

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Gerrie Schipske to gerri@earthlink at 13:39:29.00. Subject: Of Primary Importance - Why Gerrie Schipske needs to win the primary. (3 pages)	01/09/2000	Personal Misfile
002. email	Gerrie Schipske to gerri@earthlink at 13:37:17.00. Subject: Of Primary Importance - Why Gerrie Schipske needs to win the primary. (3 pages)	01/09/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
Default ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 1100000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/08/2000 - 01/11/2000]

2015-0017-F
ab1575

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-JAN-2000 19:55:00.00

SUBJECT: Gore Backpedals on Gay Policy (2 stories & editorial)

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

TEXT:
(AP Story , NY Times Story, and NY Times Editorial)

January 7, 1999

Gore Backpedals on Gay Policy

DES MOINES, Iowa (AP) - Under political pressure, Vice President Al Gore backpedaled Friday from his statement that he would require candidates for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to agree with his intention 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 opinions of officers in the U.S. military," Gore told reporters at a hastily convened news conference after a campaign rally at a Des Moines-area high school.

Gore, under fire from military brass and some of his own political allies, spoke two days after his original comments at a candidates' debate. The comments have sparked dissent from former members of the joint chiefs and from Sen. John Kerry, a Vietnam veteran campaigning for Gore in New Hampshire.

"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," 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 make agreement on gays in the military a litmus test for appointments to the joint chiefs.

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.

On Friday night, Gore said, "I didn't use that term, litmus test."

Bradley, Gore's rival for the Democratic nomination, said Wednesday 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 Karenna, Carolyn Klein, 59, said such a prerequisite for serving as a joint chief was misguided 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."

New York Times, January 8, 2000
(<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."

New York Times, January 8, 2000

Editorial: The Debate Over Gay Troops

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.

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-JAN-2000 14:48:52.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.8.00.4

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. LOS ANGELES TIMES Letter: "Homosexuality is about as natural as trying to eat through one's nose"
2. LOS ANGELES TIMES Columnist asks teens: Should gay clubs meet on campus?
3. GREENWICH VILLAGE GAZETTE Jack Nichols: Must Love and Romance End in Marriage?
4. ASSOCIATED PRESS Judge delays setting trial date for brothers charged in slaying of gay couple
5. ARIZONA DAILY STAR Phelps Klan to picket Steve May at the Arizona legislature (if they even show up)

Los Angeles Times, January 8, 2000
Times Mirror Square, Los Angeles, CA, 90053
(Fax 213-237-7679 or 213-237-5319) (E-MAIL: letters@latimes.com)
(<http://www.latimes.com>)

Letter: Pastor's letter was wrong

It's unfortunate that a pastor would write such an uninformed and misleading letter as Dr. Gary Barmore did ("Acceptance of others is Christian way," Dec. 18). He wrote that some are "created naturally homosexual." Well, homosexuality is about as natural as trying to eat through one's nose.

He states twice that Jesus said nothing about homosexuality. That is false.

Yes, Jesus is loving and compassionate. He said to the woman taken in adultery, "Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more." You can love someone and still disapprove of their behavior. If you love a drug addict or alcoholic, you try to help them stop before it's too late. So, we need to love the homosexual by encouraging them to give up that lifestyle before it's too late.

? JEFF OSTBY, Newport Beach

Los Angeles Times, January 8, 2000
Should Gay Clubs Meet on Campus?
By HELEN KIM

A group of students at El Modena High School in Orange County recently

attempted to form a gay-themed club on their campus. The Orange Unified School District board barred the club, but the members have not given up. HELEN KIM spoke with students about this national debate.

CHRISTINE BAI, 17, senior, Van Nuys High School:

Public schools shouldn't have gay clubs because these clubs send out a message to people that it's OK to be gay. God intended for women and men to marry each other and have children, and a lot of religions are against homosexuality.

What is the purpose of these gay-themed clubs? It's to prove that they are gay and proud of it. Gay clubs on campus will make other people feel uncomfortable. Instead of having gay clubs at school, the members should have these clubs outside of school on their own time.

Public schools should encourage noncurricular activities and organizations that have a good purpose. Activities that involve community service and volunteer work are always good to have at a school. Many clubs have a specific purpose.

But what is the purpose of having a gay club except to show off that they're gay?

Before approving a club, the school should consider the club's motives for existing. For instance, my Korean Club tries to raise money for the Korean community and for our school's auditorium. I think that if a group of people has a good purpose in mind and no one feels offended by anything, then there is no reason not to form a club.

I see the gay-themed club as different from other clubs. If I had the authority to make a decision at El Modena High School in Orange County, I would ask them what the purpose of their club is and then I would tell them to form their club outside of school because other students might feel uncomfortable.

BETTY SANTANA, 15, sophomore, Inglewood High School:

Students have the right to discuss homosexuality in a club at school. I think homosexuality is an appropriate topic for a public high school. If students don't learn about it in school, they are bound to learn about gays and lesbians somewhere else. Besides, a gay club can help gays open up and come forth ? it's not something to be ashamed of.

A gay-themed club is no different from any other club.

Schools should have the right to allow certain clubs to exist, yet exclude others. Certain clubs aren't appropriate for schools. If there were a KKK club at my school, I think there would be a lot of riots. Clubs that educate students have a positive impact. Clubs such as the science club can be beneficial for students. Sex education is a topic that should be addressed in a classroom as well as in a club. If students can discuss such topics in a classroom, why can't they discuss them in a club?

BEN FREEMAN, 17, senior, Inglewood High School:

Everyone has the right to express their feelings, but some may express them too strongly and offend others around them. Homosexual discussions at school can produce hate crimes. I think it's a risk to have a gay club in a public high school. I don't think homosexuality is really an appropriate topic for school.

It's good for people to be true to themselves, but it can cause them problems. A gay student can get harassed. There are a lot of hate crimes that are already going on at school. Everybody has the right to express their feelings, but I'm certain that in any school the presence of some clubs would result in chaos.

If there were a gay club at my school, I would be OK with its presence as long as the members are respectful toward others.

Clubs and other noncurricular activities and organizations give students something to do and something to learn about. For example, a religious club would be good to have because it would inform others about students' backgrounds and interests. I see the gay-themed club as different because it's something new.

There will always be conflicts, but I feel that they should go ahead and do what they want to do. They should try to form their club and see how everything works out.

MAX ABRAMS, 16, junior, Calabasas High School:

It's the students' decision to decide what's right for them. Students have the right to discuss topics such as homosexuality in a club at school. A gay-themed club would be a good way for members to meet friends. The presence of a gay-themed club wouldn't persuade people in either direction; a gay club would just make others more aware of what's going on around them.

Students should have some say as to whether a club should exist at a school. Clubs are generally very beneficial for students, as long as the club is open to everyone. If there is a religious club, it should be open to all students so that everyone can become more aware of the religion. The Calabasas Interact Club is very beneficial; it helps people interact more with the community in positive ways. I am in the Earth Club, the Speech and Debate Club and Amnesty International. The clubs that I participate in make me more aware of my surroundings and more involved in my community.

I see the gay-themed club as different from other clubs, such as ones that promote community service. There's not really much that a gay club can do outside of school except have discussions. A gay-themed club would make people more aware of gays and lesbians and help others fight homophobia.

I would prefer teachers, instead of clubs, to address sex education because it would help people become more aware about the dangers and risks involved. But] I say let the gay-themed club exist if the students want to have one.

Greenwich Village Gazette, January 6, 2000

New York, NY

(E-Mail: editor@new1.com) (<http://www.nycny.com>)

Must Romance and Love End in Marriage?

By Jack Nichols

Vermont's well-meaning Supreme Court opened cans of legal worms last month, leaving many with the impression that gay men and lesbians are uniformly eager to tie marital knots. The much vaunted institution of monogamous marriage for same-sex couples is now being talked about in editorials from coast to coast.

After observing a myriad of marriages, the gay pioneer, Lige Clarke, told me long ago what he thought about the so-called sacred words, "Husband" and "Wife." "Husband or Wife are words without meaning," he said, "unless they mean Friend."

Lige knew that most of what goes by the name of romance can be just as irrational and silly as is a conversion to some religious cult, accompanied in like manner by a host of hopeful, projected illusions. When the conversion evaporates under bright lights, so does the quick-started romance.

Lige's philosophy affected me profoundly. I noticed he politely refused to attend marriage ceremonies. He was not, after all, the ritual-loving type.

Ritual, as he saw it, kept people locked in the same old boxes. He eschewed it in favor of an adventuresome approach that changed its course regularly on the way to new, unexpected discoveries.

If I was to keep up with handsome Lige, to really be his friend, I knew that I too must open myself to such changes, and that I must love myself too,

giving attention to my own body, while listening well to what he said; being

willing to share the excitement he felt as he traveled to new places on the spice and variety map of human consciousness.

As early as 1964, when I first met him, he made me promise that I'd never

insist we wear identical shirts or outfits, as he'd seen others doing.

This early promise seemed easy enough to keep. He explained it simply, saying he wanted each of us to hold on to our own cultivated individualities,

that he didn't want us to be Tweedle-Dum and Dee'd.

In January, 1966, a month before the first national meeting of gay and lesbian organizations in Kansas City, Lige insisted we write an article together, one which became the first of many we'd write through the ensuing years.

It appeared in one of the few gay movement magazines then extant, The Homosexual Citizen, a joint publication of the Mattachine Society of Washington (D.C.) and The Mattachine Society of Florida, Inc.

This article, more Lige's idea than mine, said that any relationship in which one partner insists that the other must conform to a set of pre-arranged rules ? expectations ? eliminates a spontaneity that's needed for more exciting relations, turning daily lives into dull routines, into

rituals.

Many gay men and lesbians, Lige wrote, don't realize that when they honor old religious formulas as their own, they often ? as a result ? suffer the same suffocating, debilitating difficulties many conventional couples do.

Notions of "duty" (to marry) and "obligation" (to reproduce) put heavy weights into otherwise light-hearted, free-spirited relationships, making it easy to sink them.

Marriage? It was clear to Lige that many people form legal bonds, as Mary Chilton, a free-love advocate from the last century had put it: "out of selfish, mercenary, bread and clothes considerations," and as "a protection against poverty, combined with a purely selfish fear of the condemnation of the world, should the lovers follow their intuitions and obey the dictates of their hearts by simply remaining lovers."

The freedom Lige sought for us was not specifically to have multiple sex partners. It was to make changes in the laws and assumptions governing the institution of marriage. To free love, in fact, from the bondage of legalized marriage.

In the days when this pre-Stonewall article got published, many gay men and lesbians were still rushing into heterosexual marriages to prove to themselves and to others that they weren't gay.

"That many should rush into marriage to avoid being thought "queer", we wrote, "is another indication of the harm done by warped prejudices and conformist pressures."

Or, if same-sex lovers accepted themselves, as we did, they often, unfortunately, aped straight customs, since no acceptable gay customs had yet been developed.

This conformist pressure is what Lige wanted us, in our own relationship, to avoid. The reasons why were then clearer to him than to me.

Shortly after our 1966 article appeared and because I was still blind to Lige's perspective (even though I'd helped write the article) he asked that we separate after two years living together.

Not forever, he promised, but at least until I could understand that we wouldn't be traveling across traditional marital routes.

I was devastated. Separate? I worried that Lige didn't love me anymore.

"Why can't we live together?" I begged. It took me about a year to get a handle on his thinking.

In the meantime I moaned and complained, having more than my share of what we southerners call hissy fits. We dated. We fought. We stayed away.

We traveled independently.

And then, as the late 60s counterculture revolution began, I began somehow to relax. I learned to laugh again. My posture showed how I was returning to self-confidence and ease.

Lige noticed this, and once again we began living together. After eight

years passed, our first book ? the first non-fiction memoir by a male couple
? was published. It was called I Have More Fun With You Than Anybody. (St. Martin's Press, 1972)

We told, as we described our break-up and our reunion in that book, how we'd rethought our old values, examining them to see if they were making us truly happy. We searched ourselves, discussing lingering fears and insecurities.

What did we learn? First, that each of us must try to take care of himself, that we mustn't lean thoughtlessly for support. We discovered that acute self-awareness of both body and mind led to happiness for both of us. It was this independence and self-awareness that drew us to each other most.

We learned to be alone at times, and we found that being alone is a tool that creates togetherness. Constant companionship, as much as we may have longed for it, gave us few opportunities to bring home new thoughts and little surprises.

Each day, even if we stayed at home, we took time to ourselves. To read.

To listen to music. To stand ? yoga fashion ? on our heads.

We examined jealousy and concluded it is a neurotic disease. Sensible people don't go around asking, "Has anybody besides me shown an interest in you?"

We saw that only misery lay ahead if we concerned ourselves with such questions. When real sexual freedom exists, we said, it's seldom used to excess. The ancient Chinese philosopher, Lao Tzu, had written "Things which go together naturally, don't need to be tied." We believed that.

If we held on to each other too tightly, our life-dance would be clumsy.

If we were tense, we'd step all over each other's feet. At the same time, if we still laughed for the same reasons, we knew that neither of us would be dancing far away. If we didn't act like wardens for each other, we found that we had more fun with each other than with anybody else.

Sexy moments aren't always the same, we knew. We were excited by each other not because we had sex, but because we shared values. Affection, humor, honesty and curiosity were the best aphrodisiacs. It's important, Lige wrote, not to confuse any sexual act with nearness in other areas of life. "A perfect connection in the sack tells us we're having fun," he said, "but it's not our only barometer. If we don't writhe ecstatically one day, there's always tomorrow. In the meantime, coupled values ? kindness, good humor, empathy, and bodily energy ? keep our bedroom door open."

The soul of sensuality, Lige advised, is procrastination. We wouldn't be in a hurry. Grabbing too quickly at a flower, Robert Burns had said in his poems, causes that flower's petals to fall.

Sexbed isn't a demonstration ground. "Not even the almighty orgasm, which society teaches us to demand, measures our pleasure. As in conversations, high points are reached when we don't consciously pursue

them.

The means ? foreplay ? is more important than the end.

"We watched in dismay as couples we knew misused their sexual freedom. In the name of liberation, they were often hateful and unkind to each other.

They used sexual freedom as a power tool, slamming away at one another, releasing their hostilities and insecurities. "You screwed around last night, so I'm going to screw around tonight..."

As we saw it, not only did such people misunderstand each other, but they understood the good sweet nature of touch and feeling itself. There was contempt in their voices, not only for sex, but for the "sex objects" they hoped to make.

We began to realize that the nature of our affection might be similar in some ways to the companionship we enjoyed with good friends when we were young. In childhood we were both explorers, curious, and adventuresome. Our good friends shared adventures with us, popping in and out of caves, of haunted houses, of winding paths and wood thickets.

We were builders, constructing tree-huts, underground passages. We were rascals, taking special delight in surprising our elders. We looked out to the world beyond us, going on expeditions, riding our bikes as far as we could peddle, before we returned, exhausted to our homes.

Since we had no children of our own, we were free to travel, to pick up and leave for any locale whenever we desired.

Our children, we said, we met along the open roads, "both young and old, both bright and dull witted: our acquaintances and friends. They were those we counseled and assisted in times of distress, they were our thoughts, those which reproduced their kind and helped make, hopefully, for a better world.

We learned to save ourselves first, if we were to save others. The way to do, said Lao Tzu, is to be. To live beliefs, rather than worrying about how to spread them, or how to convince others of their validity.

Gay liberation for us would not be a cause or an organization, but living in accordance with the best we discovered, alone and together. Marriage was not the word we chose to describe this relationship. Friendship, instead, was our strong bond.

1975 arrived. The last time I saw Lige alive, he was getting into an auto to go on a two week vacation. He was concerned I'd react with dismay at his hurried decision to leave. I didn't fuss. I knew he'd soon return. And

he appreciated me much for my calm as he prepared to leave.

Before he stepped into the car, he kissed me, saying, "Now I love you more than I've ever loved you before." Within three days he was dead, murdered mysteriously, gunned down in the car at a roadblock.

But those final spoken words of his returned to give me comfort. I'd recognized the importance of celebrating another's freedom and had been

assured of his love as a result.

This said, do I support legalized marriages for gay men and lesbians? Yes and no. First, let it be said that the larger groups ? HRC and NGLTF ? in the gay, lesbian and bisexual movement itself didn't initiate this demand for marriage.

It was first made an issue by the Christian Coalition in an attempt to bring focus to the one matter about which the heterosexual side of the sexual continuum seems worried.

Since then too, the matter has erupted because individual Hawaiian gays and lesbians took it to court. The strongest supporters of same-sex marriage in America's gay communities are probably the members of the gay-founded Christian denomination, the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches. I'm not a member of that denomination.

On a personal level, marriage just isn't my style. But equal rights is my style. If other Americans enjoy the right to marry with its benefits, so should gay men and lesbians have that right, even if I, personally, have no love for the institution.

Would I settle for a domestic partnership arrangement? No, because that would be accepting a "back of the bus" arrangement. I feel similarly about access to military service.

Do I, personally, want to be able to drop bombs on problematic planetary neighbors? No. But if other Americans have that right, so should gay men and lesbians.

Not long ago I dropped in at a local gay club. Sitting at the bar was a young man who, I realized, was an unhappy camper indeed. As we talked he explained how his lover of several years had recently left him.

A legalized marriage wouldn't have helped to keep them together. In fact, it would have made their plight even more difficult, requiring court expenses and a protracted bitterness. His lover had told him that any romance they'd known had altogether disappeared from their lives.

Though this young man once considered himself attractive, there was little about his distraught face that showed any evidence of vitality or adventure-love. Like all too many folk, he accepted the culture around him without questioning it, as if it were natural.

If same-sex marriages were legal, he'd now be in the midst of a messy divorce, he explained.

As we talked I thought about something Mary Chilton, the free-love feminist advocate, had written in 1856:

"Oh! cautious and conservative reformer, look about you and see the careworn faces of your respectable married friends; listen and hear the sighs and groans of heartbroken sufferers! What does all this sickness and misery mean that we see everywhere? Are not these prudent people really the martyrs, and not the brave and fearless, who leave home and friends, and position and luxury, for the love of Freedom and the freedom of love? Not they the martyrs; no, you will find the martyrs among the respectable and

those deemed comfortable, and certainly cared-for portion of the community. Could you look behind the scenes, you would find manacles on arms that in secret are raised to Heaven...you might see the vinegar-soaked sponge of respectability, tauntingly offered in mockery, to the fevered lips."

My immediate thought ? some kind of advice ? was to tell my acquaintance to throw his shoulders back, to make himself feel sexy to himself, to go to practice nautilus at some gym. "Look in the mirror and like what you see," I begged, "and you'll get energy through exercise that'll make you sexy to yourself."

Next, I told him to open his mind to new vistas. "I want you to know that you don't need a witness, a married spouse, to attest to your good worth," I told him. "You're worthy, whether you're with or without a partner."

As usual I recommended Walt Whitman, but fearing he might need something shorter, I insisted he study Kahlil Gibran's, *The Prophet*, which had been one of Lige's favorite books.

This distraught bar patron looked at me, frowning. "My Ex told me to read that book but I never did," he said. "Maybe I should have."

"Then do it now," I pleaded, "and absorb each word and make it a natural part of your thoughts." I recited what Lige had so passionately recited to me so many years before, a discourse on marriage:

Love one another, but make not a bond of love.
Let it be rather a moving sea between the shores of your souls.
Fill each other's cup but drink not from one cup.
Give one another of your bread but eat not from the same loaf.
Sing and dance together and be joyous, but let each one of you be

alone,

Even as the strings of a lute are alone though they quiver with the same music.

? Jack Nichols is Senior Editor at GayToday: www.gaytoday.badpuppy.com

His latest book is *The Gay Agenda: Talking Back to the Fundamentalists* (Prometheus Books)

Associated Press, January 8, 2000

Judge delays setting trial date for brothers charged in slayings

REDDING, Calif. (AP) ? A Shasta County judge has delayed setting a trial date for two brothers accused of murdering a gay couple.

Superior Judge James Ruggiero on Friday granted defense attorneys' request for more time to prepare their case. He scheduled a hearing April 7

to set a trial date.

Benjamin Matthew Williams, 31, and James Tyler Williams, 29, of Palo Cedro, are charged with robbing and murdering a gay couple last summer.

Winfield Mowder, 40, and Gary Matson, 50, were found shot to death in their Happy Valley home July 1.

Matson's father, Oscar Matson of Redding, said the victims' families

are
willing to wait for a trial.

"I think it's taking a little time, but we have to do it right," he said.

"We want all the evidence in."

District Attorney McGregor Scott is seeking the death penalty.

Defense attorneys in November requested a meeting with him to argue against it. Asked whether he would be willing to reconsider, Scott replied:

"We are always willing to listen."

The brothers have pleaded innocent, but the elder Williams has told reporters he committed the murders and is also responsible for June 18 arson

attacks at three Sacramento-area synagogues.

He said his younger brother is innocent in both cases.

Federal authorities are investigating whether the Williams brothers are responsible for the temple fires, which caused more than \$1 million in damage.

The brothers are also suspects in a July 2 arson at a Sacramento building that houses an abortion clinic.

Arizona Daily Star, January 8, 2000
P. O. Box 26887, Tucson, AZ, 85726
(Fax 602-573-4141) (E-MAIL: letters@azstarnet.com)
(<http://www.azstarnet.com/>)

Anti-gay group targets Arizona legislator

PHOENIX (AP) ? When the Arizona Legislature opens its 2000 session Monday, members of a Kansas-based anti-homosexual group plan to demonstrate against a gay lawmaker whose fight to remain in the military reserve has drawn national headlines.

The Westboro Baptist Church of Topeka, led by the Rev. Fred Phelps, pickets around the country against homosexuals, those it considers sympathetic to homosexuals and those who disagree with its views. Its latest target is Rep. Steve May, a Phoenix Republican who is one of two openly gay state legislators.

May is one of several people at the center of a debate over the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding homosexuals. While Pentagon regulations still ban gays, the military isn't supposed to seek out such information.

