the diocese would provide that protection while not forcing the church to repudiate its teachings with respect to sex outside of marriage.

Under the revisions, church-affiliated hospitals and other organizations receiving state funds cannot discriminate against employees on the basis of sexual orientation, though they are still free to disapprove of any sex between unmarried people. The revisions also spell out that the law won't create job quotas or provide employer benefits to unmarried domestic partners.

The agreement with the diocese puts the church where it belongs: opposing discrimination. What this agreement should not do, however, is foster hubris on the part of civil rights proponents. Soon after it was announced, there was some discussion that the Legislature ought to enact a new civil rights law without sending it to the people for a vote in November.

Given that Mainers rejected such a law in a February 1998 vote, it is vital that further attempts to put civil rights protections for gay and lesbian people on the books be approved in a referendum.

This is not to say that civil rights issues should always be left to the will of the majority, but a pragmatic reading of the current situation strongly suggests a statewide vote is the better course. If the law were passed without the benefit of such a vote, opponents would collect the signatures needed to force it back on the ballot.

Civil rights advocates will have to campaign for the law in any event. Not agreeing up front to put the law on the ballot risks a backlash from voters who might feel their wishes were ignored.

A good, fair compromise has been struck. Mainers will see that, and approve civil rights protections for gay and lesbian citizens this November.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 8, 2000

900 N. Tucker Blvd., St. Louis, MO, 63101

(Fax 314-340-3139 ) (E-MAIL: letters@postnet.com )

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

Reality of military life means fairness for gays takes back seat

Military Matters Column

By Harry Levins

The barracks murder of a homosexual soldier has reheated the debate about

"don't ask, don't tell." The ruckus has even prompted second thoughts from the purveyor of the policy, President Bill Clinton.

The consensus holds that "don't ask, don't tell" is fatally flawed ?

that  
patriotic homosexuals should be allowed to serve without hiding their  
orientation. It's a matter of fairness, we're told.

What's open to question is whether fairness is the issue here.

Consider that nobody has a right to serve in the armed forces. The  
armed  
forces discriminate regularly. They'll turn you away if you're too old,  
too  
young, too fat, too dumb. You're a felon who paid your debt to society?  
Sorry. You're a kid with a bum eye who's yearning to follow your father  
into  
the Marine Corps? Sorry.

The courts have consistently deferred to the armed forces as the best  
judges of how to defend society. After all, at bottom, the armed forces  
are  
about life and death. Alone in our society, they have a warrant to kill  
people and break things.

Given those grim realities, the courts have left decisions on  
eligibility  
to the armed forces ? and to Congress, which sets the rules and regulations  
for people in uniform.

In 1993, when Congress OK'd "don't ask, don't tell," it did so through  
a  
law that states flatly, "Homosexuality is incompatible with military  
service."

Why do the armed forces feel that way? Two reasons, mainly.

Military people call the first "small-unit cohesion." You and I call  
it  
"male bonding," of the nonsexual sort. To prevail in combat, soldiers must  
have trust and faith in one another. Sexual tension corrodes faith and  
trust, which is a big reason why women have been barred from infantry  
squad  
squad  
and tank crews ? so far, anyway.

The second reason is a simple respect for what little privacy soldiers  
enjoy. Soldiers do more than work together. They eat, sleep, shower and  
shave together.

I sampled this togetherness in September in Kosovo, where I lived in a  
tent with a dozen Navy Seabees. We showered in a group in a big tent with  
no  
partitions. That shower tent drove home "don't ask, don't tell" to me.

But I suspect that few of the people writing the op-ed pieces or  
appearing on the cable TV talk shows have had that shower-tent experience,  
or  
any experience with the armed forces.

That's the way of it these days. Fewer and fewer of us have served in  
the armed forces. When something like the issue of homosexuality arises,  
we  
react as civilians ? as fair-minded Americans, loath to discriminate  
against  
anybody.

The fair-minded critics like to point out that other armies have  
integrated homosexuals with few problems. They usually cite the Dutch as  
an  
example.

That's fine for those who want the Dutch army as a model for our own. Few American officers do. Gays aside, the Dutch army is tiny and hardly a force in world affairs ? a good thing, given its reputation as a slack and sloppy outfit. It was a Dutch infantry unit that bugged out of the U.N. "safe haven" of Srebrenica in summer '95, abandoning thousands of Muslim men to be massacred by the Bosnian Serbs.

Even so, when America's soldiers try to defend their policy on homosexuals, those of us living an unregimented life judge them as bigoted and prudish. They're trying to explain a military society that seems as alien as Borneo's. Inevitably, they come across as woefully illiberal.

But as military historian T.R. Ferenbach has observed: "By the very nature of its missions, the military must maintain a hard and illiberal view of life and the world."

Or, as John F. Kennedy said when asked about the unfairness of summoning reservists for the Berlin Crisis of 1961: "Life itself is unfair."

More so than in any other presidential campaign, Democrats are appealing to gays this year, particularly in California and New York where there are many gay voters, and where a very significant number of delegates will be chosen in primaries on March 7. But homosexuality is still a sensitive issue in many areas of the country, and support for

having gays serve in the military could hurt Mr. Gore in the South in the general election if he became the nominee.

Mr. Gore's public retraction ? his press secretary, Chris Lehane, called it a "clarification" ? came within an hour of his attempt to clear up another campaign embarrassment, this one fostered by his campaign manager, Donna Brazile.

Ms. Brazile had said in a recent interview that Republicans used blacks like General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for photo opportunities but did not really care about them. Mr. Gore called General Powell tonight and told reporters at the same news conference that he had "reaffirmed my respect" for the General. He refused to say whether he had apologized.

Mr. Gore said today that he had been mis-heard on Wednesday. "That is not what I meant to convey ? that's what you heard," he told reporters here tonight in the corner of a high school gymnasium after a pep rally. Even so his remarks Wednesday night seemed unequivocal. Asked if he would tolerate dissent among the top officers, he said, "Of course."

Mr. Gore's remarks had been widely criticized by military leaders and former military officials. Even in his own campaign, there was reaction to Mr. Gore's remarks today. Senator John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat and Vietnam veteran, said commanders of small, specialized units should be allowed to choose members without the hindrance of broad policies.

The Gore campaign has been openly courting black voters and homosexual voters, and Mr. Gore's backtracking tonight on the litmus test and on Ms. Brazile's comments suggested that the campaign had perhaps gone too far on both counts.

There was an odd confluence of these two episodes in the person of General Powell, one of the most popular figures in America. He objected in 1993 to President Clinton's attempt to allow gays to serve openly in the military, which resulted in the compromise of the "don't ask, don't tell policy." But as someone who has traditionally remained above the political fray, he did not comment on Mr. Gore's suggestion Wednesday on the litmus test. But he did respond to Ms. Brazile's comments, sending a note to Mr. Gore that he had been "disappointed and offended" by them.

Mr. Gore, like Mr. Bradley, has put an especially strong emphasis on the gay vote in this campaign, appealing directly to homosexuals in speeches, meetings with gay leaders and in policy positions. In New York, both have slated openly gay delegates to the Democratic National Convention.

Indeed, Mr. Gore did not back down tonight from his commitment to allowing gays to serve openly in the military. But his comments were a reflection of the difficulty that any commander-in-chief would have in implementing it. "You have to have a determination to implement it if that kind of change is going to take place," he said.

But before Mr. Gore backpedaled on the litmus test, some of his supporters said they believed Mr. Bradley had proved more politically adept than Mr. Gore at winning over gay supporters.

Homosexuals have found increasing strength at the ballot box. People who identify themselves as gay make up between 8 and 9 percent of the primary electorate nationwide and a bit more in New York and California, according to polls of voters leaving the booths in previous elections. In general elections, they account for about 5 percent of the national total.

Some Gore advisers believe that while Mr. Bradley is newer to his overt commitment to gay rights than Mr. Gore, he has gained traction in

the gay community for two reasons. One is that Mr. Gore suffers by association with President Clinton. Although Mr. Clinton was the first presidential candidate to openly court gays, many were disenchanted with his compromise on gays in the military, settling for a "don't ask, don't tell" policy that now even Mr. Clinton has called unworkable.

The second reason is that some Gore supporters think Mr. Bradley has out-foxed Mr. Gore in the race for gay votes. "Gore has a stronger record over a longer period of time of being a leader on these issues," said Richard Socarides, until recently the Clinton Administration official who oversaw gay and lesbian issues. "But it's frustrating because he's been out-maneuvered on tactics."

For example, while Mr. Gore has long argued privately within the Administration to allow gays to serve openly in the military, it was Mr. Bradley who first said publicly in this campaign that he favored such a policy. Mr. Gore did not publicly declare his support for the policy until after Hillary Clinton and then President Clinton both criticized the current policy. This played into the damaging perception that Mr. Gore is a politician who waits for political cover before taking a bold position.

As a result, Mr. Gore has been looking for ways to distinguish himself on matters of interest to homosexuals. Gore supporters said that the sharper comments at Wednesday night's debate ? while not planned because the litmus-test question was not foreseen ? stemmed from Mr. Gore's long-held belief that gays should serve openly but also from his need to try to gain an edge over Mr. Bradley and separate himself from the Clinton compromise.

Emily Giske, a vice chairman of the New York State Democratic Party and one of the lesbian leaders whom Mr. Gore is to meet with on Monday in New York, said that while she was watching Mr. Gore's comments at the debate, she thought, "Of course he is looking for a way to put his own stamp on this issue."

California and New York are home to significant blocs of gay voters, and for the first time in presidential politics, those voters are now themselves part of a calculated strategy to win the Democratic nomination. Homosexuals figure as prominently in Mr. Gore's plans to stop Mr. Bradley as do African-Americans and organized labor, while Mr. Bradley is counting on them to help transform his insurgent candidacy into the nomination.

"It's the first time there's been a competition in any presidential primary for the gay and lesbian vote," said Jeff Trammell, Mr. Gore's top adviser on gay issues. "It's part of the coming of age politically for gay and lesbian Americans."

What is different in this election is not only the competition for the gay vote but that the gay vote is now perceived to be significant enough to form part of Mr. Gore's bedrock strategy.