Westboro Baptist Church's Web site said it also plans to stage a protest outside the Phoenix office of U.S. Sen. John McCain, whose presidential campaign has drawn support from a gay Republican group.

May acknowledged his sexual orientation while he was an honorably discharged civilian debating a bill as a state legislator. The Army then called him back to active duty in preparation for a possible ground assault in Kosovo. Now an Army investigator has recommended that May, a lieutenant in the reserves, be discharged. He is fighting any disciplinary action.

Phelps traveled to Phoenix last year to protest against May's remaining in the Army.

McCain, running for the Republican presidential nomination, has collected about \$40,000 in contributions from members of the Log Cabin Republicans even though he and they disagree on some gay issues.

"A Faustian deal with the devil," the church's home page said of gays' support for McCain.

The Westboro group is best known for picketing funerals, including those of Arizona Sen. Barry Goldwater, who supported his gay grandson's lifestyle, and Matthew Shepard, the gay college student murdered in Wyoming.

Department of Public Safety spokesman Andy Vidaure said the anti-gay protest at the Capitol is expected to involve about 10 people and the counterprotest about 100. The groups will be kept in separate, fenced areas.

murder their son, then drop the most serious charges.

"Suddenly, the Army let him plead to nothing related to the actual murder . . . justice was not served today," they said in a statement.

A group that represents gay and lesbian service members said the sentence is too lenient, considering that Fisher had admitted goading Glover into attacking Winchell.

The sentence is "a travesty," said C. Dixon Osburn, co-executive director of the Service Members Legal Defense Network, which is based in Washington, D.C. "We're left with huge questions about why Ft. Campbell cut this deal."

Fisher will be eligible for parole in about four years, Osburn noted.

The Winchell case has galvanized a national reappraisal of the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy six years after it was adopted amid a storm of controversy.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Gerrie Schipske to gerri@earthlink at 13:39:29.00. Subject: Of Primary Importance - Why Gerrie Schipske needs to win the primary. (3 pages)	01/09/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
Default ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 1100000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/08/2000 - 01/11/2000]

2015-0017-F
ab1575

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Gerrie Schipske to gerri@earthlink at 13:37:17.00. Subject: Of Primary Importance - Why Gerrie Schipske needs to win the primary. (3 pages)	01/09/2000	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
Default ([Don't Ask, Don't Tell])
OA/Box Number: 1100000

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/08/2000 - 01/11/2000]

2015-0017-F
ab1575

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JAN-2000 02:15:28.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.8.00.6

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

TEXT:

1. SCHENECTADY DAILY GAZETTE Police officer suspended after another officer accuses him of ruining his name by falsely saying he is homosexual
2. LAS VEGAS SUN Nevada's Rep. Berkley urges Congress to pass hate crimes bill including gays
3. HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN Editorial on gays in the military: Members of the armed forces are expected to carry out orders whether they agree with them or not

Schenectady Daily Gazette, January 8, 2000
Box 1090, Schenectady, NY, 12301
(Fax 518-395-3089) (E-MAIL: gazette@dailygazette.com)
(<http://www.dailygazette.com>)

Saratoga officer suspended

By RIK STEVENS, Gazette Reporter

SARATOGA SPRINGS ? A veteran city police officer was suspended six days before another officer filed a legal document charging him with sexual harassment.

Lawrence Castell was suspended Dec. 30 without pay for 30 days pending the outcome of a departmental hearing, according to Police Chief Kenneth E. King.

On Jan 5, the lawyer for Officer Robert C. Dennis filed a notice of claim accusing Castell of continuing to sexually harass him even after Dennis sued several officers and the city, alleging a pattern of harassment.

Dennis said officers falsely claimed he is homosexual, ruining his name in the community and making his workplace intolerable.

Citing confidentiality, King said he would not disclose the nature of the disciplinary hearing against Castell but did say that personnel complaints had been filed against both officers. Dennis faces no disciplinary action in connection with the complaint, King said.

Castell, who joined the force in May 1976 and earns \$41,850 per year, could not be reached for comment.

In his suit, Dennis named several officers, King, the assistant police chief and the city, seeking \$30 million and charging several fellow officers

ruined his name by telling people he is homosexual.

In a lawsuit filed in U.S. District Court, Dennis says charges that he

is
gay have ruined his reputation in the community, caused "enormous emotional distress," and taken away his desire to go to work and be a police officer.

Castell was one of the officers originally named in the suit. Dennis said he blew kisses to him over the police radio and said he saw him at the mall "with your boyfriend."

But Dennis dropped Castell from the suit, conceding that Castell's alleged actions were "perhaps part of the childish games that all too often invade the workplace," according to the latest notice of claim.

On Wednesday, Dennis informed the city he might put Castell back into the lawsuit after an incident in the locker room on Dec. 16, 1999, when Castell again blew kisses at Dennis, according to Dennis.

"This is remarkable, as Castell was given a reprieve during the first lawsuit," the notice of claim reads. "Now, during the course of this litigation, and so close to trial, he blows kisses to [Dennis], and ? in response to an official complaint filed against him by patrolman Dennis ? claims, entirely falsely, that [Dennis] was 'menacing' him with a shotgun in the locker room."

King would not comment on the alleged locker room episode.

The suit is expected to go to trial May 1.

In the original complaint, Dennis claimed police brass looked the other way when he made formal complaints against several fellow officers, allowing the harassment to continue.

Las Vegas Sun, January 6, 2000

Box 4275, Las Vegas, NV, 89107

(Fax 702-383-7264) (E-MAIL: letters@lasvegassun.com)

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

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

Rep. Berkley urges Congress to pass hate crimes bill

SPARKS, Nev. (AP) ? Rep. Shelley Berkley urged conservatives in Congress to stop blocking a hate crime bill in the face of continued attacks like the attempted fire-bombing of a Reno synagogue.

The Nevada Democrat, whose family fled the Nazis during World War II, also was the lone politician at an interfaith gathering Wednesday night who specifically called for federal hate-crime protections to be extended to gays.

"There is hate crimes legislation pending before the United States Congress that we can't even get to the committee to hear," said Berkley, a member of Temple Beth Sholom in Las Vegas and regional board of the Anti-Defamation League.

"I think it is outrageous," she said in an interview.

Berkley and Republican Gov. Kenny Guinn joined Jewish, Catholic, Mormon and other religious leaders addressing more than 800 people at the rally denouncing the Nov. 30 attack at Temple Emanu-El in Reno.

Five white supremacists have been arrested and are scheduled to go to trial next month on conspiracy and bomb charges punishable by up to 30 years

in prison. Nevada has no hate-crime enhancement for property crimes, but the FBI continues to investigate whether to file additional charges under federal hate-crime laws.

"Our society must have zero tolerance for crimes perpetuated against a group for the simple reason that they are different. If the Holocaust taught us anything, it is that you cannot tolerate heinous acts of hatred," Berkley said.

The Senate unanimously approved hate crimes prevention legislation in July, but it stalled in the House Judiciary Committee.

Last month, President Clinton vetoed a spending bill for the Commerce, Justice and State departments because the hate crimes provision was not in it. Earlier this week, the president included the proposal as one of his legislative priorities in 2000.

The hate crimes bill would add crimes motivated by a victim's sexual orientation, sex or disability to the list of hate crimes already covered under federal law ? those motivated by race, religion, color or national origin.

It also would allow federal prosecutors to pursue a hate crime case if local authorities decline to press charges.

Current law limits such prosecution to situations where the victim is targeted for engaging in certain federally protected activities, such as serving on a jury, voting or attending public school.

Critics say the bill is redundant because it covers acts that current law already punishes. But Sen. Gordon Smith, R-Ore., who supports the bill, has said that many of his colleagues are against it because they are "uncomfortable with homosexuality."

At the rally Wednesday night, Berkley was the only politician among those who railed against bigotry to call for protecting gays.

"I stand with you tonight so that ... two generations after my family fled the Nazis to find safe haven in this wonderful country of ours, that their dream of religious freedom ? a world free of hatred and racism and bigotry and prejudice ? will become a reality for Jews and non-Jews for men and women, heterosexuals and homosexuals, people who have black skin, red skin, white skin, yellow skin and brown skin," Berkley said.

Nevada's hate law already protects victims attacked because of their sexual orientation, but gay rights activists are on the defensive on other fronts, including a proposal to amend the state constitution to ban gay marriages.

Berkley doesn't believe the amendment would serve any purpose because state law already defines marriage as being between a man and a woman, her spokeswoman Laura Chapin said.

Berkley opened her speech quoting Martin Niemoller, a German protestant minister who led the organized church opposition to Hitler and was imprisoned in a concentration camp from 1938-45.

"First they came for the Socialists. And I did not speak because I was not a Socialist. Then they came for the trade unionists. And I did not

Speak because I was not a trade unionist," she read.

"Then they came for the Jews. And I did not speak because I was not a Jew. And then they came for me and there was no one left to speak for me."

"Those words hang on the wall in my office in Washington to remind me why I'm serving in Congress," she said.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 8, 2000

Box 3080, Honolulu, HI, 96802

(Fax 808-523-8509) (E-MAIL: letters@starbulletin.com)

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

Editorial: Gays in the military

? The issue: Al Gore said he would make support for homosexual rights in the military a "litmus test" for appointment to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

? Our view: Members of the armed forces are expected to carry out orders whether they agree with them or not.

If Al Gore is elected president, he will face a military already antagonized by a foolish statement he made about gays in the military. In a debate with Bill Bradley in New Hampshire Wednesday, Gore said he would make agreement with his views on homosexuals in the armed forces a "litmus test" for any appointment he made to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Bradley, who also supports gay and lesbian rights, made the more sensible statement that he would expect his appointees to the Joint Chiefs to carry out his policy. In the military, one is expected to follow orders, including those one doesn't agree with.

That goes for the top brass as well as the lowliest private. When Douglas MacArthur refused to follow orders, Harry Truman fired him.

Retired Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, former Air Force chief of staff, commented, "I regard that (Gore's statement) as a ridiculous assertion, that that should be a qualification for office. I suppose winning the nation's wars should be the primary qualification."

Gore's statement raises doubts about his qualifications to be president.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JAN-2000 15:18:52.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.9.00.4

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

TEXT:

1. BALTIMORE SUN Two letters about same-sex benefits and families
2. DALLAS MORNING NEWS Letter from former Navy Lieutenant: Gay warriors
3. DALLAS MORNING NEWS Book Review ("Out For Good"): Gay rights chronicle limits its own impact
4. PARADE MAGAZINE Ellen DeGeneres to have new sitcom on CBS
5. LINCOLN JOURNAL STAR Letter from parents of the young man who found Matthew Shepard tied to a fence in Wyoming
6. GLASGOW RECORD & MAIL (Scotland) New lead in whereabouts of torso of young man believed killed by gay suspect William Beggs

Baltimore Sun, January 9, 2000
501 N. Calvert Street, Baltimore, MD, 21278
(Fax 410-332-6977) (E-MAIL: letters@baltsun.com)
(<http://www.sunspot.net/>)

Letter: Homosexual couples shouldn't expect benefits

I applaud ExxonMobil's decision to end Mobil's policy of providing benefits to gay and lesbian couples ("ExxonMobil falters on gay partner benefits," Opinion Commentary, Dec. 28).

Heterosexual couples generally have to wait until they are married to get spousal benefits.

Why are companies even considering providing benefits to people who exhibit deviant behavior?

Marriage was and is designed to be between one man and one woman for the purpose of procreation; that definitely excludes gays and lesbians.

It's time more companies stood their ground and refused to make special accommodations for people who have left the normal realms of behavior.

It's a free county: If you want to choose a lifestyle that is immoral and indecent, go right ahead.

Just don't expect to be treated as if your arrangement is a normal marriage because it is not.

? Robert G. Padgett, Baltimore

Letter: Gays and lesbians raise children, too

Peter Jensen's article on the increasingly diverse structure of American

families surprisingly made no mention of families headed by lesbian or gay parents ("The changing family," Home and Family, Jan. 2).

Although these families have historically been invisible to much of

mainstream society, researchers estimate that at least 6 million (and perhaps as many as 14 million) U.S. children are being raised by same-sex parents.

This number is expected to grow rather dramatically in the coming years because of the availability of alternative reproductive technology and adoption.

Studies over the past two decades have shown that these families are functioning quite effectively ? parents are capable and committed, children are healthy and well-adjusted ? despite the stress caused by homophobia.

Mr. Jensen's omission of lesbian and gay parent families from his discussion underscores the marginal status of this sizable and growing population.

Regardless of one's views about same-sex parents, such lack of recognition is a disservice to their children.

? Mary Lambert, Baltimore

Dallas Morning News, January 9, 2000

Box 655237, Dallas, TX, 75265

(Fax 972-263-0456) (E-Mail: letterstoeditor@dallasnews.com)

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

Letter: Gay warriors

Re: "Homosexuals in the military ? Gays aren't warriors," Letters, Jan. 2.

Thomas R. Collingwood is correct in stating the mission of the military is "about destroying the enemies of the United States." Accordingly, we should welcome to the ranks the very best warriors available, from all walks of life.

The history of gays and lesbians in the U.S. military has shattered the stereotype that homosexuality prevents one from being a warrior (as the letter from P.B. Johnson printed next to Mr. Collingwood's attests).

Mr. Collingwood cites "the gay agenda" as his rationale for opposing gays in the military. I have never received a copy of the "gay agenda" (does it come from "gay headquarters"?), so I need to get a copy and get up to speed.

I will loan Mr. Collingwood my copy of "Conduct Unbecoming: Gays & Lesbians in the U.S. Military" so he can learn about the heroism and dedication of gay

men and women in uniform, if he will loan me his copy of the "gay agenda" so

I can understand what he is talking about.

? T.S. CARSON, Former lieutenant, U.S. Navy, Dallas

Dallas Morning News, January 8, 2000

Gay rights chronicle limits its own impact

By John Rechy

Out for Good: The Struggle to Build a Gay Rights Movement in America

By Dudley Clendinen and Adam Nagourney, (Simon & Schuster, \$30)

The authors of this history place the birth of the modern gay rights movement in June 1969, the time of riots at the Stonewall Inn, a bar in New York City.

Earlier actions are attributed to a "tiny network of people . . . essentially silent, unseen and inert." At Stonewall, "for the first time, the usual acquiescence turned into violent resistance [and] the lives of millions of gay men and lesbians began to change." That narrowing of gay defiance ? and at times, a seemingly arbitrary choice of what is of historical import ? mar this generally impressive book.

Veterans of the front lines will recoil at the authors' assertion that the years before Stonewall were "years of unchallenged police raids." Historian Jim Kemper's "Becoming a People, a 400-Year Gay and Lesbian Chronology", an imposing record published by the National Gay Archives, describes many such actions before Stonewall. A 1967 raid on the Black Cat Bar in San Francisco created disruptions that spread into Los Angeles, where

more than 2,000 gay men protested. In early 1969, the beating of a gay man led to a battle with heavily armed Los Angeles police. Both events are relegated to an "inert" time by the authors, who assert that it took "six months for the spark of Stonewall to reach Los Angeles."

It is not inconceivable that emphasis on the Stonewall rebellion comes, in part, because it occurred in New York and was given its present importance by East Coast activities.

Surprisingly, among hundreds of interviews cited, no voice is heard from those who set the night on fire at Stonewall, only from those who emerged in caucuses and meetings.

Gay gossip recurs here as history. Three pages are donated to the account by a "cute" young man about how he got Tennessee Williams ? "infamously alcoholic and unreliable" ? to sign a letter in support of individual rights; the young man once "batted his eyelashes" at the great playwright, although he "didn't want to have to go to bed" with him.

Dozens of heroic men and women emerge deservedly and sharply out of this account, but the authors dismiss more exotic but equally valiant players, such as the publishers of "physique" magazines whose court cases paved the way for gay rights. "Faggots", a fine novel by admirable advocate and canny performer Larry Kramer, is given singular significance, while insurrectionary pioneers such as William Burroughs and James Purdy are ignored.

Despite its shortcomings, this book is a monumental trove of essential information ungathered until now.

? John Rechy is the first novelist to receive PEN/USA-West's Lifetime Achievement Award; his most recent novel is The Coming of the Night.

Parade Magazine, January 9, 2000
Walter Scott's Personalith Parade
Box 5001, Grand Central Station, New York, NY 10163-5001

Q: Is it true Ellen DeGeneres will star in a comedy series like the old "Carol Burnett Show?"
? Cindy Smith, Alrington Mass.

A: Not exactly. DeGeneres, 41 ? whose previous show was canceled by

ABC

in 1998 after four years and her controversial "coming out" ? does have a series in development at CBS, but it's a half-hour sitcom, not a variety show

with skits a la Burnett. Your confusion is understandable, because the format of the sitcom will be a show-within-a-show, with the comedienne palying the host of a TV comedy series. It will focus on its characters' backstage activities. "The idea of her character being gay has not been discussed," says a CBS spokesman, "but we'd have no problem with it if that's

what Ellen wants." CBS hopes to launch the show this fall.

Lincoln Journal Star, January 9, 2000

PO Box 81609, Lincoln, NE 68501-1609

(FAX: 402-473-7291, EMAIL:oped@nebweb.com)

Letter: Prayers appreciated

Over the holidays, we had many friends, acquaintances and strangers ask how our son Aaron was doing since testifying in the Matthew Shepard trial. We also found out how many had been praying for him and the Shepards through the trial.

Aaron is doing OK. The horror of it all has put his education on hold for now, but he looks to the future with hope and without bitterness. When something like this happens to a family, you find out a lot about people, both good and bad, at home and across the nation.

We thank all of you for your prayers and kind thoughts. Without them, we

are sure it would have been a lot worse. We know it was God's plan for Aaron

to find Matthew tied to that fence, in the middle of nowhere, giving his parents closure and the possibility to be with him as he died. God works in

strange ways!

? Kevin, Anita, Aaron and Joey Kreifels, Grand Island

Glasgow Daily Record and Sunday Mail, January 9, 2000

Anderston Quay, Glasgow, Scotland, G3 8DA

(Daily Record: editors@dailyrecord.co.uk)

(Sunday Mail: editor@features.sundaymail.co.uk)

(<http://www.record-mail.co.uk/rm/>)

Women see torso floating in river

Police switch search for Barry

The search for the torso of tragic teenager Barry Wallace switched to a world-famous beauty spot yesterday.

Police divers scoured the River Doon in Alloway outside Ayr, just half a mile away from Burns Cottage, the birthplace of national bard Rabbie Burns.

Police have been scouring a huge refuse dump throughout the week in Cumnock, Ayrshire, looking for the torso.

But following a sighting by two women of what they believed to be a body

floating in the river near a the luxury Brig O' Doon House Hotel, the

Strathclyde Police Underwater Unit secretly began a search of the river.

They started the hunt at a point near the hotel, owned by Kilmarnock Football Club chairman Bill Costley, and slowly moved down river. The teenager's limbs turned up in Loch Lomond five weeks ago and his head was found eight days later on a beach near Troon, Ayrshire, nearly 60 miles away.

Detectives then received a tip-off that Barry's torso may have been taped up in black bin bags and dumped in a wheelie bin.

As a result they cordoned off the landfill site at Cumnock last week which takes waste from throughout Ayrshire including Barry's home town of Kilmarnock.

Officers then began the gruesome task of sifting through 2,000 tons of festering refuse.

However, two women walking their dog outside the hotel on Thursday spotted what they thought was a body in the water.

They alerted the police who immediately sealed off the area and a team from the Strathclyde Police underwater unit started a search.

It went on all day Friday and has continued through the weekend.

Detectives believe that Barry's killer may have dumped the body from the bridge overlooking the river at the hotel and it then floated down stream.

Yesterday, Strathclyde Police confirmed that they were searching the river in connection with the death of Barry Wallace

A spokeswoman added: "On Thursday two women who were walking their dog over the bridge at the hotel reported seeing a body floating in the river.

"Strathclyde Police divers are searching the river and the surrounding area."

The search at the landfill site was stopped for the weekend to allow police to search the river. However, the dump search will continue tomorrow as will the search of the river.

Tesco shelf stacker Barry, 18, went missing after a night out with workmates in Kilmarnock on December 4.

On December 17 police raided the home of computer operator William Beggs in Kilmarnock and four days later a warrant was issued for his arrest.

Beggs is now in a Dutch jail after handing himself over to police in Amsterdam.

His lawyer says he plans to fight extradition to the UK.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JAN-2000 11:32:59.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.9.00.2

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. NEW YORK TIMES Letter from Lambda Legal Defense on grandparents' rights court case
2. THE RECORD (NJ) Letter from the Articles-reading Galluccios praising the PFLAG billboard that says "Someone you know and love is lesbian or gay"
3. WASHINGTON POST Grandparents' rights case has implications for gay families
4. LOS ANGELES TIMES Soldier Gets 12 1/2 Years in Prison for His Role in Beating Death of Pfc. Barry Winchell
5. ASSOCIATED PRESS Justin Fisher sentenced in killing of Pfc. Barry Winchell; Fisher lied in murder case of private rumored to be gay; psychiatrist testifies Fisher is secret cross-dresser

New York Times, January 9, 2000
229 W. 43rd Street, New York, NY, 10036
(Fax 212-556-3622) (E-MAIL: letters@nytimes.com)
(<http://www.nytimes.com>)
Letter:

In discussing the visitation dispute before the Supreme Court, Carol Sanger (Op-Ed, Jan. 5) says some gay rights groups are siding with the grandparents.

In fact, although we disagree with the position that parents' constitutional rights nearly never allow others even to seek visitation, we support the parent in this case because we believe that Washington State's law allowing anyone to seek visitation at any time is unconstitutionally broad and intrusive.

We urge the justices to find a middle ground. No one knows better than the gay community the liabilities of either extreme.