The current thinking inside the Gore camp goes like this: Mr. Gore is poised to win the Iowa caucuses on Jan. 24 but is neck and neck with Mr. Bradley in the New Hampshire primary on Feb. 1. If New Hampshire legitimizes Mr. Bradley, New York, which votes March 7 and is already extremely receptive to Mr. Bradley, could follow suit. In that case, California, which also votes March 7, becomes all the more critical for Mr. Gore.

While Mr. Gore is counting on organized labor and minorities to help him in New York, he is also relying on homosexuals to stop any Bradley momentum in California, advisers said. Turnout among gays could be higher than usual in California this year because of an initiative on the ballot

to ban same-sex marriage.

Gore advisers said that the vice president's comments reflected a growing consensus that supporting gay rights is not as politically perilous as it once was, particularly since several high-profile murders of gays.

A Gallup poll last month found that 70 percent of Americans support allowing gays in the military (although 76 percent of those in senior military ranks are opposed).

"Gore and Bradley are sensing a change in public opinion," said Aaron Belkin, an assistant professor at the University of California at Santa Barbara and director of a center that studies gays in the military. "The issue has become safe."

"And," he added, "they really want the gay votes in California. Both are coming from exactly the same position, they're just trying to outflank each other."

Washington Post,  
January 8, 2000

Gore Clarifies Position on Gays  
No 'Litmus Test' for Joint Chiefs  
By John F. Harris, Washington Post Staff Writer

Vice President Gore moved to quell a rising political controversy last night by stating that he would not insist that senior military commanders personally agree with him about allowing gays to serve openly in the armed forces, but would require only that his appointees faithfully carry out his policy.

Pulling back from remarks he made three days ago at a Democratic debate in New Hampshire ? when he answered "yes" to a question about whether he would apply a "litmus test" for the Joint Chiefs of Staff on gays serving openly in the military ? Gore told an impromptu news conference in West Des Moines, Iowa, that his meaning had been misunderstood.

"I did not mean to imply that there should ever be any kind of inquiry into the personal political opinions of officers in the U.S. military, nor would I ever tolerate such inquiries," Gore said.

Gore's statement followed a day of top-level discussions within his campaign about how to respond to what many outside political strategists and some on his own team feared was a damaging answer the vice president gave Wednesday night.

Gore said then that he is determined to scrap the Clinton administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy requiring homosexuals to keep their sexual orientation private, adding, "I think that would require those who wanted to serve on the position of the Joint Chiefs to be in agreement with [my] policy."

That answer ? combined with Gore's assent to moderator Peter Jennings's question of whether this amounted to a litmus test ? appalled many current and retired military officers, surprised even some gay activists and invited a shower of Republican criticism. Several Democratic sources close to Gore's camp said he had no choice but to backtrack or risk having the issue become a serious distraction.

But Democratic sources said Gore was determined that he not be seen as abandoning a position under pressure. He and the campaign insisted the

candidate's statement last night was not a change of position, merely a clarification of it.

Gore said that by stating he would apply a litmus test, he meant "that I would insist on having members of the Joint Chiefs who would implement that policy and who would not do anything but implement that policy."

The result is that Gore's position is essentially identical to one former senator Bill Bradley articulated at the same University of New Hampshire debate.

The Bradley-Gore battle for the support of gay voters has been particularly aggressive as both camps have realized the influence the community exerts on Democratic Party politics. In California, where voters also will consider a gay marriage ballot initiative on March 7, activists predict homosexuals will make up 10 percent to 15 percent of the Democratic primary vote.

But in last night's Republican debate in South Carolina, Arizona Sen. John McCain criticized both Gore and Bradley for calling for their appointees to carry out a policy of allowing gays to serve openly. "That is a total destruction of the entire concept of the military and we should as Americans reject such a thing because of the harmful effect it will have on the military of the United States of America," McCain said.

Gore's statement of policy could defuse the issue ? in the short term and the long term. By moving late Friday, Gore hoped to avoid having the issue affect today's debate with Bradley in Iowa.

Michael Collins, a Republican National Committee spokesman, said yesterday ? before Gore restated his view ? that what was galling about the vice president's position was not its support of homosexuals. "It's not about gays in the military, it's about his concept of command," Collins said, adding that Gore seemed to be saying to the military, "If you don't share my political agenda, you're not suitable for command."

The RNC yesterday was producing a TV ad, to be aired in Iowa, New Hampshire and some markets with large military populations, asserting that retired Gens. Colin L. Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf "couldn't pass Al Gore's litmus test."

There is evidence the gays-in-the-military issue is not as volatile as it was in 1993, when President Clinton was forced to abandon his pledge to end the military's prohibition against homosexual personnel in favor of the "don't ask, don't tell" compromise. At a debate Thursday night, the two leading GOP contenders said they wanted to keep the compromise policy intact, rather than go back to the more restrictive pre-Clinton policy. A focus group in New Hampshire organized by The Washington Post found

Democratic voters irritated that Jennings raised the gays-in-uniform issue at all during the debate, regarding it as irrelevant. Michael Harrison, who monitors radio talk shows for Talkers magazine, said the issue these days generates little of the contention and ill feeling on the airwaves that it did seven years ago.

Geoff Garin, a Democratic pollster not affiliated with either presidential campaign, said rising tolerance on gay rights issues by all but the most committed conservatives means that Bradley and Gore are not taking huge general-election risks by campaigning so aggressively for gays in the military. "If you're going to vote on the basis of this issue, we probably already know how you're going to vote," he said.

But Garin said Gore's "litmus test" remark risked conveying disrespect for the military and could have become a general-election liability.

Peter Feaver, an associate professor at Duke University and specialist

in civil-military relations, said Gore's litmus test remark hit a military nerve that goes beyond the issue of whether gays should be allowed to serve openly.

"When Gore says he'd make the gays issue a litmus test, he's touching all the wrong buttons," Feaver said. "Many in the military already are sensitive to not being heard. It was an excruciatingly dumb thing to say."

There remain a host of practical questions casting doubt on whether Gore's and Bradley's statements on the subject are achievable.

"The Gore-Bradley discussion missed the point completely, because before a president can try to convince the Joint Chiefs, he has to convince Congress," said Joseph J. Collins, a retired Army colonel. "What stops gays from serving openly in the military is the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which prohibits specific homosexual acts, and unless the code is changed by Congress you cannot settle this issue."

Gore and Bradley also seem to be assuming that commanders might harbor "personal" views about gays in the military, but that this would not impede their implementing a new policy. In fact, as Clinton found, commanders are allowed to share their opinions, even if they differ from the administration, on matters affecting their services. Clinton's plans were swamped when congressional hearings revealed overwhelming uniformed opposition to allowing gays to serve openly.

? Staff writers Dan Balz with Gore and Ceci Connolly, Bradley Graham and Roberto Suro in Washington contributed to this report.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-JAN-2000 11:59:32.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.8.00

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

TEXT:

1. NEW YORK TIMES Gore, in Reversal, Shuns Litmus Test Over Gay Troops
2. NEW YORK TIMES Editorial: The debate over gay troops
3. NEW YORK TIMES Part Martha Stewart, Part RuPaul: Ben Sanders' alter ego  
Brini Maxwell gives household tips on weekly TV show
4. DES MOINES REGISTER Testy letter objects to depiction of hetero marriage  
in editorial cartoon
5. MINNEAPOLIS STAR TRIBUNE Short essay by 14-year-old who is disillusioned  
with religion over Matthew Shepard incident
6. WASHINGTON POST Gore Clarifies Position on Gays: No 'Litmus Test' for Joint Chiefs

New York Times, January 8, 2000  
229 W. 43rd Street, New York, NY, 10036  
(Fax 212-556-3622 ) (E-MAIL: letters@nytimes.com )  
( <http://www.nytimes.com> )

Gore, in Reversal, Shuns Litmus Test Over Gay Troops  
By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

DES MOINES ? Vice President Al Gore backtracked tonight on comments he made in a debate on Wednesday when he said he would require any appointee to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to agree in advance to let gays serve openly in the military.

"I did not mean to imply that there should ever be any kind of inquiry into the personal political opinion of the officers in the U.S. military," Mr. Gore told reporters at a quickly assembled news conference here tonight after questions began mounting about his intent.

At a debate in New Hampshire Wednesday night, the vice president said he would require such a litmus test.

"I would insist before appointing anybody to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that that individual support my policy, and yes, I would make that a requirement," Mr. Gore said.

His remarks today put him in line with his opponent for the Democratic nomination for president, former Senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey.

Mr. Bradley has also said that current law should be changed to allow homosexuals to serve openly in the military. But when asked in the debate on

Wednesday about a litmus test on the issue for his appointees to the Joint Chiefs he said only that if he were elected he would expect military leaders that he appointed to carry out his orders.

The issue surfaced in tonight's debate with Republican candidates for president when Senator John McCain of Arizona, a veteran of the Vietnam War, called Mr. Gore's remarks on Wednesday "disgraceful."

More so than in any other presidential campaign, Democrats are appealing to gays this year, particularly in California and New York where there are many gay voters, and where a very significant number of delegates will be chosen in primaries on March 7. But homosexuality is still a sensitive issue in many areas of the country, and support for having gays serve in the military could hurt Mr. Gore in the South in the general election if he became the nominee.

Mr. Gore's public retraction ? his press secretary, Chris Lehane, called it a "clarification" ? came within an hour of his attempt to clear up another campaign embarrassment, this one fostered by his campaign manager, Donna Brazile.

Ms. Brazile had said in a recent interview that Republicans used blacks like General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for photo opportunities but did not really care about them. Mr. Gore called General Powell tonight and told reporters at the same news conference that he had "reaffirmed my respect" for the General. He refused to say whether he had apologized.

Mr. Gore said today that he had been mis-heard on Wednesday. "That is not what I meant to convey ? that's what you heard," he told reporters here tonight in the corner of a high school gymnasium after a pep rally. Even so his remarks Wednesday night seemed unequivocal. Asked if he would tolerate dissent among the top officers, he said, "Of course."

Mr. Gore's remarks had been widely criticized by military leaders and former military officials. Even in his own campaign, there was reaction to Mr. Gore's remarks today. Senator John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat and Vietnam veteran, said commanders of small, specialized units should be allowed to choose members without the hindrance of broad policies.