Our families regularly fight off challenges by others, even grandparents, who use prejudice to justify taking our children away from us, and we also routinely suffer from the common misconception that only biological or legal parents have important and enforceable relationships with children.
? BEATRICE DOHRN, Legal Director, Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund

The Record, January 9, 2000
150 River Street, Hackensack, NJ, 07602
(Fax 201-646-4135) (E-MAIL: LettersToTheEditor@bergen.com)

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

Letter: Simple truth, simple message

Regarding "Sign of support" (Editorial, Jan. 4):

One of the things that we believe has most inhibited the gay and lesbian community over the years is our own fear of being "found out." Opposition to our very existence has been so vehement and many times hateful, it has seemed to be safer to blend in and live our lives in secret. Because gay people span every culture, race, and religion, it has been relatively easy for us to pass as straight. By doing this we have been able to avoid abuse, whether physical or emotional. For many, this has become a safe and acceptable existence.

Now, what was once our only means of preservation has become one of the greatest roadblocks to our assuming our rightful place as equal, normal, ordinary people. Since we have been so effective at hiding ourselves, society has actually come to believe that we are nothing more than a relatively small group of shameful individuals trying to push our "ways" on the rest of the world. Really, who could blame them?

For the most part, we have dismissed the jokes, taunts, and beatings as "just part of our lives." By denying ourselves, we have perpetuated the idea that we have, in fact, something of which to be ashamed.

Unfortunately, we are still at a point in our history where we need to fear losing our jobs, our families, and even our lives. As gay and lesbian people, these fears are very real. Lucky for us all, there is a group like Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays to lend a hand. In one simple act, a group of straight Bergen County citizens has been able to state

the obvious: "Someone you know and love is lesbian or gay." How simple and how true.

? Michael and Jon Galluccio, Maywood [jgalluccio@email.msn.com]

Washington Post, January 9, 2000
1150 15th Street NW, Washington, DC, 20071

(Online Mailer:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/edit/letters/letterform.htm>)

Challenging Legal Notion Of 'Family'

Supreme Court Set To Hear Grandparents' Visitation Request

By Joan Biskupic, Washington Post Staff Writer

Before their son died, Jenifer and Gary Troxel doted on their young granddaughters. They would do jigsaw puzzles together, wade in a creek near their rural Washington state home and treat the girls to cheese macaroni and

drinks topped with whipped cream at a local restaurant.

But after Brad Troxel committed suicide in 1993, those ties frayed as the Troxels and the girls' mother, Tommie Granville, quarreled over the amount of

time they wanted to spend with the girls. That precipitated a contemporary twist on grandparent-grandchild relations: The Troxels sued for visitation rights.

"We don't want them to forget that their daddy loved them," Jenifer Troxel said of the visitation battle, now entering its seventh year. "We miss watching them grow up."

In an era of splintered families, their case, to be heard at the Supreme Court on Wednesday, raises difficult and emotional questions about the rights of parents, the role of relatives and ? fundamentally ? how the law should respond to evolving notions of "family."

With a growing number of children being cared for by extended families and surrogate kin, the dispute has implications for a tangled array of modern relationships. Courts across the country have been asked to rule on visitation battles involving not only grandparents, but also other blood relatives, former boyfriends of a child's mother, former foster parents, the biological mother of a child after adoption and gay partners of a child's biological parent.

At the Supreme Court, advocates for the nation's 60 million grandparents have weighed in on the Troxels' side, citing the powerful emotional bonds between grandchildren and grandparents. On Granville's side, religious organizations seeking to preserve traditional notions of family have found themselves allied with civil libertarians who argue that the government has no right to dictate to parents who can see their children.

Gay rights advocates have charted a middle course based on their interest in ensuring that children raised by lesbians and gay men are not treated differently from other children. They want the court to reinforce the "vital, autonomous nature of parental decisions" ? protecting gay parents against interference from disapproving judges ? but still leave the door open to visiting rights for those who have had an "unusually significant relationship" with a child, a standard that could help gay men and women who want to maintain contact with a former partner's child.

The court's eventual ruling may also have particular resonance in the District, which the Census Bureau says has the highest nationwide rate of children living in a grandparent's home, 19 percent.

The dispute in *Troxel v. Granville* involves a Washington state law, similar to child visitation statutes in all states, that allows grandparents or any third party to seek time with a child if a court determines it would be in the child's best interest.

The Troxels won visitation under the law, although they didn't get as much as they wanted. They had sought an entire weekend visit every other week, but the judge allowed a once-a-month visit from 4:30 p.m. Saturday until 6 p.m. Sunday. Objecting to the order involving her girls, Granville appealed, and on Christmas Eve in 1998 the Washington Supreme Court struck down the law for infringing on parents' constitutional privacy interests.

The court ruled that parents have a right to rear their children

without
state interference and said visitation could be imposed only if necessary
to
prevent harm to the child.

"Like any family, we're a special family and we have a lot to offer
these
kids," Jenifer Troxel said. She said the absence of the granddaughters,
Natalie and Isabelle, has been hard on the whole Troxel clan, which
includes
the girls' eight young cousins who used to spend time with them.

"It's fun to have the whole family together, and we miss that," Troxel
said. "We miss seeing their musical accomplishments. Natalie takes piano.
They've both taken dance lessons." She said she and husband Gary, who was
the lead-singer for the popular 1960s rock group The Fleetwoods,
particularly
long to be part of the girls' musical efforts.

But the children's mother, who has since married Kelly Wynn, said it
should be up to the mother or father ? not a judge ? to say what
interaction
with grandparents is allowed. "Grandparents' support is always welcome,
but
court-ordered visitation is not supportive," Tommie Granville Wynn wrote
in a
letter recently posted on a parents' rights Web site.

Tommie Wynn's situation presents a snapshot of modern America ? "a
blended family," she and her husband call it on the Web site. She already
had three children from a previous marriage when she became involved with
Brad Troxel and had two children with him, Natalie and Isabelle, now 10 and
8. The two never married, but they lived together on and off from 1989 to
1991. After Troxel's death, Wynn married Kelly Wynn, a local business
owner
with two children of his own. Then the Wynns had an eighth child together.

Tommie Wynn explains in filings to the Supreme Court that she never
tried
to cut off all access to her daughters but was simply trying to carve out
enough time for her new family to be together. She says she was concerned
about the Troxel family's increasing "spur-of-the-moment" requests to see
her
daughters and said she had wanted to keep the contact to one weekend day a
month.

Her lawyers say the case is about "the fundamental right of . . .
parents
to family autonomy, the oldest and one of the most sacred of our personal
liberties." They urge the justices to adopt a standard that bars
court-ordered visitation unless it can be shown that the child is being
harmed in some way. They also attack the Washington law for its breadth;
it
goes further than many other state statutes, allowing "any person," not
just
relatives, to go to court to try to obtain visiting rights "at any time."

The Troxels' lawyers counter that the Washington court put too high a
premium on parents' rights. They urge the court to look at "all of the
competing familial interests involved. The parent-child relationship is
not

the only constitutionally significant interest at stake in cases such as this. The relationship between a grandchild and grandparent is also an important part of family life."

Disputes over such inherently personal bonds do not often come to the Supreme Court, but the justices will begin with some touchstones. In the 1920s, the court recognized a liberty interest in the Constitution for parents to "establish a home and bring up children." Parents' rights are not

absolute, and the court has said it must carefully balance them against the government's asserted interest ? for example, in seeing that children are educated or in enforcing child labor laws.

The court has not confined its protections to the nuclear family. In 1977, when it struck down an East Cleveland, Ohio, housing ordinance that made it illegal for a grandmother to live with her son and two grandsons, the

court said, "Ours is by no means a tradition limited to respect for the bonds

uniting the members of the nuclear family. The tradition of uncles, aunts, cousins, and especially grandparents sharing a household . . . has roots equally venerable and equally deserving of constitutional recognition."

The social crosscurrents of the new dispute are revealed by the various groups supporting each side. Backing the mother are such unlikely allies as

the American Civil Liberties Union and the Christian Legal Society, among others. Although they take different tacks, both emphasize the autonomy of the family. In the same vein, the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund has submitted a brief urging the court to make sure it doesn't rule in a way

that would intrude on gay parents who are often challenged by third parties who think they know what's best for the children.

Siding with the Troxels are the powerful senior-citizen group AARP, which

emphasizes how involved grandparents are in child-rearing today, and 12 states and numerous other governmental groups that insist the government needs to be able to order third-party visitation to protect the welfare of children.

Beyond such organized interest, Granville's case has galvanized individual parents and grandparents in difficult situations nationwide. Connie and Michael Monschein of Indianapolis, who are locked in a visitation battle, have been following the case through the Internet.

"A lot of times people think that when people become grandparents they become saints," Connie Monschein said. "There are just as many manipulative and dysfunctional grandparents as there are parents."

The bitterness that arises in families, particularly in the wake of divorce and death, is precisely why states should get involved, said Gerard Wallace of the Grandparent Caregiver Law Center at Hunter College in New York. Wallace mentioned the "hatred" he has seen in families and said that unless the Washington law is upheld, "the already-torn fabric of family unity will be ripped to shreds."

As part of its support for the Troxels, the AARP released a report last week that highlighted the strong bonds between grandparents and grandchildren. The AARP found that 11 percent of grandparents over age 50

are caregivers; 8 percent say that they provide day care on a regular basis;

and 3 percent say they are raising a grandchild.

Overall, the group said, 1.5 million American children are raised primarily by their grandparents.

The Troxels' lawyers say that since the Washington Supreme Court's decision a little more than a year ago, the grandparents have seen Isabelle twice and Natalie once.

The case could affect not only the future bonds between children and the

extended relatives they might live with for a time, but the more casual relations that are the stuff of grandparenting: "They'd like to have me paint their faces," Jenifer Troxel said wistfully. "They found it fun. In turn, I'd let them paint my face. . . . But not Grandpa. He didn't like that much."

? Staff researcher Lynn Davis contributed to this report.

Los Angeles Times, January 9, 2000

Times Mirror Square, Los Angeles, CA, 90053

(Fax 213-237-7679 or 213-237-5319) (E-MAIL: letters@latimes.com)

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

Soldier Gets 12 1/2 Years in Prison for His Role in Beating Death

From Times Staff and Wire Services

FT. CAMPBELL, Ky. ? A soldier pleaded guilty to a reduced charge Saturday in the beating death of a barracks mate who had been rumored to be gay.

Army Spc. Justin R. Fisher, 26, was sentenced to 12 1/2 years in prison.

Fisher admitted he lied to military investigators and obstructed the investigation when he wiped blood from a baseball bat that Pvt. Calvin

Glover

used to kill Pfc. Barry Winchell, who had been sleeping.

During sentencing, Fisher wept as he apologized to his family and to the relatives of the victim.

"Barry, I hope you can hear me," Fisher started. "I'm sorry for the part I played in this. I know you are now in a better place. I hope you know that if I could go back to the morning it happened, I would have changed it all."

Under a plea agreement, the Army dropped other charges, including participating as a principal to premeditated murder and acting as an accessory after the fact.

Fisher's court-martial trial had been scheduled to start Saturday.

Winchell, 21, was killed while he slept on his cot at Ft. Campbell.

Rumors had circulated on the post that the soldier from Kansas City, Mo., was

gay, and prosecutors said Glover was driven by hatred of homosexuals.

Glover, 19, of Sulphur, Okla., was convicted of premeditated murder and

sentenced to life in prison. He never addressed the allegation that he despised homosexuals. His attorneys argued that Fisher goaded Glover into the attack.

The mother and stepfather of the victim denounced Saturday's verdict. Pat and Wally Kutteles said that they could not understand how the Army could at first charge Fisher to stand trial for goading Glover to murder their son, then drop the most serious charges.

"Suddenly, the Army let him plead to nothing related to the actual murder . . . justice was not served today," they said in a statement.

A group that represents gay and lesbian service members said the sentence is too lenient, considering that Fisher had admitted goading Glover into attacking Winchell.

The sentence is "a travesty," said C. Dixon Osburn, co-executive director of the Service Members Legal Defense Network, which is based in Washington, D.C. "We're left with huge questions about why Ft. Campbell cut this deal."

Fisher will be eligible for parole in about four years, Osburn noted.

The Winchell case has galvanized a national reappraisal of the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy six years after it was adopted amid a storm of controversy.

Associated Press, January 9, 2000

2nd soldier sentenced in killing

Fisher lied in murder case of private rumored to be gay

FORT CAMPBELL ? A soldier was sentenced during a court-martial yesterday

to 12 1/2 years in prison for lying to Army investigators about his involvement in the bludgeoning death of another soldier rumored to be gay.

Spc. Justin R. Fisher, 26, of Lincoln, Neb., pleaded guilty earlier in the day to making false statements to Army investigators and to obstructing justice.

During sentencing, Fisher wept as he apologized to his family and to the relatives of the victim, Pfc. Barry L. Winchell.

"Barry, I hope you can hear me," Fisher started. "I'm sorry for the part I played in this. I know you are now in a better place. I hope you know that if I could go back to the morning it happened, I would have changed it all."

Winchell, 21, was sleeping on a cot in the hallway outside the fourth-floor barracks room he shared with Fisher when he was beaten in a bloody attack early on July 5. Winchell died the following day.

Another soldier who lived in the barracks, Pvt. Calvin N. Glover, 19, of Sulfur, Okla., was court-martialed last month. On Dec. 8, he was convicted of premeditated murder and sentenced to life in prison with the possibility of parole at an unspecified date.

All three infantrymen served in the same unit at Fort Campbell, which straddles the Kentucky-Tennessee border about 50 miles northwest of Nashville.

A drunken Glover, upset about losing a recent fight to Winchell, crept up

to him and crushed his skull with a baseball bat belonging to Fisher.

Fisher admitted that he washed the blood from the bat and lied about his involvement to investigators. He also said he confided in another soldier, who was not charged, and asked him not to say anything to authorities.

Prosecutors contend during the trial that the attack was fueled by Glover's hatred of homosexuals.

There had been a swirl of rumors on the post that Winchell, a native of Kansas City, Mo., was gay. Gay-rights activists have called the case a tragic failure of the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy toward homosexuals.

Fisher said he didn't think Glover was serious when he talked about going after Winchell.

"I didn't know he had that much rage in him," Fisher said. "Even when he came back in (Fisher's room, immediately after the attack), I didn't know the extent of what Glover had done to Barry. I'm sorry from the bottom of my heart."

As part of a plea agreement, charges of premeditated murder and acting as an accessory after the fact were dismissed in exchange for Fisher's plea. Fisher also pleaded guilty to supplying alcohol to a minor, which he did by purchasing beer for Glover.

Military Judge Col. Kenneth D. Pangburn was inclined to sentence him to 14 years in prison, but under the terms of the agreement, Fisher could be sentenced to no more than 12 1/2 years. The sentencing hearing was held in case the judge wanted to impose a shorter sentence.

Fisher will be imprisoned at Fort Knox.

Wally Kutteles, Winchell's stepfather, testified that his family could have handled Winchell's death more easily had it occurred during combat or training.

"This is a tragedy that never should have happened," he said, his voice rising.

Kutteles said he was angry that, after learning about the attack, Fisher, who made the 911 call, didn't do enough to help his stepson.

"Specialist Fisher was too busy cleaning off a bat to go see what happened to him," Kutteles said.

Fisher's mother, Connie Butler, tearfully told of how she divorced an alcoholic and abusive husband in 1987 who always seemed disappointed in his son's performance in school, sports and relationships.

"He was just not being the man he wanted him to be," she said. "He just could not get up to that standard for him."

Keith Caruso, a defense psychiatrist with a practice in Nashville, said he diagnosed Fisher as an alcoholic with a cross-dressing fetish.

Caruso said Fisher told him he was not attracted to men but that wearing lingerie beneath his clothing aroused him and made him feel more comfortable.

The fetish apparently developed while Fisher was growing up and he

noticed the closeness of his three sisters and their affectionate relationship with their mother. He longed to become "one of the girls," the psychiatrist said.

Fisher had been troubled and puzzled about his cross-dressing and his participation in the crime, and appeared to find some relief in his diagnosis, Caruso said.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-JAN-2000 15:30:20.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.9.00.5

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. COLUMBUS (OH) DISPATCH Letter against the Vermont ruling
2. CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER Two letters from outside Lakewood criticize domestic partner proposal: "We have to defend God wherever he is attacked"
3. PALM SPRINGS DESERT SUN Sarcastic letter about gay "recruiting"
4. NASHUA (NH) TELEGRAPH Student grills Bauer on his anti-same-sex-marriage plank
5. EVERETT (WA) HERALD Two letters against gays serving openly in military

Columbus Dispatch, January 7, 2000
34 S. 3rd Street, Columbus, OH, 43216
(Fax 614-461-7580) (E-MAIL: letters@dispatch.com)
(<http://www.dispatch.com>)

Letter: Granting homosexuals marriage benefits is crazy

The Vermont Supreme Court's ruling that homosexuals are entitled to the same marriage benefits and protections as heterosexuals is only the beginning.

Our damn fool judges and psychopathic politicians, as manipulated by the uncivilized news media, soon will rule the same for the members of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, who will want to marry their pets. And half the news editors and all the Hollywood celebrities will, no doubt, want to marry their mirrors.

Why not? The reasoning is the same for all.
? Dr. Samuel A. Nigro, Cleveland Heights, Ohio

Cleveland Plain Dealer, December 31, 1999
1801 Superior Avenue, Cleveland, OH, 44114
(Fax 216-999-6209) (E-MAIL: letters@plaind.com)
(<http://www.cleveland.com/news>)

Letter: Sanctioning same-sex unions defies God's law

Lakewood has done what generations of persecution could not do: poke a finger in the eye of God.

Either this country was formed on a Judeo-Christian base, or our Constitution and history are a lie. Either the Bible, which has survived 6,000 years, is legitimate or it is a lie. Perhaps religion has failed to educate and change the hearts and morals of man, but the city of Lakewood

certainly does not have the right to legislate that point.

To allow a government body to legislate away the sanctity and the bonds of marriage in a benefit package to consenting adults is a travesty of justice. To say that a government body can boldly overstep the word of God, the Bible or even what has always been accepted as the norm of society is an abomination.

No one can convince the heart of man to consider all the alternatives. There are those who will always say, "there is no hell," or, "there is no God" ? but rest assured, there is none who will say, "there is no judgment."

If Lakewood can say yes to a benefit package for nonlegally encumbered same-sex individuals, nothing else will be kept from its power.
? ALFRED DEIMLING, Broadview Heights

Why do we allow the people we have elected to thumb their noses at God? And why is Lakewood's City Council so eager to ensure that people will continue to turn their backs on God? Why are these councilmen so willing to assist in the breakdown of morality by providing benefits for unmarried couples (homosexual or heterosexual) who are living together, breaking God's commandments?

Our founding fathers came to America to find religious freedom. That means that they recognized that their relationship with God was the most important thing in their lives. It had to be because they risked everything and went into the unknown to ensure it. God was at the very center of their lives. Why isn't God at the center of our lives? Or more important, why are we electing people to government who do not place God in the driver's seat of their lives?

Why am I worried about Lakewood when I live in Euclid? Because we have to fight for God wherever he is attacked. Please, let us regain our morality. Let us first worry about God. He'll take care of all the rest.
? ANN MILLER, Euclid

Palm Springs Desert Sun, January 6, 2000

P. O. Box 190, Palm Springs, CA, 92262

(Fax 760-778-4654)

(Online Mailer:

<http://www.desertsunonline.com/letterstotheeditor/index.shtml>

)

(<http://www.desert-sun.com/>)

Letter: Perceptive thoughts

I cannot begin to tell you how impressed I was with the insightful reasoning of Don Derwin, who said in his recent letter on attempts to "recruit" boys to homosexuality: "Homosexuality isn't caused by nature or nurture. It's all salesmanship."

I would like to add some other facts which, while not necessarily on

the
same topic, are equally perceptive and important for your readers to understand.

The world is flat. All attempts to recruit people to any other belief will never work. (Even with properly folded brochures.)

The moon is made of green cheese. It appears to be cream cheese because
of light refractions.

And don't let anyone try to tell you otherwise!
? Pierce Rollins, Palm Springs

Nashua Telegraph, January 8, 2000

Box 1008, Nashua, NH, 03061

(Fax 603-882-5138) (E-MAIL: letters@telegraph-nh.com)

Students grill Bauer about same-sex marriages, abortion (excerpt)

By JILLIAN SAFER, Telegraph Staff

MILFORD ? Presidential candidate Gary Bauer took time out between
debates

Friday morning for a Q-and-A session with about 90 eighth-graders at
Milford

Middle School, but the visit was no walk in the park. . .

Another student questioned how Bauer could oppose same-sex marriages if
he believed everyone was created equal.

Bauer said, "For thousands of years of western civilization, marriage
has
been one man and one woman. That's not discrimination. That's not taking
away people's freedom. It means that as a civilization we've decided that
marriage is between one adult man and one adult woman, and we are going,
as a
civilization, to eliminate the other possible ways that people might choose
to live together."

He said that just as he would oppose polygamy or an adult being able to
marry a child, he didn't believe that society should recognize same-sex
marriage.

"And I do that not because I want to deny liberty, but because to allow
that would undermine the ordered liberty under God that our country is
built
on," he said.

Everett Herald, January 7, 2000

Box 930, Everett, WA, 98206

(Fax 425-339-3049) (E-MAIL: letters@heraldnet.com)

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

Letter: Don't ask, don't tell works

Recently in several different venues, I have read or heard condemnation
of the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Usually cited as an
example of its failure is the murder of gay Pvt. Barry Winchell. Your
editorial Dec. 27 is another iteration of the same theme.

The questions that immediately come to mind: Are you and others
advocating open homosexuality? And, how did the "don't ask, don't tell"
policy cause or encourage the murder. Had Winchell been openly gay, would
that have deterred the homophobics?

Admittedly, with a very low level of interest in the overall story, I have not followed it closely and the answer to my questions may be obvious in the missed details.

On the surface, which is the extent of my interest, the "don't ask, don't tell" policy seems to be reasonably acceptable. It doesn't penalize homosexuality (don't ask), but it does discourage flagrant flaunting (don't tell). And it would also seem to help reduce the status quo inertia embodying anti-homosexual bias.