The Gore campaign has been openly courting black voters and homosexual voters, and Mr. Gore's backtracking tonight on the litmus test and on Ms. Brazile's comments suggested that the campaign had perhaps gone too far on both counts.

There was an odd confluence of these two episodes in the person of General Powell, one of the most popular figures in America. He objected in 1993 to President Clinton's attempt to allow gays to serve openly in the military, which resulted in the compromise of the "don't ask, don't tell policy." But as someone who has traditionally remained above the political fray, he did not comment on Mr. Gore's suggestion Wednesday on the litmus test. But he did respond to Ms. Brazile's comments, sending a note to Mr. Gore that he had been "disappointed and offended" by them.

Mr. Gore, like Mr. Bradley, has put an especially strong emphasis on the

gay vote in this campaign, appealing directly to homosexuals in speeches, meetings with gay leaders and in policy positions. In New York, both have slated openly gay delegates to the Democratic National Convention.

Indeed, Mr. Gore did not back down tonight from his commitment to allowing gays to serve openly in the military. But his comments were a reflection of the difficulty that any commander-in-chief would have in implementing it. "You have to have a determination to implement it if that kind of change is going to take place," he said.

But before Mr. Gore backpedaled on the litmus test, some of his supporters said they believed Mr. Bradley had proved more politically adept than Mr. Gore at winning over gay supporters.

Homosexuals have found increasing strength at the ballot box. People who identify themselves as gay make up between 8 and 9 percent of the primary electorate nationwide and a bit more in New York and California, according to

polls of voters leaving the booths in previous elections. In general elections, they account for about 5 percent of the national total.

Some Gore advisers believe that while Mr. Bradley is newer to his overt commitment to gay rights than Mr. Gore, he has gained traction in the gay community for two reasons. One is that Mr. Gore suffers by association with

President Clinton. Although Mr. Clinton was the first presidential candidate

to openly court gays, many were disenchanted with his compromise on gays in the military, settling for a "don't ask, don't tell" policy that now even Mr. Clinton has called unworkable.

The second reason is that some Gore supporters think Mr. Bradley has out-foxed Mr. Gore in the race for gay votes. "Gore has a stronger record over a longer period of time of being a leader on these issues," said Richard

Socarides, until recently the Clinton Administration official who oversaw gay and lesbian issues. "But it's frustrating because he's been out-maneuvered on tactics."

For example, while Mr. Gore has long argued privately within the Administration to allow gays to serve openly in the military, it was Mr. Bradley who first said publicly in this campaign that he favored such a policy. Mr. Gore did not publicly declare his support for the policy until after Hillary Clinton and then President Clinton both criticized the current

policy. This played into the damaging perception that Mr. Gore is a politician who waits for political cover before taking a bold position.

As a result, Mr. Gore has been looking for ways to distinguish himself on

matters of interest to homosexuals. Gore supporters said that the sharper comments at Wednesday night's debate ? while not planned because the litmus-test question was not foreseen ? stemmed from Mr. Gore's long-held belief that gays should serve openly but also from his need to try to gain an

edge over Mr. Bradley and separate himself from the Clinton compromise.

Emily Giske, a vice chairman of the New York State Democratic Party and one of the lesbian leaders whom Mr. Gore is to meet with on Monday in New York, said that while she was watching Mr. Gore's comments at the debate,

she thought, "Of course he is looking for a way to put his own stamp on this issue."

California and New York are home to significant blocs of gay voters, and for the first time in presidential politics, those voters are now themselves part of a calculated strategy to win the Democratic nomination. Homosexuals figure as prominently in Mr. Gore's plans to stop Mr. Bradley as do African-Americans and organized labor, while Mr. Bradley is counting on them to help transform his insurgent candidacy into the nomination.

"It's the first time there's been a competition in any presidential primary for the gay and lesbian vote," said Jeff Trammell, Mr. Gore's top adviser on gay issues. "It's part of the coming of age politically for gay and lesbian Americans."

What is different in this election is not only the competition for the gay vote but that the gay vote is now perceived to be significant enough to form part of Mr. Gore's bedrock strategy.

The current thinking inside the Gore camp goes like this: Mr. Gore is poised to win the Iowa caucuses on Jan. 24 but is neck and neck with Mr. Bradley in the New Hampshire primary on Feb. 1. If New Hampshire legitimizes Mr. Bradley, New York, which votes March 7 and is already extremely receptive to Mr. Bradley, could follow suit. In that case, California, which also votes March 7, becomes all the more critical for Mr. Gore.

While Mr. Gore is counting on organized labor and minorities to help him in New York, he is also relying on homosexuals to stop any Bradley momentum in California, advisers said. Turnout among gays could be higher than usual in California this year because of an initiative on the ballot to ban same-sex marriage.

Gore advisers said that the vice president's comments reflected a growing consensus that supporting gay rights is not as politically perilous as it once was, particularly since several high-profile murders of gays.

A Gallup poll last month found that 70 percent of Americans support allowing gays in the military (although 76 percent of those in senior military ranks are opposed).

"Gore and Bradley are sensing a change in public opinion," said Aaron Belkin, an assistant professor at the University of California at Santa Barbara and director of a center that studies gays in the military. "The issue has become safe."

"And," he added, "they really want the gay votes in California. Both are coming from exactly the same position, they're just trying to outflank each other."

Both Democratic presidential candidates, Vice President Al Gore and former Senator Bill Bradley, said strongly and unequivocally this week that they would allow gays to serve openly in the military. That is the only fair and rational course now that five years of experience has shown the compromise policy of "don't ask, don't tell" to be a failure that should be abolished.

There appeared at first to be a subtle but important difference between the two Democrats in the debate Wednesday night. Mr. Gore said he would require in advance that his appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff be in agreement with his position. Mr. Bradley had the better formulation, saying simply that he would expect his appointees to carry out the policy of their commander in chief on gays in the military. That put the emphasis where it belongs, on the need for military obedience to lawful orders rather than on the personal beliefs of the officers. Yesterday Mr. Gore adjusted his stance by asserting that he did not intend to ask nominees for the Joint Chiefs or other high military positions about their personal views or ideology on this or any other issue. He said he, too, would simply expect them to follow orders.

The Republican candidates, by contrast, all oppose lifting the ban on openly gay troops. Senator John McCain said he would retain the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. He asserted that it was working despite ample evidence that it has accelerated the dismissal of gay service members. Gov. George W. Bush of Texas also said he backed "don't ask, don't tell," but made things worse by inventing a litmus test against liberalizing the policy. He said he would not appoint anyone to the Joint Chiefs who advocated allowing gays to serve openly in the military, thus elevating bigotry as a defining criterion for selecting military leaders.

The Democratic candidates are taking a risk in standing up for principle on this issue. But by asserting the primacy of civilian command, they may be able to avoid the trouble that befell President Clinton. Mr. Clinton supported ending the ban on gay troops. But once in office he was forced to retreat because Gen. Colin Powell, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and others publicly denounced that policy. Congress later blocked the lifting of the ban and wrote "don't ask, don't tell" into law.

A new president who wants to change the policy would have to work with Congress to rewrite the law. But the starting point has to be a presidential commitment to the right of gay people to serve on an equal basis in the armed forces.

New York Times, January 8, 2000  
Part Martha Stewart, Part Rupaul  
By CHRIS HEDGES

Brini Maxwell, the svelte and stylish creation of Ben Sander, is a drag queen's answer to Martha Stewart. Dressed in a meticulously coiffured blond wig, patent leather pumps and an array of vintage dresses, she gushes over obscure household tips, etiquette and recipes on her weekly television show.

Annoyed by the black heel marks on the kitchen linoleum? Try a dab of lighter fluid on a paper towel. Want to save money on paper plates? Wash and reuse the trays from TV dinners. Interested in a new dish to delight your guests? How about a crown roast of cheese?

"Cheese," says Brini, stealing a line from the critic Clifton Fadiman, "is milk's leap to immortality."

"The Brini Maxwell Show," taped in Mr. Sander's small Chelsea apartment by his mother, the actress Mary Jane Wells, appears in Manhattan on a leased access television channel on Friday nights. Though there are no viewer ratings systems for leased access cable shows, Brini (rhymes with "teeny") has received hundreds of letters and e-mail messages since the show began in January 1998.

"My husband and I always enjoy your show and try to watch it every week,"

Brenda Dally said by e-mail.

"I must admit, though," she continued, "that after one of your episodes,

I feel quite inadequate to my role of wife, and know that my hubby probably feels a twinge of regret at marrying a modern career woman instead of an efficient, elegant nest builder like you." Mr. Sander says his alter ego's appeal lies in her polish.

"Brini is a terribly good cook and hostess," he said. "She is the perfect homemaker. She slips in the door because she isn't threatening. She

ushers in gay culture in an acceptable disguise."

Men in heels are nothing new on television. Milton Berle regularly donned a dress on "The Texaco Star Theater" in the late 1940's. RuPaul had a talk show on VH1 from 1996 to 1998 and has appeared in Old Navy commercials.

But if drag makes steady appearances on nationwide television, it has flooded Manhattan cable television: there are now four weekly programs with drag queen hosts and one with a woman dressed as a man.

Brini was one of four drag queens nominated for the Glammy Award for Best TV Performer, given by the drag queen community last month.

Some 300 drag queens and their guests burst into applause as Brini, dressed in an ivory floor-length skirt with a side slit, a black sweater and a Mongolian lamb's wool wrap, swooshed through the crowd and onto the stage to accept the award.

"It is wonderful how supportive the drag community is of each other," she

said, her white rhinestone necklace flashing in the stage lights.

Brini has appeared in 28 episodes. The program started as "At Home With Tigs" and centered on a jet-setting drag character. But Mr. Sander felt the character was "too tony" and turned to his fourth-floor walk-up for inspiration; his apartment is filled with furniture, artwork and dishes that are decades old.

He then took the name Brini from a character in a Stephanie Powers mini-series called "Deceptions" in which she played twins. The name Maxwell came from Barbra Streisand's character in "What's Up, Doc?"

Brini's outfits include capri pants, produced on Mr. Sander's sewing machine, and billowy skirts with garish bows.

The result is a composite of television characters played by Donna Reed, Marlo Thomas and Mary Tyler Moore.