Personally, I am completely neutral on homosexuality, neither condemning nor condoning. If I should suddenly discover a member of my own family was homosexual, it would not change my love and respect for that individual.

But consider this ? every member of my family engages in the daily routine of bodily waste elimination. All living creatures do. There is nothing wrong, immoral, unethical or shameful about this; it is an essential

function in maintaining health. However, if a member of my family defecated on a busy sidewalk or urinated on a public wall, I would be angry and embarrassed.

We do not flaunt or publicly discuss these normal bodily functions. In the event of a problem, it is discussed in private with the closest relative or a physician.

Except on scatological talk shows, publicly flaunting personal matters is not acceptable: homosexuality, heterosexuality, immorality, health, ostentatious affluence, imperious religion or whatever. Private matters should be kept private and not inflicted upon the public.

Respect and tolerance is a two-way street. If minority groups expect tolerance, respect and accommodation, they must reciprocate by not forcefully imposing their lifestyles, morals and philosophies on an unsympathetic public. Preach morals in a church or any other venue where the public has the option to listen or pass. Practice homosexuality or flagrant heterosexuality in private.

The world would be a better place if everyone respected the rights of others and where minority super-rights did not unnecessarily impinge upon the general rights of the public majority.
? BILL WALLACE, Everett

Letter: Editorial flawed, not policy

Regarding The Herald's Dec. 27 editorial, "Don't ask, don't tell policy was flawed from the start":

As an old soldier I find that this editorial is what is flawed. I'm afraid that I must take great exception to this article. I'll attempt to answer why we serve and what we really fight for with, I hope, a reason for excluding gays in the military.

To me, the why revolves around a moral stand and commitment. Just why would someone be willing to serve and possibly die in the military? Key word

is serve. Will they serve with honor and loyalty? No disagreement on the loyalty part, I hope. But, what does it take to measure up to the standards

regarding honor? When you enter the service you will be given several tests

and asked questions such as: Are you a felon, drug user, pervert, etc.?

The

military will want to know if you lie, steal or cheat.

These are very strong indicators of your moral values, ethics and degrees

of self-discipline. You, very simply put, must be trustworthy. No one will

follow into combat a leader they do not trust and no sensible leader will jeopardize his men to a member he does not trust. You cannot expect our young men who meet these standards to abandon their beliefs and moral values

to appease the pro-homosexual movement stirred up by those that I call social

provocateurs.

Sexual misconduct, as in any form of misconduct cannot be tolerated.

No

one seems to have a problem with the military policy regarding adultery, except of course, cases where a woman is caught and the feminists cry foul!

Now, as to what we fight for. The Herald's statement, "Members of the military fight for our country and everyone in it ? that means people of all

racess, disabilities, sexual preferences and classes. Why then, can't those people be a part of the military that defends us?" is seriously flawed.

The oath we take is to support and defend the Constitution. The U.S. military has a long and proud history. My greatest privilege was to serve in

the military for more than 22 years with men and women of the highest caliber

and integrity. They will sacrifice all they possess "to support and defend the Constitution" (what's left of it), and they still believe "that they are

endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

If you have a problem with the Creator part, that's OK with me. Just don't expect those of us who do believe to die for you. Especially for the wrong reasons.

? DENNIS D. MORGAN, Marysville

evolving," says Rich Tafel, executive director of the Log Cabin Republicans. Sunday, the Reform Party's brightest star struck the same note. "It's my country, it's their country, it's all of our country," Gov. Jesse Ventura of Minnesota told the CBS program "Face the Nation," offering a vigorous defense of allowing gays to serve openly in the military.

New attitudes in both parties track the changes in American society during the past generation. During the 1980s and 1990s, increasing numbers of gays and lesbians began declaring their sexual orientation openly; popular culture punctuated the trend a couple of years ago when the lead character on a highly-rated TV sitcom declared herself a lesbian.

The trend heightened awareness among heterosexuals of their gay family members, friends and co-workers -- and helped make attitudes toward gays more a matter of tolerance than moral judgment. A Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll last summer found 75% of Americans favoring legislation increasing penalties for hate crimes based on a person's sexual orientation among other factors. An earlier survey found 72% backing Mr. Clinton's efforts to prohibit discrimination against homosexuals working in federal agencies.

"Mainstream America has become more supportive and understanding," says Jeff Soref, an investor and gay activist in New York. "That's a radical change from '92 and '93."

"The world has changed so much," says Andrew Tobias, an openly-gay writer and investor who also is treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. He praises Mr. Clinton for advancing the process by courting the gay constituency in his 1992 campaign, noting "People started talking about it publicly in a way that wasn't terribly embarrassing. Each year it gets talked about more, and in a more relaxed way."

It has yielded a payoff for Democrats. Though difficult to track, gay political contributions have become an important source of financing for the Democratic Party. In one three-week window in October, about \$2.5 million was raised at events targeting gay donors. Much of the money is headed to Democratic-friendly causes, including about \$850,000 for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. First lady Hillary Clinton, who is making a run for the Senate, took in \$125,000 at a December event organized by Mr. Soref, and the Democratic National Committee reaped more than \$800,000 at a luncheon aimed at gay donors that was headlined by the president.

"It's a way of letting the good guys know that, now that they have given us a place at the table, we want to pay our fair share," Mr. Tobias says. "We're good teammates."

Rep. Barney Frank, an openly gay Massachusetts Democrat, says the gay community's rising clout stems less from campaign donations than from the power of its votes. In the last two elections, gays and lesbians have gone to the polls in numbers comparable to Hispanics, according to Voter News Service exit polls. In 1996, gays comprised about 5% of the total electorate.

The gay and lesbian constituency could be especially significant in this year's presidential primary in California. That March 7 contest could prove critical to the insurgent Democratic campaign of Mr. Bradley, who has jockeyed for advantage with Mr. Gore by calling for the 1964 Civil Rights Act to be reopened to cover gays. Gay turnout for the primary is expected to be unusually heavy because of a ballot initiative asking voters whether marriage should be limited to unions between a man and a woman.

Still, the fact that no major White House contender -- including Democrats Gore and Bradley -- has embraced the cause of same-sex marriages underscores the limits of the gay community's influence, as did Mr. Gore's shift on a litmus test for military appointments.

"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," Mr. Gore said at an Iowa news conference.

On NBC's "Meet the Press" Sunday, former Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman John Vessey said, "If presidents ... insist that the leadership of the military give them the advice that the presidents want to hear, rather than the best military advice these people can provide ... they'll have a difficult time finding people."

Social conservatives in the GOP continue to rally their troops by opposing the gay-rights agenda. Former ambassador Alan Keyes, a long-shot GOP presidential candidate, challenged Mr. McCain on the subject directly last week in South Carolina, where the Arizona senator will need votes from conservatives and veterans in the Feb. 19 primary to sustain his bid.

But gay Republicans point to the tone of the top-tier GOP candidates as evidence that the political tide is flowing in their direction. Mr. Tafel is even confident that Mr. Bush will eventually shift gears and meet with his group. "The world has changed," he says.

CHART:

Recent surveys of American adults suggest rising tolerance for gays and lesbians:

Do you favor passing legislation against hate crimes that would increase the punishment for a crime committed against a person because of the victim's race, religion, ethnic background or sexual orientation?

Yes 75%

No 21%

Which of the following changes that have taken place in society over the past 15 to 20 years bothers you the most?

Lack of respect for authority and elders 29%

The number of unwed teenage mothers 15%

Content of today's TV/music programming 13%
The tolerance of gay lifestyles 7%

And 1996 exit polls signaled the size and presidential preferences of the
gay constituency within the overall electorate:

Gays 5%
Hispanics 5%
Jews 3%

Gay Voter Preferences (96):

Bill Clinton 66%
Bob Dole 23%
Others 11%

Sources: The Wall Street Journal/NBC News Poll, Voter News Service

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 13:00:42.00

SUBJECT: Gore Steps on a Land Mine . .

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

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

TEXT:
The Washington Post
January 10, 2000

OP-ED SECTION

Gore Steps on a Land Mine . . .

By Peter Feaver

Vice President Al Gore stepped on a land mine during last week's campaign debate. He pledged not only to allow gays to serve openly in the military but to make the issue a litmus test for anyone he appointed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The campaign tried to contain the damage and by week's end the vice president retreated partway in a hastily called news conference. Latest word: He will allow gays to serve openly but will not make the issue a litmus test for promotions to the highest military commands.

The Gore team may have spun its way out of a short-term campaign fiasco, but the long-term damage is harder to assess because pollsters will not survey the audience most affected by his remarks and the one most important for Gore's ability to function as commander in chief: the armed forces. If he wins in November, Gore may discover that the troops remember those throwaway lines meant to appease a special interest in key primaries.

Gore's statements hit two of the most sensitive hot buttons for the military, as revealed in a recent survey by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies (TISS).

First, he is endorsing a proposal that most in the military oppose strongly. Fully 75 percent of the up-and-coming officers polled opposed allowing gays to serve openly in the military. As many as 26 percent said that they would leave the military if gays were allowed to serve openly. At a time when the military is struggling to meet retention goals, lifting the ban surely would be disruptive.

Second, with his proposed litmus test, the vice president unwittingly touched an exceedingly raw nerve about the proper advisory role of the

military. The TISS study and a companion study by the Center for Strategic and International Studies found that many officers believe that the most senior military leaders have bowed to the winds of political correctness rather than honoring their duty to tell it like it is to politicians.

An astonishing 49 percent of those we surveyed said they would leave the military if "the senior uniformed leadership does not stand up for what is right in military policy."

The military probably heard echoes of Vietnam in Gore's proposed litmus test. Many officers blame the war on the alleged failure of the senior uniformed leadership to speak candidly to the president, Congress and the people for fear of losing influence in the politicized Johnson administration.

Gore seemed to imply that he too only wants yes men as advisers. Because of the up-or-out system, military officers know that this would trickle down through promotion boards, and with it would come the political-correctness poison they fear.

The Gore people undoubtedly hope that by rescinding the threat of a litmus test, they have put the issue behind them. But the cat is already out of the bag and any controversial military proposal in a Gore administration now would inevitably be viewed through the lens of whether he is politicizing the military as he once threatened to do. While the military still would submit to civilian control, the control would come at a higher price.

Recall that President Clinton extravagantly spent political capital wooing the military, trying to make up for his famous draft-avoidance quote about "loathing the military" and his abortive effort to impose a gay policy on the military without adequate consultation.

As president, Gore would be forced to make the same gestures and would lose the same leverage over the military, especially on unpopular measures. Ironically, barring an extraordinary swing to the left in Congress, Gore might even find that he lacks the political leverage to change the "don't ask, don't tell policy" he claims to abhor.

Candidates who want to make dramatic changes in military policy can learn from Gore's mistake. If they want to avoid spending an inordinate amount of effort as president trying to earn back the trust of the military they must order into combat, they would do well to learn these lines:

"I will commission a blue-ribbon panel of respected experts, including retired senior military officers, to review the policy. I will insist that the panel be balanced and thorough and that it listen carefully to the perspectives of those in uniform.

"I will take the recommendations of this panel seriously and then make my own decisions. If it recommends a change, I will work with the senior military leadership to devise a plan to implement the change with the least disruption to military effectiveness and morale. I will insist that my senior military advisers give me their frank opinion at every turn, and I

will never, ever demand that they tailor their advice to suit what they think I want to hear.

"I know the military will faithfully execute the lawful orders I give, and if they do not they will be fired."

Gore's land-mine injury may well prove permanently disabling. Other candidates need not follow in his missteps.

The writer is an associate professor of political science at Duke University and executive secretary of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, a faculty consortium based at Duke, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University.

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 12:18:33.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.10.00.2

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. DETROIT NEWS Deb Price: Gays make state-by-state progress
 2. NEW YORK TIMES Barry Winchell's mother sees no end to ordeal of his slaying
 3. NEW YORK TIMES Despite Gore's Reversal, Candidates Criticize 'Litmus Test' for Joint Chiefs
 4. INDIANAPOLIS STAR A family by choice; Love for adopted boys links the disparate lives of three adults
- FEEDBACK E-Mail can be sent to Craig Peterson, the gay man who adopted 3 of the boys and was refused permission to adopt their sister, at dcraigpete@aol.com

Detroit News, January 10, 2000
615 W. Lafayette, Detroit, MI, 48226
(Fax 313-222-6417) (E-MAIL: Letters@detnews.com)
(<http://detnews.com/>)

Gays make state-by-state progress
Deb Price

States, like people, respond to peer pressure.

They don't want to be first or last to do most anything. They want to be modern, but not radical; traditional, but not backward. So, because states see one another moving toward embracing their gay citizens, the momentum for progress is starting to snowball quite delightfully.

The 2000 presidential and congressional campaigns certainly demand attention, yet our day-to-day lives are shaped in large measure by state politics.

State laws and courts, for example, normally control who can marry, who can adopt, whether unmarried couples have legal rights, how hate violence is punished and whether adults' sexual privacy is invaded. And since Congress has yet to protect basic gay civil rights, whether gay people are shielded from bias in employment, housing and public accommodations depends on state and local governments.

The good news is that the states' lawmakers and judges are responding more favorably than ever before to gay pleas. Advances in state laws, judicial rulings, corporate employment and benefit policies, and public opinion are creating a gay-friendly synergy. The 1999 legislative season, which broke all records for gay state-level progress, pointed toward even better years.

As National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Director Kerry Lobel points out, today's breakthroughs are a result of gay people's willingness to be out at home and at work, in small towns and big cities. "As more of us are living openly, we touch the lives of people who are closest to us, who touch the lives of people closest to them. Our visibility is a ripple in a pond. It reverberates in ways we can't even measure," she says.

When we do try to measure progress, using one giant federal yardstick probably isn't the best approach. Ironically, as the task force notes, a set of smaller state and local yardsticks provides a better indication of how far we've come as a nation and how far we still have to go:

• **Protective Job Gear:** Laws in 11 states, 18 counties and more than 100 cities protect 103 million Americans from anti-gay job discrimination and often from bias in housing and public accommodations. That's 38 percent of the U.S. population. (East Lansing took the lead back in 1972 by shielding city workers, but the state of Michigan still doesn't protect gay workers.)

• **Fair Play Mandates:** Following San Francisco's hugely successful lead, Los Angeles and Seattle are telling would-be city contractors, "If you want to play ball with us, you must give the same benefits to gay and straight workers."

• **Bedroom Snooping:** Only 18 states (including Michigan, except Wayne County) still have sodomy laws — archaic, privacy-violating sex laws primarily used as an excuse to discriminate in, for example, custody decisions. Georgia's top court hastened sodomy laws' nationwide demise by striking down its infamous law in 1998.

• **Saying "No" to Hate:** This year, new states — though probably not Michigan — will likely join the 23 with hate-crimes laws covering anti-gay attacks.

• **Family matters:** Even among gay-marriage foes, there's a growing realization that gay couples haven't been treated fairly. Seven states and 83 localities offer domestic partner benefits to their own workers. California and 41 local governments have domestic partner registries. (In Michigan, Ann Arbor has a domestic partner registry and offers some benefits to city workers.)

The Vermont court decision requiring that state to offer same-sex couples all the legal benefits of marriage will cause lots of other state legislatures that have made clear they are not open to (gay) marriage to start reconsidering whether they ought to be doing something in terms of domestic partnership," predicts Matt Coles, chief gay-rights attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union.

By most measures, life in this 50-state union is improving for those of us who're gay.

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

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

Mother Sees No End to Ordeal in Slaying

By FRANCIS X. CLINES

KANSAS CITY, Mo. ? Somewhere in the long season of grief for her murdered son, it dawned on Patricia Kutteles that she would never be done with the United States Army, where her son Barry found a home that proved his undoing and where he left her a cause that she now pursues as his only true memorial.

"I realized it won't ever end till I die," Mrs. Kutteles said last week.

She spoke of her struggle to absorb, first, the brutal barracks bludgeoning of her son; then, the shocking discovery that he had been taunted for months with epithets; and now, her deepening despair at military justice.

"My life is now at the whim of the Army," the mother said, showing the tightly folded flag that she was given at the funeral along with the Army's official regrets for the loss of her son, Pfc. Barry Winchell.

His murder last July at Fort Campbell, Ky., is being cited as proof of the failure of the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy toward gay and lesbian service members.

Mrs. Kutteles spent much of the summer and autumn at the army base, grasping for details about her son's months of harassment and his death in the Army.

She attended the court-martial of his confessed murderer, Pvt. Calvin Glover, who beat her son in the head with a baseball bat as he slept in the barracks. Private Glover, 19, taunted to act after he had challenged Private

Winchell to a fight and lost, was sentenced last month to life imprisonment but with the possibility of parole.

This means, Mrs. Kutteles has learned, that she will have to be vigilant after the first decade of imprisonment to speak at parole hearings against any early release from the military justice that she has learned to distrust.

"Oh, no, it'll never end," said Mrs. Kutteles, a 50-year-old registered nurse. She sat chain-smoking in her home here near the edge of the city's beltway, worrying about the surprising ways of the Army. "I'll have to go to years of hearings."

Beyond that, Mrs. Kutteles is anguished at the leniency being extended to Private Glover's accomplice, Specialist Justin R. Fisher, 26, who witnesses said spread the rumors about Private Winchell's private life, goaded his killer with taunts and handed him the bat, even washing the blood off afterward.

But Specialist Fisher, in exchange for testifying against Private Glover, saw the most serious charge, accomplice to murder, dropped.

He faces 12 1/2 years for obstruction of justice, making false statements

and for providing alcohol to a minor ? a ludicrous footnote, in Mrs. Kutteles's view, to the frequent drinking bouts at the barracks that the murder investigation showed went on with no interference from base commanders.

"Everything I've fought to find out ? and I don't care whether Barry was gay or not ? leaves me worried about the safety of all the young men and women the Army is supposed to be looking after," Mrs. Kutteles said. "I can't bear to hear that Army recruiting song: 'Be all that you can be in the Army.' My son tried to be all that he could be and he got murdered."

In her frustration, Mrs. Kutteles and her husband, Wally, Private Winchell's stepfather and a veteran of the Korean War, planned to try to force the issue into a civilian court by pursuing a wrongful death suit. They said they would take the step to protect the rights of other soldiers and to defend their son's memory.

Mrs. Kutteles angrily said her son was still being defamed and pointed to stories she had been gathering from members of the service who say harassment of gays continues.

"They're making a mockery of his death," Mrs. Kutteles said. She knew her son as a confiding young man who told her about several girlfriends.

"I think he was just trying to find out who he was," she said of reports that Barry began dating a Navy veteran who apparently had undergone a sex change and was a dancer at a nightclub in Nashville. "He, or she, is a very nice person," Mrs. Kutteles said of the dancer.

Her son was first taken to the club by his Fort Campbell roommate, Specialist Fisher, who, witnesses testified, later spread rumors that Private Winchell was gay that, in violation of the "don't ask" policy, some sergeants then began investigating.

Friends said Private Winchell, caught in this spiral, did not complain about the persistent harassment in fear of being dismissed from the Army under the "don't tell" part of the military policy.

"Barry was so proud of himself as a soldier," his mother said. "They called him 'Top Gun,'" she said of his awards for proficiency as a machine gunner in the 101st Airborne Division. He never once mentioned his troubles, she said, but in frequent chats would focus on her mundane cares and would offer a bit of Army-slang advice about always being persistent in life.

"I hear him now, over and over, telling me, 'Suck it up, Mom, and drive on,'" she remembered. "Everything I'm doing is for him: Suck it up and drive on."

After the slaying, more gay servicemen and women have come forward to complain about harassment while others continue to leave the military at a rate that has nearly doubled since the inception of the "don't ask" policy in 1993, according to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, a gay rights group that monitors military justice.

Mrs. Kutteles stays in touch with the organization, saying the case might

have been treated by the Army as a classic drunken brawl crime but for the information the group received about a hate crime rooted in homophobia.

"The S.L.D.N. helped immensely in finding out what really went on," she said, accepting its cause as her own even though she has no clear idea about her son's private life.

"It didn't matter to me one way or the other, and Barry would know that," she said. "And I think he would have told me as soon as he figured it out."

What particularly grieves Mrs. Kutteles is a sense that the Army has been waiting for this case to fade away.

She received no reply, she said, to a letter in October to Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen that warned of continuing harassment of gays and "blasphemies to the memory of our son."

"I hold the Army just as responsible as the two who were tried," she said. "Oh, no, this will never end."

New York Times, January 10, 2000

Despite Gore's Reversal, Candidates Criticize 'Litmus Test' for Joint Chiefs

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON ? Vice President Al Gore faced new criticism today over his conflicting remarks last week on requiring the Joint Chiefs of Staff to support his policy of allowing gays to serve openly in the military.

On Friday night, Mr. Gore backtracked from his statement during a debate two days earlier that he would make support for his policy a requirement for his nominees for the Joint Chiefs.

Instead, he said he would simply require them to follow his orders as commander in chief and not impose a "litmus test" on their personal views.

Despite the reversal, Senator John McCain, a Republican presidential candidate, today criticized Mr. Gore's views, saying they would have "a terrible effect on the civilian-military relationship."

"I don't know what he's backed off to; I guess it depends," Mr. McCain, of Arizona, said during an appearance on the CBS news program "Face the Nation." "But his initial statement showed me an incredible lack of understanding of the role of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

Later in an appearance before the New Hampshire State Republican Committee, Mr. McCain elaborated, saying that questions about "a social agenda" have no place in deciding who should lead the military. "The job of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs is to give the president the best advice" about military matters. He added, "'Don't ask, don't tell' works. I'll support it; I'll continue to improve it."

Appearing on the NBC program "Meet the Press," one of Mr. Gore's campaign advisers, Bob Shrum, insisted that the vice president had not significantly altered his position, which provoked criticism last week from Republicans and retired officers who said Mr. Gore's initial stand would have politicized

the
process of selecting chiefs.

But Representative Jerrold Nadler, Democrat of New York, who appeared with Mr. Shrum on the program, disagreed. "He made a major mistake," said Mr. Nadler, who is supporting Mr. Gore's opponent for the Democratic nomination, former Senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey. "He admitted it. He retreated. He changed his position."

The debate over Mr. Gore's position underscored the resonance of the issue in this year's campaign. The Republican National Committee had already produced a television advertisement saying that Gen. Colin L. Powell and Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf would not have been able to pass "Al Gore's litmus test."

Mr. Nadler and Representative Barney Frank, Democrat of Massachusetts, said they would press for legislation to change the current "don't ask, don't tell" law, which allows gays to serve in the military provided they do not disclose their sexual orientation or engage in homosexual conduct.

Mr. Frank, who is one of three openly gay members of Congress, said it was time to review the Uniform Code of Military Justice, noting that it prohibited not only homosexual acts, but other acts, like sex between unmarried heterosexual couples, that society viewed as private issues.

Mr. Bradley, who expressed support for allowing gays to serve openly but stopped short of saying he would impose a litmus test on appointees to the Joint Chiefs, declined today to say how or when he would order the Pentagon to allow gays to serve openly.

"Bill Bradley's position on this issue is clear and has not changed," said Anita Dunn, Bradley's communications director. "There will be no litmus test for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but the president as commander in chief, will direct the policy."

Appearing on "Fox News Sunday," Mr. Bradley said the fact that Congress had turned "don't ask, don't tell" into law made a change more difficult than in 1993, when President Clinton was forced to retreat from his campaign pledge to allow gays to serve. Mr. McCain said he supported the current policy and suggested that a review of it would not be appropriate in an election year.

"If we're going to change it, I don't think we talk about that in a political campaign," he said. "We talk about it after we become the president and say, 'I'll have a review of the policy.'"

INDIANAPOLIS STAR NEWS, January 10, 2000

P. O. Box 145, Indianapolis, IN, 46206-0145

(Fax 317-656-1435) (E-MAIL: stareditor@starnews.com)

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

A family by choice

Love for adopted boys links the disparate lives of three adults

By Kathleen Schuckel, The Indianapolis Star

INDIANAPOLIS -- Craig Peterson, Kim Guiden and Susan Adkins couldn't be

more different from one another.

Peterson is an upper middle class father of three, a perfectionist who likes to be in control of every situation. He is gay.

In contrast, Guiden's life often has been out of control.

She is poor and a high school dropout, who has given birth to six children. She's battled alcoholism and reckless behavior that ultimately sent her to prison for 1 1/2 years.

Adkins is a stay-at-home mom with an adopted son living in a one-stoplight town east of Indianapolis. A devout Christian, she attends a church that teaches that homosexuality is sinful.

Yet these three people, who would never be found in the same neighborhood, grocery store or church pew, have lifelong bonds that they honor: Their sons.

Guiden gave birth to them, but couldn't raise them, and the state took over their care.

Peterson adopted her three oldest sons. And Adkins and her husband adopted their little brother.

Any connection between the three could have ended right there.

Guiden could have gone on with her struggling existence in Anderson; Peterson could have continued his suburban Indianapolis life and Adkins her quiet, rural one.

But these three people agreed that their sons should visit one another. And along the journey, they came to accept one another, too.

Open adoption

Maintaining contact with a child's birth parents and other family members

is called "open adoption," an increasingly common method of adopting children. Closed, or confidential adoptions result when identifying information is not exchanged between the birth- and adoptive parents.

Opponents of open adoption say it creates conflicting, confusing relationships for the child. The birth parent and the adoptive parent might disagree over child rearing, for example. Or the birth parent may only sporadically be interested in the child's welfare, making him or her feel repeatedly rejected.

Proponents of open adoption say it takes the mystique and worry away from the process. Too often, kids see adoption as their fault, a rejection because they weren't "good."

Communicating with the birth parents helps them understand that adoption

occurred because of factors outside the child's control. Open adoption also is a direct way for adopted children to feel the birth parents' love for them.

When Adkins first learned Peterson was gay and adopting, she disapproved.

But she changed her thinking.

"If I say it's not right, somebody might look at me and say something's not right in my life," Adkins said.

"And you know what? Nobody else stepped up to the plate to adopt those boys. Nobody else was willing to take on that responsibility, including myself."

She said it's important for her son Jacob, 2, to know he has brothers.

"I guess it's the completeness I want to make sure he has."

One Saturday afternoon, the Peterson boys -- Andrew, 6, Michael, 5, and Brandon, 4 -- gathered to help Jacob celebrate his second birthday. They brought their little brother some of their toys they had outgrown.

After a few hours in the playroom and at a playground down the street, the families parted. Michael cried. Adkins hugged him and promised the boys they could come back.

To Peterson, family is more important than anything. That's why he wants his sons to know their other siblings.

"My three boys -- their whole world is each other. They're the main people they play with, and they're so supportive of each other and sharing new experiences," he said.

When he adopted his three sons, Peterson also was supposed to adopt their sister, who lived in a different foster home. But child welfare officials reneged once the girl's foster family objected publicly to Peterson's sexual orientation.

The foster family adopted the little girl. But all was not well -- the adoptive father later admitted to sexually molesting her. The father is no longer in the household; the girl still lives with her adoptive mother.

And the mother won't allow the little girl to see her brothers. She's not allowed to see her birth mother, either.

But Peterson and Adkins see things differently.

Not only do they want the brothers and sister to stay in touch, they want to honor the birth mother's role in their sons' lives.

"I may be young, and I may have had all of them kids, but I still love them, no matter where they at," said Guiden.

"And ain't nobody ever going to take that away from me."

Peterson holds no contempt for the young mother, even though Guiden drank heavily while pregnant with his sons. They have fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) and lasting emotional and mental disabilities as a result.

"If she never had the kids, I wouldn't have them now," Peterson said.

Among other things, FAS can cause mental retardation, memory problems, impulsivity and susceptibility to drug addiction.

Adkins first came to know Guiden when she was pregnant and in the Indiana Women's Prison.

Through a church program, Adkins agreed to take care of Guiden's baby until she was released.

Every other week, Adkins and Jacob visited Guiden at the prison. No one else ever did.

Once she was released from prison, Guiden realized she couldn't care for the little boy. She asked the Adkinses to adopt him.

The two women continued their friendship. Nearly every day, they talk on the phone, Adkins paying for the calls and acting like a substitute mother.

She was distressed when Guiden got pregnant a sixth time, but encouraged her to get medical care and prepare for a baby in her home.

She told Guiden: "Jacob is my miracle. This baby is going to be your miracle."

Adkins says she wants her son to be able to be proud that his birth mother beat the odds and made life better for herself.

"He's been such a blessing to us: How could we not help her?" Adkins asked. "If I didn't help her, how could I explain that to Jacob when he's older?"

Caring, but victimized

Peterson wanted his sons to meet their birth mother so they wouldn't worry about adoption and feel rejected later. He wanted them to see -- for themselves -- that she cared for them, but couldn't raise them.

She made mistakes, but never abused the children, he said.

"She just needs to know that people care about her. I don't think the woman has ever heard that."

He decided the timing was right last fall for the family reunion.

Guiden

was due to deliver her sixth baby. Seeing the birth mother with a swelled abdomen would create a "real good visual" for the boys to see where they came

from, Peterson said.

One morning, he loaded the boys in his red Jeep and left their orderly Pike Township subdivision.

He explained to his sons that they were going to visit their birth mother

-- a woman they should call "Kim."

"I don't want it to be confusing for these boys that they think all of a sudden that they have a mother," he said.

Once they arrived in Anderson, Peterson drove through the neighborhood that sported both a police substation and a bullet-riddled storefront.

He parked across from the house surrounded by a chain-link fence and "Beware of Dog" sign.

Guiden sits on the couch alone, small, despite being eight months pregnant, in a grimy room.

"How are you doing?" Peterson asked awkwardly.

"OK ...Nervous," Guiden said.

"I, I can see you look a lot like Andrew," Peterson said.

Guiden smiled slightly.

Then, the boys bounded in.

Guiden squealed. "Oh! Oh! They look like me." She giggled like a little girl.

Michael said: "Hi. Do you have our brother in your tummy?"

"Yeah, right here," answered Guiden. "Do you want to rub it?"

The three boys gathered around her and patted her belly.

Guiden did not touch her former sons; she just looked at them in wonder.

After a few minutes, she asked Peterson for permission to hug them.

He granted her request, but had to urge the boys forward.

Guiden hugged each boy, expelling a breathy "Oh," each time her arms reached around their small shoulders.

After the hugs, Peterson was full of reassurances: "You're going to

live
with Father forever. Remember? OK? OK? That's what the judge told us. OK?"

When Guiden first learned that her children might be adopted by a gay man, she was upset.

But then, she saw the boys.

"Right there, I could see they was happy, and as long as they is happy, I'm happy, too. I was relieved that they had been taken care of because I couldn't do it."

That wasn't the only visit Guiden had with the boys. The day she gave birth to her sixth child, Peterson took Andrew, Michael and Brandon to see their new little brother, an hours-old baby.

The boys each held their little brother; Peterson snapped pictures.

"Here's some lotion," said Michael, rooting through the drawers in the baby's bed. "You gave me lotion when I was a little baby."

Guiden smiled again, but remained silent. Later, she said she longs to tell her birth sons this:

"I'm sorry for what I did to you. I didn't really mean for it to happen.

I wish I could give you another chance. But I can see you are happy now, and

I don't really want to interfere."

FEEDBACK E-Mail can be sent to Craig Peterson, the gay man who adopted 3 of the boys and was refused permission to adopt their sister, at dcraigpete@aol.com

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "ABCNEWS.com" <abcnewsnow-editor@mail.abcnews.go.com> ("ABCNEWS.com" <abcnewsnow-editor@mail.abcnews.go.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 08:08:39.00

SUBJECT: ABCNEWS.com Top Stories - 1/10/99

TO: abcnewsnow-l <abcnewsnow-l@list0.starwave.com> (abcnewsnow-l <abcnewsnow-l@list0.starwave.com> [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Sponsored by EDS

Today's top stories as of 8 a.m. ET:
Monday, January 10, 2000

U. S.

SENATOR DEFENDS ELIAN SUBPOENA

On ABC's This Week , Sen. Dan Burton defended subpoenaing Elian Gonzalez before Congress, saying it was a delaying tactic to let the Cuban boy's case get to court. Cuban exile leaders called for a temporary halt to street protests.
<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/world/DailyNews/elian000109.html>

DOES ELIAN KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON?

Elian Gonzalez has said he wants to stay in the United States. But is it fair to ask a young boy to make those kinds of decisions? Mental health experts weigh in on the issue.
<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/living/DailyNews/elianpsyche000109.html>

P O L I T I C S

GORE 'CLARIFIES' GAYS POLICY

Al Gore backtracked from a statement he made about gays in the military, dropping the idea of a litmus test for top military leaders.
<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/goregays000108.html>

BRADLEY, GORE SPAR IN FIFTH DEBATE

During a debate in Iowa -- their fifth round of verbal sparring-- Al Gore and Bill Bradley called each other's health plans unhealthy for the economy.
http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/debates000108_dems.html

W O R L D

CLINTON CAN'T BREAK ISRAEL-SYRIA IMPASSE

President Clinton tried to nudge Israeli and Syrian negotiators toward a land-for-peace treaty Sunday evening, but the weeklong talks wound down without even a tentative agreement

<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/world/DailyNews/mideast000110.html>

GOLAN HEIGHTS: NO LONGER A BUFFER ZONE?

The Golan Heights has been touted as the biggest bargaining chip in the Israel-Syria peace talks. But advances in weapons technology may make it less of a "buffer zone" between Israel and its potential enemies.

http://abcnews.go.com/sections/world/DailyNews/mideast000107_Starr.html

B U S I N E S S

TIME WARNER, AOL TO MERGE

Time Warner and America Online were expected to announce a stock-for-stock merger today. The marriage of a major media conglomerate and a leading Internet company could have major repercussions on both industries

http://abcnews.go.com/sections/business/DailyNews/time_aol000110.html

S&P'S MORNING CALL

The markets stumbled early in the first week of the new century but closed on an upbeat note. Listen live at 8:15 a.m. ET when Standard & Poor's analysts discuss where stocks might be headed next.

http://abcnews.go.com/sections/business/popoff/S&Pphonecall_audio_popoff/index.html

S C I E N C E

CHINA'S CLOSE ENCOUNTERS

China has serious plans to listen for extraterrestrial intelligence and become a space power. The popular interest, however, seems to be spurred by UFO sightings.

<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/science/DailyNews/chinaspace000107.html>

T R A V E L

RICK STEVES' EUROPE: SICILY

Midway between Europe and Africa, Italy's island of Sicily is bubbling with a live volcano, vibrant cities, lavish art and rich history. Rick Steves takes a tour.

<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/travel/Europhiles/steves.html>

S P O R T S

VIKINGS, DOLPHINS WIN

A day after Tennessee shocked Buffalo 22-16 with a last-second touchdown, the Minnesota Vikings beat the Dallas Cowboys and the Miami Dolphins topped the Seattle Seahawks to move on in the playoffs.

<http://espn.go.com/nfl/playoffs99/index.html>

ENTERTAINMENT

MOUSE ROARS: 'STUART' STILL TOPS

"Stuart Little" remained the big cheese at the nation's theaters over the weekend. The talking mouse raked in an estimated \$11.5 million, more than enough to hold off the holiday holdovers vying for No. 2.
http://www.mrshowbiz.go.com/news/Todays_Stories/109/boxoffice010900.html

ABC NEWS ON TV

POST QUESTIONS FOR CHAT ABOUT KIDS' ALLOWANCES

The days of the \$2-a-week allowance are long gone. Now, some kids get as much as \$100 a week. Could a large allowance be bad for your kid? GMA's parenting contributor Ann Pleshette Murphy will answer your questions about allowances on Monday at 1:30 p.m. ET. Click here to post your question.
<http://chat.abcnews.go.com/cgi/chat/chat.dll?room=annmurphychats>

Do you feel e-behind? Take charge by getting to know us at EDS. We're a world leading information and technology services provider specializing in helping global corporations and governments compete in the new e-economy. We'll help your business go "e" and remain competitive. Visit us at <http://www.eds.com>. and read about how we've helped our clients.

For news that's up to the minute and up to you,
visit <http://www.abcnews.go.com>
ABCNEWS.com -- Ready When You Are (tm).

You received this mail because you subscribed via ABCNEWS.com at
<http://abcnews.go.com/service/maillsub.html>

If you would like to stop receiving these mailings, unsubscribe at
<http://abcnews.go.com/service/mailunsub.html>

Please do not respond to this mail. Questions or comments can be submitted at
<http://abcnews.go.com/service/abcccontact.html>

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 08:23:04.00

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

TO: msievert@nsf.gov (msievert@nsf.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

> -----

> From: Slate Magazine[SMTP:DELIVERY_MORNING@SLATE.COM]

> Sent: Monday, January 10, 2000 7:42:53 AM

> To: msievert@nsf.gov

> Subject: SLATE NEWS: Mon., Jan. 10, 2000

> Auto forwarded by a Rule

>

SLATE NEWS: Mon., Jan. 10, 2000

--today's papers: Grunts' Groans

--pundit central: McCain's Glass House

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

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

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

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

today's papers

Grunts' Groans

By Scott Shuger

USAT leads with the Clinton administration's proposal for establishing a nationwide computer system for rapidly tracking the course of infectious diseases like the flu and hepatitis C. The NYT lead also connects medicine and cyberspace with a report that the rise of Americans' online pharmaceutical purchases via foreign-based Web sites has led to record levels of illegal drug imports, judging from the latest figures on Customs Service

seizures of imported drugs in 1999, which ran about 4.5 times higher than 1998. The LAT leads with good news about Medicare: the implementation of the DOJ's campaign against fraudulent claims, combined with the low inflation rate, has kept spending in the 25-year-old program to its lowest growth rate ever. The WP goes with a private study of the attitudes of members of the U.S. military. Main findings of the worldwide survey of 12,000: the service members feel overworked and underpaid, feel that they don't have enough resources to carry out their assignments, and lack confidence in their leaders. But according to the survey, they still have a deep commitment to military service. By the way, the Post reports that the issue of gays in the military was hardly ever mentioned by the service members. The military study is the off-lead at USAT and is fronted at the LAT. It runs inside at the NYT. (To see that the U.S. military isn't the only one with big problems, check out <http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-07/Assessment.asp>.)

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

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

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

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

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

that the deals are intended to include Internet access for owners from their cars as well.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4

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

Saint Boris

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

The Russian Military

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

McCain Knocks Himself Out

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

pundit central

McCain's Glass House

By Michael Brus

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

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

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

Many pundits—including Mara Liasson (Washington Week), Mark Shields (NewsHour and Capital Gang), Sam Donaldson (ABC's This Week), and Paul Begala (MSNBC coverage of Friday's night's GOP debate)—think that Gore's aggressive stance on gays-in-the-military will hurt him in the general election. Paul Gigot (NewsHour) and Steve Roberts (Late Edition) contrast Gore's ideological approach to the issue with President Clinton's pragmatic approach. Tucker Carlson (Late Edition) notes that only a nation with no security threats could devote so much attention to a "boutique issue" like the military's homosexual policy. George Stephanopoulos and George F. Will (both of This Week) think the issue is a red herring, because Congress can override any executive

order that overturns "don't ask-don't tell." Margaret Carlson (Capital Gang) and Joe Klein say that Bradley's aloofness and condescension still hurt his popularity, and Klein predicts that if he is the nominee his Senate votes against the Gulf War and welfare reform will haunt him.

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

Last Word

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

--John McCain (Face the Nation)

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 12:46:44.00

SUBJECT: Despite Gore's Reversal, Candidates Criticize 'Litmus Test' for Joint Chiefs

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

TEXT:

New York Times, January 10, 2000

Despite Gore's Reversal, Candidates Criticize 'Litmus Test' for Joint Chiefs

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON □ Vice President Al Gore faced new criticism today over his conflicting remarks last week on requiring the Joint Chiefs of Staff to support his policy of allowing gays to serve openly in the military.

On Friday night, Mr. Gore backtracked from his statement during a debate

two days earlier that he would make support for his policy a requirement for

his nominees for the Joint Chiefs.

Instead, he said he would simply require them to follow his orders as commander in chief and not impose a "litmus test" on their personal views.

Despite the reversal, Senator John McCain, a Republican presidential candidate, today criticized Mr. Gore's views, saying they would have "a terrible effect on the civilian-military relationship."

"I don't know what he's backed off to; I guess it depends," Mr. McCain, of Arizona, said during an appearance on the CBS news program "Face the Nation." "But his initial statement showed me an incredible lack of understanding of the role of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

Later in an appearance before the New Hampshire State Republican Committee, Mr. McCain elaborated, saying that questions about "a social agenda" have no place in deciding who should lead the military. "The job of

the chairman of the Joint Chiefs is to give the president the best advice" about military matters. He added, "'Don't ask, don't tell' works. I'll support it; I'll continue to improve it."

Appearing on the NBC program "Meet the Press," one of Mr. Gore's campaign

advisers, Bob Shrum, insisted that the vice president had not significantly altered his position, which provoked criticism last week from Republicans and

retired officers who said Mr. Gore's initial stand would have politicized the

process of selecting chiefs.

But Representative Jerrold Nadler, Democrat of New York, who appeared with Mr. Shrum on the program, disagreed. "He made a major mistake," said Mr. Nadler, who is supporting Mr. Gore's opponent for the Democratic nomination, former Senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey. "He admitted it.

He
retreated. He changed his position."

The debate over Mr. Gore's position underscored the resonance of the issue in this year's campaign. The Republican National Committee had already produced a television advertisement saying that Gen. Colin L. Powell and Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf would not have been able to pass "Al Gore's litmus test."

Mr. Nadler and Representative Barney Frank, Democrat of Massachusetts, said they would press for legislation to change the current "don't ask, don't tell" law, which allows gays to serve in the military provided they do not disclose their sexual orientation or engage in homosexual conduct.

Mr. Frank, who is one of three openly gay members of Congress, said it was time to review the Uniform Code of Military Justice, noting that it prohibited not only homosexual acts, but other acts, like sex between unmarried heterosexual couples, that society viewed as private issues.

Mr. Bradley, who expressed support for allowing gays to serve openly but stopped short of saying he would impose a litmus test on appointees to the Joint Chiefs, declined today to say how or when he would order the Pentagon to allow gays to serve openly.

"Bill Bradley's position on this issue is clear and has not changed," said Anita Dunn, Bradley's communications director. "There will be no litmus test for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but the president as commander in chief, will direct the policy."

Appearing on "Fox News Sunday," Mr. Bradley said the fact that Congress had turned "don't ask, don't tell" into law made a change more difficult than in 1993, when President Clinton was forced to retreat from his campaign pledge to allow gays to serve. Mr. McCain said he supported the current policy and suggested that a review of it would not be appropriate in an election year.

"If we're going to change it, I don't think we talk about that in a political campaign," he said. "We talk about it after we become the president and say, 'I'll have a review of the policy.'"

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: delivery_morning@slate.com (delivery_morning@slate.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 07:54:00.00

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

TO: robert_lawrence@Harvard.Edu (robert_lawrence@Harvard.Edu [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

delivery_morning@slate.com

01/10/2000 12:51 PM GMT

To: Robert Lawrence/FS/KSG@KSG

cc:

SLATE NEWS: Mon., Jan. 10, 2000

--today's papers: Grunts' Groans

--pundit central: McCain's Glass House

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

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

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

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

today's papers

Grunts' Groans

By Scott Shuger

USAT leads with the Clinton administration's proposal for establishing a nationwide computer system for rapidly tracking the course of infectious diseases like the flu and hepatitis C. The NYT lead also connects medicine and cyberspace with a report that the rise of Americans' online pharmaceutical purchases via foreign-based Web sites has led to record levels of illegal drug imports, judging from the latest figures on Customs Service

seizures of imported drugs in 1999, which ran about 4.5 times higher than 1998. The LAT leads with good news about Medicare: the implementation of the DOJ's campaign against fraudulent claims, combined with the low inflation rate, has kept spending in the 25-year-old program to its lowest growth rate ever. The WP goes with a private study of the attitudes of members of the U.S. military. Main findings of the worldwide survey of 12,000: the service members feel overworked and underpaid, feel that they don't have enough resources to carry out their assignments, and lack confidence in their leaders. But according to the survey, they still have a deep commitment to military service. By the way, the Post reports that the issue of gays in the military was hardly ever mentioned by the service members. The military study is the off-lead at USAT and is fronted at the LAT. It runs inside at the NYT. (To see that the U.S. military isn't the only one with big problems, check out <http://www.slate.com/Assessment/00-01-07/Assessment.asp>.)