"Ben is trying to recreate his childhood," Ms. Wells volunteered from the kitchen.

"Mom," he says, "I was born in 1969." Although the fictional models were long gone by the time Mr. Sander became a dedicated television viewer, he reaches out to recreate the security and innocence of their worlds.

"With Brini I have more self-confidence," Mr. Sander said. "I express myself more freely. I think of myself as an icon. Without Brini I am a loner who finds it difficult to make lasting friendships. Parts of me are so disparate and there is some shame associated with them. It is difficult to let all of myself be known to people. I guess part of me is ashamed of being gay."

Each show opens with a montage of shots of Brini: posing in Central Park on the Alice in Wonderland sculpture (as did the television character Rhoda); standing in front of Bergdorf Goodman in a bright checkered coat and turquoise hat; wearing a blue and white dress, along with a red, white and blue pillbox hat, in front of the Queensboro Bridge.

Episodes revolve around tensions between Brini and her neighbor Mary Ellen, played by Thom Hansen. Mary Ellen, whose acerbic asides are lost on Brini, is recruited into various household tasks she would prefer to forgo. When Brini makes Swedish meatballs, Mary Ellen is ordered to knead the ground meat, but finds that her fake fingernails come off in the dish.

"A wise woman will prepare her nails after dinner," Mary Ellen intones into the camera.

Brini inserts 30-second shorts that give household tips, like boiling spices in a pan to get rid of the smell of stale cigarette smoke.

Sadness is held at bay, even when it intrudes in the lives of the cast. Mary Ellen is the willing victim in an episode on how to care for an invalid,

taped while Mr. Hansen's real-life partner was dying of lung cancer. Brini

calls the delivery of the food to the bedridden Mary Ellen "Meals on Heels."

"Donna Reed's mother would never have died," Mr. Hansen, 46, said in an interview.

Last night's show was "A Salute to Wine and Cheese," although Brini slips cheese into nearly every episode. Brini told viewers how to store cheese and how to make toasted sesame cheese wafers and classic cheese fondue. Mary Ellen warned viewers how not to be taken in by the pretense of wine, although she mispronounced every label she picked up. For example, she pronounced the "t" in merlot. The half-hour program ended with a wine and cheese party in the apartment.

But the show isn't all cooking and cleaning. "Ladies, what do you do with your free time?" Brini asked in one episode, wearing an ivory short-sleeve sweater and a plaid skirt and dangling a black pocketbook from her ankle. "I mean the time you spend waiting for the dentist, or on the subway, or at the plastic surgeon's or gynecologist's office? Well, here is an interesting option. Why not get beneficial exercise and use your purse as a leg weight. No one wants cottage cheese thighs."

DES MOINES REGISTER, January 8, 2000

Box 957, Des Moines, Ia., 50304

(Fax 515-286-2511 ) (E-MAIL: letters@news.dmreg.com )

THE REGISTER'S READERS SAY  
OFFENSIVE

The Steve Benson cartoon the Register printed on the Jan.5 opinion page is the most insulting cartoon that you could print against heterosexual marriages. There are many heterosexual marriages that do not fit the stereotyping in that cartoon. That is as much hate-mongering as any that I have seen.

? Edward Moses, 1407 N. Brobst, Knoxville, Iowa 50138-1205

[Reminder: Here's the description of the cartoon again.

A big hairy ogre with wife in one hand, kid in other, wearing a tee-shirt

that says DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, CHILD ABUSE AND DIVORCE AMONG HETEROSEXUALS is telling a gay and lesbian couple (Entitled: Committed Gay Unions):

"You're  
Undermining the Morals of Civilization!" ]

Minneapolis Star Tribune, January 10, 2000

425 Portland Avenue, Minneapolis, MN, 55408

(Fax 612-673-4359 ) (E-MAIL: opinion@startribune.com )

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

Mindworks: Essays from young writers on significant events in 1999  
(excerpt)

Courtney Selstad, Age 14, grade 8

St. Louis Park, St. Louis Park Jr. High School

Most of the past events are nothing more than a blur, and a lot of that I

don't care to relive. I've learned the hard way to think for myself. I've been up and down and around the corner so much I'm nauseous.

One thing, though, that sticks out in the mess that is my brain would be

the death of Matthew Shepard. That event left me wondering how people can think the way they do. I've never heard of anything so incredibly sad and inhumane as what those men did. What affected me the most was how people decided to debate the rights and wrongs of being gay instead of supporting the family.

This one page on the Internet was made by a Southern Baptist church, and there you could see "How Many Days Matthew's Been in Hell" and you could download him "screaming in hell." I thought to myself, if some churchgoers aren't good people, who is? After seeing that, I made the final decision not to be religious.

Washington Post, January 8, 2000

1150 15th Street NW, Washington, DC, 20071

( Online Mailer:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/edit/letters/letterform.htm> )

Gore Clarifies Position on Gays

No 'Litmus Test' for Joint Chiefs

By John F. Harris, Washington Post Staff Writer

Vice President Gore moved to quell a rising political controversy last night by stating that he would not insist that senior military commanders personally agree with him about allowing gays to serve openly in the armed forces, but would require only that his appointees faithfully carry out his policy.