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

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

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

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

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

that the deals are intended to include Internet access for owners from their cars as well.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4

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

Saint Boris

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

The Russian Military

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

McCain Knocks Himself Out

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

pundit central

McCain's Glass House

By Michael Brus

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

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

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

Many pundits—including Mara Liasson (Washington Week), Mark Shields (NewsHour and Capital Gang), Sam Donaldson (ABC's This Week), and Paul Begala (MSNBC coverage of Friday's night's GOP debate)--think that Gore's aggressive stance on gays-in-the-military will hurt him in the general election. Paul Gigot (NewsHour) and Steve Roberts (Late Edition) contrast Gore's ideological approach to the issue with President Clinton's pragmatic approach. Tucker Carlson (Late Edition) notes that only a nation with no security threats could devote so much attention to a "boutique issue" like the military's homosexual policy. George Stephanopoulos and George F. Will (both of This Week) think the issue is a red herring, because Congress can override any executive

order that overturns "don't ask-don't tell." Margaret Carlson (Capital Gang) and Joe Klein say that Bradley's aloofness and condescension still hurt his popularity, and Klein predicts that if he is the nominee his Senate votes against the Gulf War and welfare reform will haunt him.

Miscellany: John McLaughlin, Jim Warren, and Eleanor Clift (all of the McLaughlin Group) call the new rule barring presidential candidates with less-than-15-percent support from general-election debates "undemocratic," and argue that any party qualifying for federal matching funds should get to participate. Appearing on Fox, Bill Bradley also voices disagreement with the new rule, saying that the Reform Party has a "strong case" that it should be included in the debates. Appearing on CBS's Face the Nation, Gov. Jesse Ventura, Ref.-Minn., notes that he had only 10-percent support when he debated Minnesota's Democratic and Republican candidates for governor; six weeks later he won the election with 37 percent.

? Appearing on Friday's Larry King Live (CNN), both Bob and Elizabeth Dole say that the general election will be close, and not a blowout by Bush. Appearing with his wife again on This Week, Bob Dole predicts that Bush will win the nomination (although he still will not endorse him). Steve Roberts opines that although Mrs. Dole has proved to be an awful presidential campaigner, her popularity among women will be hard for Bush to resist when he selects his running mate. ? When Elizabeth Dole praises Bush's "executive experience" on This Week, Sam Donaldson points out that her own husband had no such experience when he ran for president.

Last Word

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

--John McCain (Face the Nation)

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "society.reader@voxcap.com" <society.reader@voxcap.com> ("society.reader@voxcap.com" <society.reader@voxcap.com> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 12:48:04.00

SUBJECT: VoxCap.com Society & Values Reader, 1/10/00

TO: society.reader@voxcap.com (society.reader@voxcap.com [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
VoxCap.com Society & Values Reader, 1/10/00

***** PARTNER MESSAGE *****

* George W. too green? McCain too hot-headed? *
* Gore too stiff? Bradley too tall? *
* *
* Sound off on Campaign 2000 at VoxCap.com *
* <http://www.voxcap.com/anon/c8070/cover.dhtml> *
* *
* VoxCap.com -- The home of Online Activism *
* <http://www.voxcap.com> *

A NEW RATIONALITY IN RELIGION?

Beliefnet.com is reporting that key black Muslims are ready to disavow the "blue-eyed devils" notion about white people, and Slate.com's Chatterbox column is challenging other religions to conform to a new standard of "rationality."

At issue are such notions as papal infallibility and "Judaism's silly prejudice against crabcakes and Lobster Thermidor."

<http://www.slate.com/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp?Show=1/3/00&idMessage=4283>

Here's a link to the Beliefnet piece.

http://www.beliefnet.com/frameset.asp?boardID=688&pageloc=/story/2/story_231_1.html

OPTIMISM ABOUT POSITIVE THINKING

It has been a long time since so many medical professionals were so optimistic about the power of optimism. The Los Angeles Times produces a fabulous story detailing the positive effects of positive thinking -- longer life, for starters. And after decades of zeroing in almost entirely on depression and other negative emotional states, optimism is finally beginning to get its due in scientific studies.

<http://www.latimes.com/print/20000105/t000001328.html>

THE CULTURAL STATEMENTS IN TODAY'S GAME SHOWS

One of the primary reasons game shows are popular again is this:

The questions are simpler. Gone are the days when instant winnings

were tied to stumpers requiring contestants to name the Verdi opera that launched Arturo Toscanini's conducting career. In their place: questions like, What year did Columbus sail to America?, or What is the power source when using solar energy? The Washington Post analyzes this shift and makes some sweeping conclusions. Among them: Americans used to feel comfortable knowing they still had a lot to learn; now they are happier believing they're really smart already.
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A11220-2000Jan6.html>

GAYS-IN-THE-MILITARY RETURNS

It's back: the gays-in-the-military issue that kicked off the Clinton presidency to begin with. Presidential candidates Gore and Bradley both endorsed a liberalizing of the policy, with Gore strongly advocating the ability of gays to serve openly. Republicans are expected to temper the sentiment with objections.
<http://www.nytimes.com/library/politics/camp/010600wh-dem.html>

ORDAINING BISHOPS WITHOUT POPE'S BLESSING

The Chinese Catholic church, continuing its denial of worldwide papal control of the religion, ordained new bishops without the approval of the pontiff. MSNBC.com has the story, complete with analysis of the significance of the snub.
<http://www.msnbc.com/news/354218.asp>

SELF-HELP ON STEROIDS

There's no time like the millennium to improve the self. At least that's what an army of self-help gurus, and Newsweek magazine, would have you believe. Newsweek offers a lengthy story on the resolution-arama now taking place, and the industry that has risen up to fuel and serve it.
<http://www.newsweek.com/nw-srv/printed/us/sr/a46987-2000jan2.htm>

MINORITY GAINS AT NBC

The NBC TV network and the NAACP agreed to a new hiring plan that will go a great distance in placing more minorities in creative and business positions at the company. The Los Angeles Times reports on the developments at NBC, as well as similar efforts at competing networks. It also notes that Latinos feel left out.
http://www.latimes.com/business/updates/lat_nbc000106.htm

CONVERSING WITH IAN FRAZIER

Atlantic Unbound does a great Q&A with stellar outdoor writer Ian Frazier, covering everything from the lure of the West to the attitudes of Native Americans (the theme of his latest book). On Frazier's habit of moving East, then West, again and again: "When the days start to get shorter, I want to be in some nice brick building on the East Coast with the lights glowing in the windows. When the daylight starts changing, I want to be out West...I always feel nostalgia for the place I'm not in, and then I get there and find myself in a traffic jam going into the Lincoln Tunnel and I think, God, why was I romanticizing

this part of the country?"
<http://www.theatlantic.com/unbound/interviews/ba2000-01-05.htm>

IN THE TREND TOWARD EATING OUT, KIDS ARE KEY
Eating out at restaurants took a big leap in prevalence in the 1990s, and the Dallas Morning News sees children as a major key to the social trend. Restaurants are going more and more out of their way to cater to kids -- with crayons, play spaces, toy tables and more -- and the result is dramatic.
http://dallasnews.com/business/14757_playroom.html

****VOXCAP.com*****

Sound off on today's issues in the VoxCap.com RoundTable
<http://www.voxcap.com/anon/c8071/cover.dhtml>

Want to do something about the news instead of just read about it?
Make your own society club at VoxCap.com (<http://www.voxcap.com>).

THIS WEEK IN VOXCAP.COM'S SOCIETY CHANNEL:
Peace and Prosperity Forever?
<http://www.voxcap.com/content/ic/7/item7804.asp>

To UNSUBSCRIBE from this list, please visit:
<http://www.voxcap.com/memberadmin/>

To SUBSCRIBE to any of our other VoxCap Readers, please visit:
<http://www.voxcap.com/memberadmin/>

This is an automatically generated email. Please do not reply to this message. If you have any problems or questions regarding this newsletter or VoxCap.com, please email us at: info@voxcap.com

Visit us at: <http://www.voxcap.com>

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: E-Wire@CNN.COM (E-Wire@CNN.COM [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 18:42:22.00

SUBJECT: AllPolitics E-Wire -- January 10, 2000

TO: TEXTEWIRE@CNNMAIL2.CNN.COM (TEXTEWIRE@CNNMAIL2.CNN.COM [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

CNN AllPolitics E-Wire

<http://allpolitics.com>

=> Check out cartoonist Bill Mitchell's

=> latest animated musings, every Monday,

=> Wednesday, and Friday on allpolitics.com.

January 10, 2000

National attention turns to Election 2000 anticipation

The focus of the nation turned last week from fears of a meltdown at the hands of technology to the frantic waving, grasping and gesturing of a select group of human hands -- hands that hope to soon wield the presidential pen used to sign bills into law. Though the 2000 presidential election is some 11 months from now, the clamor and hubbub that began late in 1999 will grow to a sustained din in very short order. Sandwiched in those five months are some 73 separate state and territorial polling events.

Details:

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/07/primaries.wrap/index.html>

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/07/other.wrap/index.html>

Bradley, Gore sharpen rhetoric in two debates

Vice President Al Gore and former New Jersey Sen. Bill Bradley faced off twice last week, challenging each other on agriculture, health care, gays in the military, campaign finance issues and a host of other issues in two debates last week, one in Iowa and one in New Hampshire.

For more information:

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/08/gore.bradley.debate/index.htm>
l
<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/06/nh.debate/>

Bush, McCain dominate GOP debate

Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Arizona Sen. John McCain met one another head-on in last week's GOP presidential debate in New Hampshire. The two men dominated the debate, locking horns on tax cuts and Social Security. The six GOP candidates will meet again Monday night in Michigan.

Details:

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/06/gop.debate/index.html>
<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/10/mich.debate/index.html>

Party stalwarts endorse party front-runners

Two party stalwarts endorsed the Democratic and Republican front-runners last week. Breaking with his personal tradition on endorsing candidates, Sen.

Edward M. Kennedy on Wednesday gave his "wholehearted and complete support" to Vice President Al Gore for the 2000 Democratic presidential nomination. Former Republican presidential candidate Elizabeth Dole on Tuesday endorsed Texas Gov. George W. Bush for president, saying Bush would cut taxes, challenge the status quo and restore pride in the nation's institutions.

Details:

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/05/kennedy.endorses/index.html>
<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/04/dole.bush/index.html>

McCain fights off accusations of misusing influence

Sen. John McCain, the Republican presidential candidate from Arizona whose main issue is campaign finance reform, is scrambling to show that he did not unduly influence government agencies to help his contributors. McCain said he is asking all federal agencies to release any correspondence from him after questions about letters McCain wrote to the Federal Communications Commission and the Transportation Department on behalf of contributors to his campaign. McCain said he wrote the letters simply to help constituents.

More details:

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/09/presidential.candidates/index.html>

Clintons move into new home and begin commuter marriage

First lady Hillary Rodham Clinton moved into the Clinton's new home in New York last week as she prepares for her campaign for the New

York Senate. It is the start of a modern commuter marriage for the Clintons as the first lady sets up a new home in a white \$1.7 million house in a wealthy hamlet north of New York City, while her husband remains at the White House. On Wednesday, the Clintons had their first meal at the new house, where they both plan to live after Clinton leaves office in January, 2001

More information:

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/06/first.lady.01/index.html>

<http://cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/05/hillary.moves/index.html>

Quote of the Week

"What they (voters) are looking for in the year 2000 is a rock-solid, direct, non-blow-dried, non-poll-driven, non-focus-group-driven, non-finger-in-the-wind-driven candidate." State Sen. John Schwarz, the Michigan chairman of John McCain's presidential campaign, who, of course, thought McCain is that candidate.

For a complete list of the stories published by AllPolitics, go to the AllPolitics archives at <http://cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/stories/>

AllPolitics.com E-Wire is produced by the staff of CNN/TIME AllPolitics (<http://allpolitics.com>) and e-mailed each Monday. We're working to make E-Wire informative and useful, so let us know how we're doing, via e-mail to editor@AllPolitics.com. Please put "E-Wire" in the subject line.

To subscribe, go to: <http://cnn.com/EMAIL/allpolitics/>

To unsubscribe, go to:
<http://cnn.com/EMAIL/allpolitics/#unsubscribe>

CNN Interactive email id:192581823511163621

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 00:01:48.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.9.00.6

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. REUTERS/VARIETY Melissa Etheridge and Julie Cypher's kids fathered by David Crosby
2. ASSOCIATED PRESS GOP to air ad accusing Gore of advocating a policy that would prohibit Colin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf from serving on the Joint Chiefs of Staff
3. SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER Carol Ness: Gay couples face immense gap in benefits
4. INDIANAPOLIS STAR A family by choice: Homophobia, sex abuse color local children's adoption saga

Reuters/Variety, January 9, 2000

David Crosby fathered Etheridge's kids

By Dean Goodman

LOS ANGELES (Reuters) ? One of the best kept secrets in rock 'n' roll is out.

The biological father of lesbian singer Melissa Etheridge's two children is none other than veteran rock star David Crosby, according to the upcoming issue of Rolling Stone magazine.

Notwithstanding his frequent drug and health problems, Crosby, 58, made the grade because Etheridge is a fan.

"He's musical, which means a lot to me, and I admire his work," Etheridge, 38, was quoted as telling the magazine.

The children, three-year-old daughter Bailey and one-year-old son Beckett, were borne by Etheridge's partner, Julie Cypher, who was fertilized via artificial insemination.

"No kitchen implements were involved," said Cypher, a 35-year-old filmmaker who was once married to actor Lou Diamond Phillips.

The family appears on the cover of Rolling Stone, along with Crosby and his wife, Jan, who recommended her husband as the donor.

Crosby, who has four children of his own ranging from ages 35 to four, was not present at Bailey's and Beckett's birth, and does not have parental duties, Etheridge said.

For his part, Crosby was happy to lend a hand.

"Maybe it's a good thing for a lot of straight families to see that

this
is not something strange," he said.

Crosby, who is returning to the road this year with supergroup Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young, received a new liver five years ago and also did time in jail for drugs. However, he and his wife have been sober for 14 years.

Rumors of the father's identity have been swirling for some time, with speculation ranging from screen hunk Brad Pitt to Etheridge's idol, Bruce Springsteen. The couple said they decided to go public because they were sick of the questions and wanted to live an open life.

The magazine hits newsstands Jan. 14.

Associated Press, January 9, 2000
GOP To Air Ad on Gays in Military
By LAURA MECKLER

WASHINGTON (AP) — Looking to exploit controversy surrounding Vice President Al Gore's position on gays in the military, the Republican National

Committee plans a new TV ad accusing Gore of advocating a policy that would prohibit Colin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf from serving on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The ad features shots of soldiers at work, of Powell and Schwarzkopf and ends with: "Call Al Gore. Tell him the only litmus test ought to be for patriotism."

Powell and Schwarzkopf directed U.S. forces during the Persian Gulf War.

The RNC is spending less than \$10,000 to air the ad in Iowa, New Hampshire and a few other states late this week, so not many people will see

it on TV. But the goal is to keep alive an issue that has forced Gore to backpedal and that could hurt Democrats in this fall's general election.

Gore and Bill Bradley, competing for the Democratic presidential nomination and the liberal voters who turn out for primaries, both have said that gays should be allowed to serve openly in the military.

But the vice president got himself into trouble last week when he said in a debate that his appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be required to agree with his stand. Asked by the moderator whether that amounted to a litmus test, he said yes.

Gore backpedaled a day later, after Republicans, military leaders and even some Gore allies balked. He said he would not require would-be appointees to personally agree, only to carry out his policy.

Despite the clarification, Republican National Committee spokesman Mark Pfeifle said it's fair to air an ad based on Gore's original comments.

"Words matter," he said Sunday. "Al Gore wants to be the president of the United States. He's going to be in negotiations with foreign countries both on defense and economic matters. Plus, he's going to be speaking to the

American people. His inability to communicate in a clear and concise matter

is a very viable political issue that Republicans will use constantly."

Republicans hope the ad ? and publicity about it ? will keep the controversy alive as a general election issue.

While Gore and Bradley are tacking to the left in the primary, the eventual winner will need to appeal to voters in the political center this fall. Many moderates are not as supportive of gay rights as liberals generally are.

The gays in the military issue has surfaced in the Republican debates as well. Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Sen. John McCain said they would continue President Clinton's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which allows gays to serve in the military as long as they do not acknowledge their homosexuality. Other GOP candidates want to ban their service altogether.

The new RNC ad will run in Iowa, New Hampshire and three states with large military populations. The RNC is considering New York, California and Virginia, but has not made a final decision, an RNC aide said, speaking on condition of anonymity.

San Francisco Examiner, January 9, 2000
P. O. Box 7260, San Francisco, CA, 94120
(Fax 415-512-1264) (E-MAIL: letters@examiner.com)
(<http://www.examiner.com>)

Gay couples face immense gap in benefits

By Carol Ness of the Examiner staff

John Caton will have to take a deep cut in his pension to make sure that, if he dies, his partner of 22 years will be provided for.

Melanie Hofmann and Jayne Roseman will have to pay at least \$1,000, plus attorney fees, to get both names on the title to their house ? and then take a large property tax hit.

Carol and Lisa Pedro-Cirabisi have done most everything the law allows to establish and shore up their domestic partnership ? they've taken each other's names, registered with the city of San Francisco, had a commitment ceremony. But still, they face daunting costs and hoops simply to give their first child ? due in mid-March ? the protection of two legal parents.

If these couples were married, none of this would be true.

Despite heralded advances in the law, the reality of domestic partnership for same-sex couples remains largely symbolic, even in the pioneering Bay Area.

Every day, gay and lesbian couples are forced to spend money, hire lawyers, grapple with complicated paperwork and resistant bureaucracies to create the kinds of legal protections and responsibilities automatically conferred with marriage. Many areas ? everything covered by federal law ? are simply out of reach.

The gap is immense and, outside of well-known issues like health insurance benefits and hospital visitation, almost invisible.

"Politicians use domestic partnership ? Al Gore and Bill Bradley say they

support it ? so they can say, "Here we can be forgiven because we don't support (gay) marriage," said Kate Kendell, executive director of the National Center for Lesbian Rights in San Francisco, a key player in the fight to strengthen same-sex coupledness.

"Domestic partners is not a substitute for anything coming close to marriage," she added.

The first real test of how closely domestic partnership can approximate marriage benefits is being played out in Vermont right now. In a landmark decision last month, the Vermont Supreme Court ruled that same-sex couples must be provided all "the common benefits and protections that flow from marriage under Vermont law."

Denied 300 benefits

The ruling came in a case filed by three couples who successfully argued that because they couldn't marry, they were denied more than 300 benefits at the state level, and more than 1,000 identified in federal law.

The court gave legislators the option of becoming the first state to sanction same-sex marriage, or to create a parallel domestic partnership system.

Debate, across deep religious, social and political divides, opened last week.

The ruling ? hailed by gay activists as a big step toward equality and by opponents as a slap at the sanctity of marriage and family ? affects only Vermont.

But the debate and its eventual outcome have thrust the spotlight squarely on the limits of domestic partnership and whether a true parallel track can be created.

In California, the developments in Vermont come when the Knight initiative on the March ballot seeks to strengthen sanctions against same-sex marriage. Opponents of the initiative, sponsored by conservative Republicans, say similar legislation in other states has been used to try to roll back even limited domestic partners benefits.

"None of the domestic partners laws in this country even begin to approach the basic legal structure of marriage, both in terms of rights and responsibilities," said Stanford family law Professor Michael Wald, who just completed an academic study that concluded the Knight initiative would prove harmful to California's 400,000 same-sex couples and their children.

California has been at the forefront of domestic partnerships, one of only two states to create a state registry for domestic partners as of Jan. 1.

Hospital visiting rights

In addition to the registry, California allows gays the right to visit their partner in the hospital, ending an AIDS-era nightmare where relatives of the ailing partner could, and did, lawfully slam the door on them. It also grants health benefits to state and local government workers in the CalPERS system.

The new law, sponsored by Assemblywoman Carole Migden, D-San Francisco,

was seen by gay activists as both a symbolic triumph and still just a baby step toward equality.

Cities like San Francisco, Berkeley and Los Angeles have been aggressive in creating domestic partners registries, and conferring health benefits on city workers.

The advances have overshadowed the huge gap that remains, which gay and lesbian couples in San Francisco deal with daily. The issues range from the

far-reaching ? property and parental rights, inheritance and pensions ? to the more mundane but still bothersome ? car registration and jury duty.

Until just three weeks ago, same-sex couples who wanted to hyphenate their names, as Carol and Lisa Pedro-Cirabisi did, had to pay the state DMV \$250; married couples could do it for free, according to San Francisco Supervisor Mark Leno, who helped get the policy changed.

If you had a child in juvenile detention, or a dog in the pound, a domestic partner couldn't get them out, Leno said. He pushed changes there, too.

For Melanie Hofmann and Jayne Roseman, property tax laws are the problem.

When Roseman moved into Hofmann's Albany home last September, they wanted to add her name to the deed. Without that, Roseman would have no claim to the home if something happened to Hofmann.

Extra taxes for partners

So they saw a lawyer, set about creating a joint tenancy ? and learned they'd have to pay a property transfer tax of about \$1,000.

"If a married couple did it, they wouldn't have to pay it," said Hofmann, an artist.

The transaction also triggers a reassessment and a certain hike in their tax bill, which wouldn't occur if they were married.

Putting a partner's name on a title is costly. Not doing it can be catastrophic when a couple breaks up or the legal homeowner dies ? because without marriage the partner is left with no legal claim to the property.

Oakland attorney Frederick Hertz just wrapped up a trial involving a couple who broke up after 42 years. His client had never been put on the title and sued after his partner cut him out.

"My guy contributed to the property for 33 years," Hertz said. A verdict is pending.

For San Francisco couples like the Pedro-Cirabisis, and Cristy Chung and Lancy Woo, things like health insurance hassles are tiresome and expensive, but a first child exposes the deep vulnerability of their families.

"We knew if we were going to try to create a family, we would have to do as much as we could legally," said Carol Pedro-Cirabisi, a therapist who also runs the Alternative Family Project.

But now, with Lisa, a corporate travel agent, near term, they have a few

other things on their shopping list along with a crib and layette: a durable power of attorney, so Carol can make medical decisions for Lisa in an emergency; and paying lawyers to try to get the state to recognize Carol as the baby's legal parent.

That requires going to court and spending thousands of dollars ? with no guarantee of the outcome.

Problems of motherhood Cristy Chung, who gave birth to their child, and Lancy Woo had Olivia 19 months ago, and they are still struggling to figure out the best way for Woo to become the baby's legal mother ? and how to pay for it.

Chung works at the Asian Women's Shelter in San Francisco. Woo owns a dog grooming business in Noe Valley. Not only do they have to worry about the adoption process, but they must put Woo's business in both of their names to protect their family.

"It's really complicated, and it's all expensive and takes so much time," said Chung.

"I guess it just seems so weird to go through this and spend so much money when we've both been parents all along," she added. "It makes me angry."

Charles Huff and Alexander Hines, together almost 20 years, have no children, and they've been careful to safeguard their Western Addition condo in case something happens to one of them.

But still, they've run into their own barriers.

Huff, who works in the San Francisco treasurer's office, remembers being called for jury duty while Hines, director of admitting at Laguna Honda Hospital, was about to undergo cancer surgery. The judge released other people who had vacation plans ? but balked when it came to Huff.

"I was his domestic partner, his primary caregiver," Huff said. "I had power of attorney over his medical care."

Grilled by judge

It took two letters from Hines' doctor, intensive questioning by the judge and an appeal from his own boss before Huff was released.

"The judge asked, "Wasn't there anyone else who could be there?" Huff said. If they'd been married, "I don't think I would have gone through that."

For John Caton of San Francisco, who retired from the American Cancer Society after 20 years, the fact that he can't marry his partner means he'll have to make a difficult and costly pension choice when he turns 55, later this year. Caton's pension would cover a legal spouse for life, if Caton dies first.

Instead, his partner qualifies for only limited benefits.

So, to make sure his partner is provided for, Caton plans to take his pension as a lump sum and invest it ? which means he'll get 30 to 40 percent less, and have to make risky investment decisions.

Even if California were to change all its laws to give gay couples parity

with marriage, the coverage would stop at the state line.

Federal law covers vast areas, including pensions, income tax law, immigration (domestic partners from other countries don't automatically qualify for citizenship) and some inheritance laws.

Leno, the San Francisco supervisor, said, "Constructing a parallel system may prove so arduous and difficult, because of all the tiny details, that I think at some point it's all going to break down. And someone is going to say, "Why are we doing this? For one word? Why don't we just do it?" At the same time, he added, "I think we move the argument much closer by going down this separate but equal route."

Indianapolis Star, January 9, 2000

P. O. Box 145, Indianapolis, IN, 46206-0145

(Fax 317-656-1435) (E-MAIL: stareditor@starnews.com)

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

A family by choice

Homophobia, sex abuse color local children's adoption saga ? ?

By Kathleen Schuckel, The Indianapolis Star

INDIANAPOLIS ? Butch Kimmerling adopted his 8-year-old foster child to keep her from becoming a gay man's daughter. Kimmerling, 52, is now accused of molesting the little girl, and has admitted it.

Even as Kimmerling prepares to go to court soon on 10 felony counts of child molestation, a state lawmaker prepares to introduce legislation to stop gay people from adopting.

State Rep. Woody Burton, R-Greenwood, said he was appalled at Kimmerling's admissions to molesting the little girl. "That guy ought to be put in jail," he said.

Still, Burton says, that doesn't mean Kimmerling's protest against gay adoption was wrong.

Spurred by Kimmerling's protests over gay adoption, Burton sponsored a bill last year in the General Assembly that would have banned gays or single people from adopting. It didn't pass, but he plans to re-introduce legislation in 2001.

Away from the maelstrom, in a quiet house in Indianapolis, a gay man raises the little girl's three brothers, ages 4, 5 and 6. They are his sons,

now. Even as Craig Peterson tries to shield his boys from the swirling controversies, the intersecting threads still touch them.

Peterson is fighting for the right for his sons to visit their older sister. In fact, he would still like to adopt her or arrange visits between her and her brothers.

"These boys ... would love to have a relationship with their sister, and they've never been given that opportunity. We talk about her, and we pray for her."

The Kimmerling's adoption of the boys' sister was approved ? in

December,

1998 ? even before Peterson's adoption of his sons was approved. That approval came in September 1999.

"Here, I'm jumping through hoops, and they're taking hoops down for these people," Peterson said.

Even after the Kimmerlings "won" adoption of the little girl, they continued to fight for a ban against gay adoption.

In a letter to the editor of The Indianapolis Star, published Oct. 13, 1998, Kimmerling and his wife wrote: "Girls need mothers so they can learn what it is to be a woman; they need fathers so they know how to interact with the opposite sex."

Kimmerling later admitted molesting the little girl numerous times before and after that letter was written ? "many times since April or May 1998, and the last time on the morning of May 10, 1999," court documents note Kimmerling said.

Two veteran public servants in Madison County ? Detective Dale Koons and Judge Fredrick Spencer ? weren't surprised by the molestation charges against Kimmerling.

"Those with the deepest secrets protest the most," Spencer said. He said he knew of numerous instances of child molesters, before they were found out "...said that all molesters should be taken out and shot for their crimes."

Kimmerling's attorney, John Erickson, said his client has fully cooperated with officials, has had no contact with his daughter and has sought treatment.

Madison County Prosecutor Rodney Cummings said he plans to try the Kimmerling case himself, rather than hand it to a deputy prosecutor.

Cummings, who himself grew up in foster care in Anderson, moving from home to home and experiencing abuse in some homes, said he takes special interest in this case.

"I want to do it, and I want to make sure it gets done the way I want it done," he said.

Cummings said last month that he didn't anticipate a plea agreement.

Refusing to talk about this case specifically, Cummings said that he saw prison as "the only option" for most child molesters.

Of the 10 counts pending against Kimmerling, two are A felonies, the other eight, C felonies. On each A felony charge, Kimmerling could get 20 to

50 years in prison, and two to eight years imprisonment for each C felony.

The Indiana Legislature won't be alone in debating the issue of gay adoption.

Controversies surrounding the issue have erupted nationally. Last year, Texas attempted to ban gay adoption, but it failed in the legislature.

However, an aide to Gov. George W. Bush said the presidential hopeful would have signed a law banning gays from adopting.

And just last year, New Hampshire lifted its ban on gay adoption. Previously, foster children weren't even allowed to spend the night in a home where a homosexual was visiting.

THERAPY: Michael, Andrew and Brandon watch a half-hour of a Disney video before bedtime with their heads in their hands to help strengthen their neck muscles, which are weak from the effects of fetal alcohol syndrome. Peterson believes this will result in improving the boys' attention spans.

While Utah and Arkansas make gay adoptions nearly impossible, Florida is the only state that has an outright ban on gays and lesbians adopting. The law stemmed from Anita Bryant's 1977 crusade to overturn a gay rights ordinance in Dade County.

Indiana's Burton is clear in his opposition to gay people becoming adoptive parents.

"I think children need the influence of both a mother and father," said Burton, who said he also plans to introduce other adoption reform bills.

"(Children) need two different people with different biological makeups.

"It takes a man and woman to make a child. It takes a man and woman to raise a child."

Burton said children adopted by gays and lesbians are hurt unnecessarily when forced to experience the stigmas and mistreatment gay and lesbian parents receive in society.

Others disagree.

"There is not one credible study out there to demonstrate that children of gay and lesbian parents suffer at the hands of their peers any more than any other kids," said Sean Lemieux, the director of the Project for Equal Rights for the Indiana Civil Liberties Union.

"Does that mean we take kids away from overweight parents because they get teased on that basis?"

Steve Kirsh, an Indianapolis lawyer who mostly handles infant adoptions, occasionally works with gay and lesbian couples.

One birth mother purposely chose a gay couple to be her baby's parents because the child was biracial, Kirsh said. The woman reasoned that the couple had themselves faced prejudice and would be better equipped to raise a child facing prejudice.

In Kirsh's practice, gay couples have adopted African-American babies, biracial babies or those with disabilities.

He doesn't think any ban on gay adoption is necessary.

"Given the fact that there are so few gay adoptions taking place and also that gay couples are adopting hard-to-place children, I would think the legislature has more important things to worry about."

Peterson's sons all have special needs. Because of their birth mother's use of alcohol during pregnancy, they suffer effects of fetal alcohol syndrome.

Ron Carpenter knows about children, like Peterson's sons, who are hard to place. He heads the Children's Bureau of Indianapolis, which has a contract with the state to help find homes for nearly 2,000 Hoosier children needing homes.

"Special-needs kids take some very special or unique kinds of families,"

Carpenter said. "Though it would be great to have the 'normal' or 'traditional' family unit stepping forward, it just doesn't happen."

There are some critics of gay adoption who insinuate that gays are more prone to molest children.

In 17 years on the bench, there is one type of person Judge Spencer in Madison County says he has not seen facing molestation charges: homosexuals.

"I have never seen a known gay person who has been accused of sexually molesting a child," he said.

Burton says he thinks more married couples would adopt, if the state had

less red tape and better laws to assist them. That will be part of the legislation he plans to introduce next year.

Judith Myers-Walls, an associate professor of family studies at Purdue University, questioned Burton's premise that a traditional mother and father

are always the best for children.

"We put adoptive parents through a lot more rigor than we do biological parents," she said.

As a result, some studies show that gay and lesbian parents tend to be better quality parents.

"They're working very hard at parenting. They're much more conscious of what they do and are careful with decisions because they worry of how they are perceived by others," Myers-Walls said.

Furthermore, kids adopted by gays don't "become" gay, she said.

Studies

show that gay and lesbian parents are slightly less likely to have children who identify themselves as gay or lesbian than heterosexual parents, Myers-Walls said.

Peterson said he doesn't spend much time researching the issues. Instead, he's focused most on being a father, providing for his sons' most immediate needs: good educations and a nurturing home that helps them to grow up kind and successful people.

The father finds sad irony in the fact that Kimmerling, who later admitted being a child molester, fought so hard to prevent him from adopting.

"How could that man say horrible things about me when he'd been doing this to the girl?"

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 09:42:59.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.10.00

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. REUTERS Parents of Barry Winchell may sue the Army for faily to protect their son from anti-gay harassment
2. NEW YORK TIMES Army to Expand Inquiry in Death of Gay Private
3. DES MOINES REGISTER Two disgruntled letters
4. OTAGO DAILY TIMES (New Zealand) Study calls for lesbians to be encouraged to become foster parents
5. OTAGO DAILY TIMES Scouting New Zealand to ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (sort of)
6. MELBOURNE HERALD SUN (Australia) Letter from a happy gay person
7. SYDNEY MORNING HERALD (Australia) Scottish Anglican church backs blessing of gay couples

Reuters, January 10, 2000

Parents of slain GI said considering suing Army

WASHINGTON (Reuters) ? The parents of infantryman Barry Winchell, 21, beaten to death because he was suspected of being a homosexual, may sue the Army for failing to protect their son from anti-gay harassment, the Washington Post reported Monday.

Pat and Wally Kutteles told the Post in an interview that military officials at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, did not take sufficient precautions to prevent Winchell's July 5 beating.

Army Pvt. Calvin Glover, 18, was convicted and sentenced to life in prison in December for beating Winchell to death with a baseball bat while he slept.

Testimony at the trial indicated the victim was harassed repeatedly before his death and that base commanders did nothing to stop the badgering.

Winchell's death prompted Defence Secretary William Cohen to order an immediate investigation at major U.S. military bases to assess the military's enforcement of a controversial "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

The policy allows gays to serve in uniform if they do not openly discuss their sexual preference or engage in homosexual acts. But it also forbids harassment of gays or investigation of suspected homosexuals without solid evidence.

Pat Kutteles told the Post that commanders at the 101st Airborne Division

tolerated a four-month harassment campaign against her son in clear violation of the policy.

"What it's shown us that the military is not a safe place to send our children to," the Post quoted her as saying. "I don't believe in lawsuits, in everybody suing other people, but it's the last resort."

The comments of Winchell's parents came a day after Army Spc. Justin R. Fisher, 26, pleaded guilty to obstructing justice and lying to military investigators in connection with Winchell's death.

Fisher, who was sentenced to 12-1/2 years in prison, wiped blood off the bat that Glover used to kill Winchell. Prosecutors said Fisher had encouraged Glover to attack Winchell in retaliation for an earlier fight.

Winchell's parents said anti-gay sentiment flourished at military installations like Fort Campbell, where soldiers made jokes about their son's death.

Pat Kutteles said Winchell's platoon sergeant had asked her son about his sexual orientation, but dropped the subject when he denied he was gay. At Glover's trial, the sergeant testified that he did nothing to stop the anti-gay epithets other soldiers hurled at Winchell. "Everybody was having fun," Staff Sgt. Michael Kleifgen said.

"Nobody in the Army or chain of command stopped it," Kutteles told the Post, adding that she and her husband held Major. Gen. Robert Clark responsible as commander of the 101st Airborne and Fort Campbell.

"He is in command. The responsibility is his," she said.

Kutteles also said they blamed Cohen for failing to adequately implement the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

New York Times, January 10, 2000
229 W. 43rd Street, New York, NY, 10036
(Fax 212-556-3622) (E-MAIL: letters@nytimes.com)
(<http://www.nytimes.com>)

Army to Expand Inquiry in Death of Gay Private

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON ? After the sentencing of a second soldier in the killing of a gay private, the Army plans to investigate whether officers at Fort Campbell,

Ky., overlooked the daily harassment that trial witnesses said the private faced before he was beaten to death, an Army official said today.

The Army is expected to announce on Monday that it has approved a request by Fort Campbell's commander, Maj. Gen. Robert T. Clark, to investigate the events surrounding the killing of the private first class, Barry Winchell, last July.

The investigation, by the Army's inspector general, could lead to further disciplinary actions against soldiers and officers at the base.

A military court sentenced Private Winchell's roommate, Specialist

Justin

R. Fisher, to 12 1/2 years in prison on Saturday evening as part of a plea bargain that allowed him to avoid more serious charges of being an accomplice to the murder and helping to cover it up.

Specialist Fisher, a 26-year-old soldier from Lincoln, Neb., pleaded guilty to two counts of obstructing justice, three of making false statements and one of providing alcohol to a minor during the beer-soaked evening that led to Private Winchell's murder.

Last month, Pvt. Calvin Glover, 19, was convicted and sentenced to life in prison for bludgeoning Private Winchell to death with a baseball bat.

The killing has reverberated throughout the military and political establishments and has become an issue for both parties in the presidential campaign.

It has renewed the debate over the Clinton administration's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which allows gays to serve in the military provided they keep their sexual orientation to themselves and do not engage in homosexual acts.

After Private Glover's conviction, President Clinton said the policy was "out of whack," and Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen ordered the Pentagon's inspector general to investigate whether gays face harassment on military bases because of their sexual orientation.

The Army's inspector general, Lt. Gen. Michael W. Ackerman, is expected to focus on what appeared to be a highly charged environment at Fort Campbell in the months leading up to Private Winchell's killing.

In Private Glover's trial, soldiers testified that Private Winchell repeatedly experienced taunting with antigay slurs and that superiors did not intervene.

One sergeant, Michael Kleifgen, even testified that he had questioned Private Winchell about his sexuality, a clear violation of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

The Army's inspector general is expected to investigate other aspects of discipline and leadership at the base, including why soldiers were allowed to drink excessively and openly at their barracks with little apparent oversight or intervention.

"It's safe to assume they'll look into whether there were violations of the 'don't ask, don't tell' policy," the Army official said today.

"They'll also look into some of the other elements of what the Army calls 'command climate.' "

Proponents of allowing gays to serve openly in the military have repeatedly cited the murder of Private Winchell as evidence that the "don't ask, don't tell" policy has failed because, in practice, gay service members continue to face harassment.

According to witnesses, Private Winchell, a machine gunner in the 101st

Airborne Division, kept his sexual orientation to himself, fearing discharge under the policy, but still found himself subjected to relentless harassment.

Some soldiers in his unit testified that they had reported the taunting to Fort Campbell's inspector general, but that nothing came of it, something that will likely be an element of the Army's investigation.

The day before the slaying, Private Glover goaded Private Winchell into a fistfight and lost the fight. That prompted Private Glover, egged on by Specialist Fisher, to retaliate by attacking the private with a bat while he slept.

After Saturday's sentencing, Private Winchell's parents and representatives of an organization that provides legal advice to gay men and lesbians in uniform criticized the plea bargain with Specialist Fisher.

Private Winchell's mother, Patricia Kutteles, called it a travesty.

According to testimony, it was Specialist Fisher who first began to circulate rumors about Private Winchell's orientation after taking him to a bar in Nashville frequented by transvestites. Specialist Fisher also provided the baseball bat and helped clean up evidence after the killing.

On the morning of the killing, a military policeman reported seeing Specialist Fisher covered in blood and shouting "Let him die! Let him die," as an ambulance carried Private Winchell to the hospital.

At the court-martial on Saturday, Specialist Fisher tearfully apologized and asked for forgiveness.

"I am sorry for the part I played in this," he said, addressing Private Winchell. "I know you are in a better place. I hope you know that if I could go back to the morning it happened, I would have changed it all."

The Army initially charged Specialist Fisher with helping commit premeditated murder and acting as an accessory after the fact, charges that could have led to life in prison. As part of an agreement that included his cooperation in the investigation, prosecutors dropped those charges and agreed to cap his sentence at 12 1/2 years.

"The Army dropped the two charges directly related to the crime, despite overwhelming evidence against him," Michelle M. Benecke, co-director of the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, an organization in Washington that provides legal aid to gays in the military, said today. "That's the troubling part." Ms. Benecke said the Army's decision to order an inspector general's investigation came too late and fell short of what was needed.

"The Army needs to do more than a review," she said. "Army leaders need to take action and make changes in the command climate at Fort Campbell and elsewhere."

THE REGISTER'S READERS SAY MAKE GAYS HAVE CHILDREN

We are to believe that the real reason for gay marriages is to give them the respect of a traditional marriage. This is not the reason for the pressure to change the definition of marriage. The real reason is not because they want to have their commitment to each other recognized by others ? that could be done with vows that they give to each other. The real reason is not love, but money, benefits and insurance. These are not reasons to change our definition of a marriage.

I do believe that a compromise can be reached. The definition of a common-law marriage should include male to male or female to female relationships to be considered married as soon as there is a child produced from the union. Until that time, they are just living together regardless of the amount of time that they have cohabited.
? Jon King, 904 Grand St., Guthrie Center, Iowa 50115-1520

PREDICTABLE

Your Jan. 2 article emphasizing the smooth-running first year of Gov. Tom Vilsack's administration ("Vilsack Finishes Smooth Year") was exactly what one would expect from the Register.

A good liberal newspaper like the Register naturally would not find fault with Vilsack's veto of nearly three-fourths of a \$150 million tax cut package, his support of gay marriages, his signing into law a reduction in the size of elementary-school classes without any provisions for where to put the excess students and his plan to limit future governors to two terms.
? Denny VoPava, 1049 Cummins Pkwy, Des Moines, Iowa 50311-2137
[Fenceberry note: Governor Vilsack, although quite pro-gay, does not support gay marriages.]

Otago Daily Times, January 10, 2000
52-66 Lower Stuart Street, Dunedin, New Zealand
(Fax: +64-3-477-1313) (Email: odt.editor@alliedpress.co.nz)
(<http://www.odt.co.nz>)

Report on lesbians sought by minister

Wellington ? A study calling for lesbians to be encouraged to become foster parents has prompted Social Services Minister Steve Maharey to request a report from Child, Youth and Family Services on the issue.

Mr Maharey said he neither favoured nor rejected the idea and intended seeking more information from the service before forming an opinion.

"I'll ask them for a piece of paper on it and see where we're up to."

The service maintains it assesses all potential foster parents and caregivers in a "non-discriminatory" way.

The study, written by Child, Youth and Family trainer Helen Alice, concluded lesbians were able to care for children as well as heterosexuals.

In furthering the goal to attract, assess and support the best homes

for
children needing out-of-family care, agencies should consider how they
could
better attract lesbians to be foster carers, she said.

Christian Heritage Party leader Graham Capill described the study as a
"sad contradiction in terms".

"Same-sex 'couples' are already breaching the bounds of what is morally
acceptable by choosing such lifestyles," he said.

"Adults consenting to such relationships is one thing; to raise
children
in such an environment is irresponsible and morally sick."
? NZPA

Otago Daily Times, January 10, 2000

Scouting NZ to ban discrimination

Wellington ? Scouting New Zealand is developing policies to ban
discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation after a scout leader
said
he was forced to resign because he was gay.

The organisation's equal opportunities working group has been briefed
to
produce anti-discrimination policies but Scouting NZ said it would also
take
into consideration the concerns of members and parents opposed to gay
leadership.

Brent Mitchell, the former Canterbury area Venturer leader and
assistant
national Venturer commissioner, has said he was invited to resign after 25
years as a volunteer in the movement, "due to the fact that I was wanting
to
be honest with everyone in the respect that I am actually gay".