Pulling back from remarks he made three days ago at a Democratic debate in New Hampshire ? when he answered "yes" to a question about whether he would apply a "litmus test" for the Joint Chiefs of Staff on gays serving openly in the military ? Gore told an impromptu news conference in West Des Moines, Iowa, that his meaning had been misunderstood.

"I did not mean to imply that there should ever be any kind of inquiry into the personal political opinions of officers in the U.S. military, nor would I ever tolerate such inquiries," Gore said.

Gore's statement followed a day of top-level discussions within his campaign about how to respond to what many outside political strategists and some on his own team feared was a damaging answer the vice president gave Wednesday night.

Gore said then that he is determined to scrap the Clinton administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy requiring homosexuals to keep

their sexual orientation private, adding, "I think that would require those who wanted to serve on the position of the Joint Chiefs to be in agreement with [my] policy."

That answer ? combined with Gore's assent to moderator Peter Jennings's question of whether this amounted to a litmus test ? appalled many current and retired military officers, surprised even some gay activists and

invited  
a shower of Republican criticism. Several Democratic sources close to Gore's camp said he had no choice but to backtrack or risk having the issue become a serious distraction.

But Democratic sources said Gore was determined that he not be seen as abandoning a position under pressure. He and the campaign insisted the candidate's statement last night was not a change of position, merely a clarification of it.

Gore said that by stating he would apply a litmus test, he meant "that I would insist on having members of the Joint Chiefs who would implement that policy and who would not do anything but implement that policy."

The result is that Gore's position is essentially identical to one former senator Bill Bradley articulated at the same University of New Hampshire debate.

The Bradley-Gore battle for the support of gay voters has been particularly aggressive as both camps have realized the influence the community exerts on Democratic Party politics. In California, where voters also will consider a gay marriage ballot initiative on March 7, activists predict homosexuals will make up 10 percent to 15 percent of the Democratic primary vote.

But in last night's Republican debate in South Carolina, Arizona Sen. John McCain criticized both Gore and Bradley for calling for their appointees to carry out a policy of allowing gays to serve openly. "That is a total destruction of the entire concept of the military and we should as Americans reject such a thing because of the harmful effect it will have on the military of the United States of America," McCain said.

Gore's statement of policy could defuse the issue ? in the short term and the long term. By moving late Friday, Gore hoped to avoid having the issue affect today's debate with Bradley in Iowa.

Michael Collins, a Republican National Committee spokesman, said yesterday ? before Gore restated his view ? that what was galling about the vice president's position was not its support of homosexuals. "It's not about gays in the military, it's about his concept of command," Collins said, adding that Gore seemed to be saying to the military, "If you don't share my political agenda, you're not suitable for command."

The RNC yesterday was producing a TV ad, to be aired in Iowa, New Hampshire and some markets with large military populations, asserting that retired Gens. Colin L. Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf "couldn't pass Al Gore's litmus test."

There is evidence the gays-in-the-military issue is not as volatile as it was in 1993, when President Clinton was forced to abandon his pledge to end the military's prohibition against homosexual personnel in favor of the "don't ask, don't tell" compromise. At a debate Thursday night, the two

leading GOP contenders said they wanted to keep the compromise policy intact, rather than go back to the more restrictive pre-Clinton policy.

A focus group in New Hampshire organized by The Washington Post found Democratic voters irritated that Jennings raised the gays-in-uniform issue at all during the debate, regarding it as irrelevant. Michael Harrison, who monitors radio talk shows for Talkers magazine, said the issue these days generates little of the contention and ill feeling on the airwaves that it did seven years ago.

Geoff Garin, a Democratic pollster not affiliated with either presidential campaign, said rising tolerance on gay rights issues by all but the most committed conservatives means that Bradley and Gore are not taking huge general-election risks by campaigning so aggressively for gays in the military. "If you're going to vote on the basis of this issue, we probably already know how you're going to vote," he said.

But Garin said Gore's "litmus test" remark risked conveying disrespect for the military and could have become a general-election liability.

Peter Feaver, an associate professor at Duke University and specialist in civil-military relations, said Gore's litmus test remark hit a military nerve that goes beyond the issue of whether gays should be allowed to serve openly.

"When Gore says he'd make the gays issue a litmus test, he's touching all the wrong buttons," Feaver said. "Many in the military already are sensitive to not being heard. It was an excruciatingly dumb thing to say."

There remain a host of practical questions casting doubt on whether Gore's and Bradley's statements on the subject are achievable.

"The Gore-Bradley discussion missed the point completely, because before a president can try to convince the Joint Chiefs, he has to convince Congress," said Joseph J. Collins, a retired Army colonel. "What stops gays from serving openly in the military is the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which prohibits specific homosexual acts, and unless the code is changed by Congress you cannot settle this issue."

Gore and Bradley also seem to be assuming that commanders might harbor "personal" views about gays in the military, but that this would not impede their implementing a new policy. In fact, as Clinton found, commanders are allowed to share their opinions, even if they differ from the administration, on matters affecting their services. Clinton's plans were swamped when congressional hearings revealed overwhelming uniformed opposition to allowing gays to serve openly.

? Staff writers Dan Balz with Gore and Ceci Connolly, Bradley Graham and Roberto Suro in Washington contributed to this report.