Working group chairwoman Lesley Anderson said the group would meet this
month and at the top of the agenda would be developing policies to prevent
gay members being discriminated against.

"We don't want to discriminate.

"But we've got to be aware of the needs of all our members, and being
very aware that we're dealing with young people.

"Our membership does have a wide age range and we've got to be very
aware
of that.

"People become very emotional about it."

Canterbury area commissioner John Allen has said Mr Mitchell was a
committed scout who resigned for the good of the movement because he
realised
that his sexual orientation might damage the public perception of the
movement.

Mr Mitchell has formally asked for a review of his "constructive
dismissal", and to be restored in his positions in the organisations, but
Scouting NZ declined to reinstate him.

Ms Anderson said the working group would be looking at material from overseas scouting movements, including
Canada where a special troop for
older
gay scouts had been established.

The Boy Scouts of America were found guilty of discrimination in 1998 after gay assistant scout leader James Dale (27) was sacked.

The working group aimed to present a preliminary report to Scouting NZ's annual meeting in May, Ms Anderson said.
? NZPA

Melbourne Herald Sun, 10th January, 2000
Box 14631, Melbourne, Victoria 8001 Australia
(Fax: + 61-3-9292-2944) (E-mail: hsletters@hwt.newsltd.com.au)
Letter: Gay suits the culture

As much as I hate to disappoint Roger Marks ('Herald Sun', December 28), most gay men and women are every bit as happy in life as their heterosexual counterparts. Gay in all senses of the word.

There are not so many things that bother us deeply, no religious or moral objections to how others need to live their lives. How sad it must be to bear the yoke of judgmentalism and carry it through life.

As to the word "gay", I think it is wonderful that the English language so readily evolves to meet the needs of a diverse and malleable culture.
If it were not to do so, it would be failing us.

Only in a nightmare Orwellian world can language be harnessed to specific moral and political ideologies
? Name Supplied, East Bentleigh, Melbourne

Sydney Morning Herald, January 10, 2000
GPO Box 506, Sydney NSW 2001 Australia
(Phone: +61/2/9282 2822) (E-Mail: letters@smh.fairfax.com.au)
(<http://www.smh.com.au/>)
Scottish Anglican church backs blessing of gay couples

LONDON ? The head of the Scottish Anglican church declared himself in favour of blessing homosexual couples and backed the legalisation of cannabis in an interview with the BBC today.

"If we can bless battleships and fox hunts, why can't we bless a couple of human beings who want to be faithful to one another?" said Richard Holloway, Bishop of Edinburgh and Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

"Sex is the last hang-up of the church. We have been operating an ethic which is no longer appropriate to our time," he added.

"I think that gay priests should be allowed to have stable relationships just like straight priests.

"There are a lot of gay priests, of gay Christians, it's tough for them to feel marginalised, made into some kind of moral lepers, and the church would collapse without them."

The bishop said he had himself blessed the union of a homosexual couple 30 years ago when still a parish priest.

Holloway, well known as an outspoken social liberal, also said he was in

favour of legalising cannabis, which he had tried, but was unsure what he thought about other drugs.

"I would legalise cannabis. I'm a bit confused about some of the other stuff, but the thing that most depresses me is that you can't even debate it in this country without being dumped on by the newspapers and the politicians that are afraid of the newspapers.

"It seems to me that the war on drugs is so expensive and it does not seem to be working. I had a couple of puffs on a friend's joint once. If that's experimentation, then I'm Einstein."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 00:49:56.00

SUBJECT: RNC to air ad on gays in military

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

TEXT:
January 9, 12000
Associated Press

GOP To Air Ad on Gays in Military

By LAURA MECKLER

WASHINGTON (AP) - Looking to exploit controversy surrounding Vice President Al Gore's position on gays in the military, the Republican National Committee plans a new TV ad accusing Gore of advocating a policy that would prohibit Colin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf from serving on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The ad features shots of soldiers at work, of Powell and Schwarzkopf and ends with: ``Call Al Gore. Tell him the only litmus test ought to be for patriotism."

Powell and Schwarzkopf directed U.S. forces during the Persian Gulf War.

The RNC is spending less than \$10,000 to air the ad in Iowa, New Hampshire and a few other states late this week, so not many people will see it on TV. But the goal is to keep alive an issue that has forced Gore to backpedal and that could hurt Democrats in this fall's general election.

Gore and Bill Bradley, competing for the Democratic presidential nomination and the liberal voters who turn out for primaries, both have said that gays should be allowed to serve openly in the military.

But the vice president got himself into trouble last week when he said in a debate that his appointees to the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be required to agree with his stand. Asked by the moderator whether that amounted to a litmus test, he said yes.

Gore backpedaled a day later, after Republicans, military leaders and even some Gore allies balked. He said he would not require would-be appointees to personally agree, only to carry out his policy.

Despite the clarification, Republican National Committee spokesman Mark Pfeifle said it's fair to air an ad based on Gore's original comments.

``Words matter," he said Sunday. ``Al Gore wants to be the president of the United States. He's going to be in negotiations with foreign countries both on defense and economic matters. Plus, he's going to be speaking to the American people. His inability to communicate in a clear and concise manner is a very viable political issue that Republicans will use constantly."

Republicans hope the ad - and publicity about it - will keep the controversy alive as a general election issue.

While Gore and Bradley are tacking to the left in the primary, the eventual winner will need to appeal to voters in the political center this fall. Many moderates are not as supportive of gay rights as liberals generally are.

The gays in the military issue has surfaced in the Republican debates as well. Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Sen. John McCain said they would continue President Clinton's ``don't ask, don't tell" policy, which allows gays to serve in the military as long as they do not acknowledge their homosexuality. Other GOP candidates want to ban their service altogether.

The new RNC ad will run in Iowa, New Hampshire and three states with large military populations. The RNC is considering New York, California and Virginia, but has not made a final decision, an RNC aide said, speaking on condition of anonymity.

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 22:55:26.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.10.00.6

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. THE INDEPENDENT (UK) Gay couple's twins to get right to stay
2. CAPE COD TIMES Letter: Homosexuality bias is selective morality
3. WASHINGTON POST Gore Steps on a Land Mine . . .
4. WASHINGTON POST Parents of Slain GI Consider Suing Army
5. ACADEME TODAY Gay-Studies Professors Debate the Pros and Cons of the Field's Popularity Among Heterosexuals

The Independent, January 9, 2000

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/UK/Legal/gaydads090100.shtml>

Gay couple's twins to get right to stay.

By Jo Dillon, Political Correspondent

The surrogate children of the gay millionaire couple Barrie Drewitt and Tony Barlow seem certain to be granted British citizenship thanks to European law.

Legal experts have explained to The Independent on Sunday that under the European Convention on Human Rights, which will be incorporated into British law in October, the children may have the right to a family life with their parents, regardless of the parents' sexuality. This means that the Home Secretary, Jack Straw, could be forced to grant citizenship to the babies, Aspen and Saffron, despite fears it could open the floodgates to similar cases.

The gay couple from Danbury, Essex, tried to bring the twins into the UK but were refused automatic entry at Heathrow. Immigration officials allowed them temporary admission for one month while the Home Office examined the case. Under British law, the babies' legal parents are the surrogate mother and her husband in the US, even though sperm from one of the men was used to conceive the children and Mr Barlow and Mr Drewitt are recorded as the parents on the birth certificates.

The two men have said they will take the case to the European Court of Human Rights if it is not resolved by the British government. But Mr Straw is likely to have to rule in the men's favour because, under articles 8 and 14 of the Convention, they have a winnable case.

One senior lawyer said: "Everybody has a right to respect for family life. A child has the right to see its parents but whether that would

extend

to the right to live here is another matter. But if a failure to have immigration status would mean you have no family life there is an arguable breach of the convention there."

Another expert said she believed the European law, which judges have been

told to take into account when making decisions ahead of October when it comes into full force, would count them as a family. "This couple are British

and have no space in America," she said. "It is a bit unclear why immigration

are making such a fuss about them. There is a good argument to suggest that there is some discrimination going on here because they are gay men."

A third lawyer said that there was existing case law from a similar situation in Portugal, where the government fell foul of European law for refusing the child of a surrogate mother access to its parents.

The fate of the babies is likely to be decided, at least in the interim,

by January 28. But the Labour MP, Gerald Bermingham, a practising lawyer, wants Mr Straw to act before then. He has told the Home Secretary in a letter

that the two men should be allowed to keep the twins with them in Britain.

Mr Bermingham told 'The Independent on Sunday': "We are dealing with two tiny children who are legally the children of those two men. The interests of the children are paramount. This family should be allowed to settle back into obscurity rather than be denied their basic human rights and the unity of the family."

CAPE COD TIMES, January 10, 2000

319 Main St., Hyannis, MA, 02601

(Fax 508-775-7337) (E-MAIL: letters@capecodonline.com)

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

Letter: Homosexuality bias is selective morality

Once again you have demonstrated your extreme bias in favor of homosexuality. You are so intent on promoting it that you have failed to think in the process. I am referring to your choice of James Robinson's quote

on your editorial page of Dec. 23.

It states, "There have been gay and lesbian couples since the beginning of humankind. It's about time they received the recognition and support."

The logic employed here is that since there has been this form of sin since the beginning we should embrace it and call it good.

No doubt the Rev. Robinson is familiar with the account of Cain and Able.

Following his logic, and the logic you have chosen to accept as your own, we

conclude that you, and he, endorse murder. Maybe we should accept murderers as a good and moral and beneficial element to our society. After all, they have been here since the beginning.

If you can be selective in your morality then you have appointed yourselves as the ultimate judge of what's right and what's wrong. And though logic may have escaped you, you cannot be foolish enough to admit to that.

It's time for the American people to start to think about who sets the standards for morality. If it's us we are doomed to destruction. If it's God then we had better ask ourselves how we shall answer to Him for the total disregard of his law.

-- JAMES A. STEWART, Harwich

Stewart is pastor of the Cape Cod Bible Fellowship.

WASHINGTON POST, January 10, 2000

1150 15th Street NW, Washington, DC, 20071

(Online Mailer:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/edit/letters/letterform.htm>)

Gore Steps on a Land Mine . . .

By Peter Feaver

Vice President Al Gore stepped on a land mine during last week's campaign debate. He pledged not only to allow gays to serve openly in the military but to make the issue a litmus test for anyone he appointed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The campaign tried to contain the damage and by week's end the vice president retreated partway in a hastily called news conference. Latest word: He will allow gays to serve openly but will not make the issue a litmus test for promotions to the highest military commands.

The Gore team may have spun its way out of a short-term campaign fiasco, but the long-term damage is harder to assess because pollsters will not survey the audience most affected by his remarks and the one most important for Gore's ability to function as commander in chief: the armed forces. If he wins in November, Gore may discover that the troops remember those throwaway lines meant to appease a special interest in key primaries.

Gore's statements hit two of the most sensitive hot buttons for the military, as revealed in a recent survey by the Triangle Institute for Security Studies (TISS).

First, he is endorsing a proposal that most in the military oppose strongly. Fully 75 percent of the up-and-coming officers polled opposed allowing gays to serve openly in the military. As many as 26 percent said that they would leave the military if gays were allowed to serve openly. At a time when the military is struggling to meet retention goals, lifting the ban surely would be disruptive.

Second, with his proposed litmus test, the vice president unwittingly touched an exceedingly raw nerve about the proper advisory role of the military. The TISS study and a companion study by the Center for Strategic

and International Studies found that many officers believe that the most senior military leaders have bowed to the winds of political correctness rather than honoring their duty to tell it like it is to politicians.

An astonishing 49 percent of those we surveyed said they would leave the military if "the senior uniformed leadership does not stand up for what is right in military policy."

The military probably heard echoes of Vietnam in Gore's proposed litmus test. Many officers blame the war on the alleged failure of the senior uniformed leadership to speak candidly to the president, Congress and the people for fear of losing influence in the politicized Johnson administration.

Gore seemed to imply that he too only wants yes men as advisers. Because of the up-or-out system, military officers know that this would trickle down through promotion boards, and with it would come the political-correctness poison they fear.

The Gore people undoubtedly hope that by rescinding the threat of a litmus test, they have put the issue behind them. But the cat is already out of the bag and any controversial military proposal in a Gore administration now would inevitably be viewed through the lens of whether he is politicizing the military as he once threatened to do. While the military still would submit to civilian control, the control would come at a higher price.

Recall that President Clinton extravagantly spent political capital wooing the military, trying to make up for his famous draft-avoidance quote about "loathing the military" and his abortive effort to impose a gay policy on the military without adequate consultation.

As president, Gore would be forced to make the same gestures and would lose the same leverage over the military, especially on unpopular measures. Ironically, barring an extraordinary swing to the left in Congress, Gore might even find that he lacks the political leverage to change the "don't ask, don't tell policy" he claims to abhor.

Candidates who want to make dramatic changes in military policy can learn from Gore's mistake. If they want to avoid spending an inordinate amount of effort as president trying to earn back the trust of the military they must order into combat, they would do well to learn these lines:

"I will commission a blue-ribbon panel of respected experts, including retired senior military officers, to review the policy. I will insist that the panel be balanced and thorough and that it listen carefully to the perspectives of those in uniform.

"I will take the recommendations of this panel seriously and then make my own decisions. If it recommends a change, I will work with the senior military leadership to devise a plan to implement the change with the least disruption to military effectiveness and morale. I will insist that my senior military advisers give me their frank opinion at every turn, and I will never, ever demand that they tailor their advice to suit what they think I want to hear.

"I know the military will faithfully execute the lawful orders I give, and if they do not they will be fired."

Gore's land-mine injury may well prove permanently disabling. Other candidates need not follow in his missteps.

The writer is an associate professor of political science at Duke University and executive secretary of the Triangle Institute for Security Studies, a faculty consortium based at Duke, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University.

WASHINGTON POST, January 10, 2000

Parents of Slain GI Consider Suing Army

By Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post Staff Writer

The parents of slain Pfc. Barry Winchell are considering suing the Army for failing to protect their son from anti-gay harassment.

In an interview yesterday, Pat and Wally Kutteles said military officials at Fort Campbell, Ky., did not take sufficient precautions to prevent Winchell's July 5 beating. Winchell, who was rumored to be gay, was attacked by another soldier as he was sleeping.

Pat Kutteles said commanders at the 101st Airborne Division tolerated a four-month harassment campaign against her son in clear violation of the Pentagon's "don't ask, don't tell" policy toward gays, a standard which has come under mounting criticism in recent weeks.

"What it's shown us is that the military is not a safe place to send our children to," she said. "I don't believe in lawsuits, in everybody suing other people, but it's the last resort."

The couple's comments came a day after Army Spc. Justin R. Fisher, 26, pleaded guilty to obstructing justice and lying to military investigators in connection with Winchell's death. Fisher, who was sentenced to 12 1/2 years in prison, wiped blood off the bat that Pvt. Calvin N. Glover used to kill Winchell. Prosecutors had said Fisher, who was Winchell's barracks mate, had encouraged Glover to attack Winchell in retaliation for an earlier fight. Glover, 18, was convicted last month of premeditated murder and sentenced to life in prison with the possibility of parole.

"Fisher's as guilty as Glover as far as we're concerned," Wally Kutteles said, noting that Fisher had taunted Glover over the fight. "Telling him, 'You got beat up by a fag.' He knew he was getting him stirred up."

At his trial, witnesses testified that Glover had provoked Winchell into a fight two days before the beating. Winchell won the fistfight easily, and Glover attacked the 21-year-old infantryman with a baseball bat Fisher supplied.

Under court-martial rules, Fisher's plea agreement is immediately subject to an appeal process in which the conviction is subject to a review by the convening authority, Maj. Gen. Robert Clark. Clark can lessen the penalty

but
not increase it.

Pat Kutteles called Fisher's plea bargain "a travesty." Her son's stepfather argued that military officials were afraid of what an extended trial would reveal about their conduct at Fort Campbell.

"It would make the Army look bad," Wally Kutteles said. "They wanted to get this over with."

But Lt. Col. Bill Wheelehan, an Army spokesman, said prosecutors were simply focused on obtaining Fisher's conviction.

"He's been convicted for his part in the beating death of a fellow soldier and it is a felony count that will follow him forever," Wheelehan said, adding that Fisher helped prosecutors in their case against Glover. "His cooperation was crucial in the conviction of the actual killer."

Winchell's death has reignited the debate over gays in the military, with politicians including presidential candidates Al Gore and Bill Bradley saying they support gays serving openly in the military.

On orders from Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, all of the military services are in the final stages of internal reviews of how they are applying the "don't ask, don't tell" policy and how they will incorporate the added imperative, "don't harass."

Wheelehan said the Pentagon is emphasizing its opposition to the harassment of gays in light of Winchell's death. But Winchell's parents said anti-gay sentiment still flourishes at military installations like Fort Campbell, where soldiers made jokes about their son's death.

Pat Kutteles noted that Winchell's platoon sergeant had asked her son about his sexual orientation but dropped the subject when Winchell denied he was gay. At Glover's trial, the sergeant testified he did nothing to stop the anti-gay epithets other soldiers hurled at Winchell. "Everybody was having fun," Staff Sgt. Michael Kleifgen said.

"Nobody in the Army or chain of command stopped it," Kutteles said of her son's harassment, adding that she and her husband held Clark responsible as commander of both the 101st Airborne and Fort Campbell. "He is in command. The responsibility is his." The Kansas City, Mo., couple said they also blamed Cohen for failing to adequately implement the "don't ask, don't tell" policy, adding that they wrote to him in October on the subject but that he has not responded.

Rear Adm. Craig Quigly, a military spokesman, said Cohen thought it was "legally more prudent" not to respond to the letter until after the court-martial proceedings had finished.

Recalling how her son had gone from tinkering with model airplanes as a child to working with helicopters and winning awards for marksmanship, Pat Kutteles said she feels compelled to hold the military responsible for the harassment Winchell endured during his service.

"It's devastating," she said. "I thought he was so happy. He seemed to be achieving so much."

Academe Today, January 10, 2000
The Chronicle of Higher Education
<http://chronicle.com>

Gay-Studies Professors Debate the Pros and Cons of the Field's Popularity Among Heterosexuals By JEFF SHARLET

Chicago - The problem with the crowd at a panel discussion on lesbian and gay history at the American Historical Association's annual meeting here may have been that it was too big. After years of marginalization, said Michael Sherry, a historian at Northwestern University, lesbian and gay history has arrived - and that could mean trouble.

Mr. Sherry presented a paper entitled "Lesbian and Gay Studies: What Happens When Everybody (It Seems) Claims to Do It?"

Although Mr. Sherry's research focuses on military history, he often teaches courses on lesbian and gay history. When he started out, his students were mostly lesbian or gay. These days, that group makes up only about a third of his class. Likewise, Mr. Sherry noted, more and more lesbian and gay history is being written by scholars identified as straight.

As a result of lesbian and gay studies' entering the mainstream, "questions of ownership arise," said Mr. Sherry. "Whose agenda will be served?"

"My gut instinct is to mistrust this development," he added. He explained that he worried that straight scholars would not have a stake in maintaining the connections between scholarship and activism that gave birth to the field.

James Naylor Green, a historian at California State University at Long Beach, agreed that too much enthusiasm from straight scholars could be a problem, but for different reasons. Young scholars whose primary focus is on lesbian and gay history have difficulty finding jobs in departments where the history of sexuality is considered a footnote, he said, especially when they must compete with straight scholars whose interest in lesbian, gay, or queer history is tangential.

"That's mitigated by the conspiracy of the elders of Sodom," Mr. Naylor joked, but he added that many hiring committees seem to worry that a scholar studying gay life in South America will give students the impression that the whole continent is queer.

"From a dean's perspective," responded Mr. Sherry, "in many departments, the ideal hire is a straight-identified scholar who poaches on this field."

Leila J. Rupp, a historian at Ohio State University, has noticed the same trends as Mr. Sherry and Mr. Green. The last time she taught a

queer-studies

course, she said, only one student who was not identified as straight enrolled. But she thinks the developments may be cause for celebration as well as concern. "I believe in identity politics," she said, "because I believe identities can overlap."

Mr. Sherry also expressed a note of optimism, despite his worries. Straight historians can no longer overlook lesbian and gay history as they might have just a decade ago, and queer studies remains a place for lesbian and gay people to be both activists and scholars. Straight scholars entering the field must deal with similar issues to join the discussion.

For now at least, he said, "hordes of heterosexuals seeking to colonize lesbian and gay studies are difficult to imagine."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 22:11:49.00

SUBJECT: [403] Online NewsHour Select - January 11, 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 11, 2000

***AOL MERGES WITH TIME WARNER**

Top Internet service provider America Online announces it will buy media conglomerate Time Warner for \$166 billion.

http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/business/aol_time_index.html

***PATH TO PEACE**

The first round of Israel-Syria peace talks ends in Shepherdstown, W.Va.

http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/middle_east/jan-june00/peace_01-10.html

***GAYS IN THE MILITARY**

FORUM: What should the U.S. military policy be for gays in the military?

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 and in the body of the message type "unsub newshour-pl" (without quotes).

, Copyright 2000 MacNeil/Lehrer Productions

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JAN-2000 17:52:00.00

SUBJECT: Presidential Candidates Embrace Gay Issues, and Enjoy Donations

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

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

TEXT:
THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
January 10, 2000

Presidential Candidates Embrace Gay Issues, and Enjoy Donations
By GREG HITT

WASHINGTON -- The politics of gay America have moved from the closet to the front room of the 2000 presidential campaign.

The shift has been most evident in the recent competition between Democratic candidates Al Gore and Bill Bradley for the votes and campaign checks of their party's sizable homosexual constituency. Both men have pledged to allow gays to serve openly in the U.S. military, and Mr. Gore last week went so far as to declare agreement with that stance a litmus test for appointment to the Pentagon's Joint Chiefs of Staff.

By retracting that assertion two days later under criticism from military officials and Republicans, Mr. Gore showed that embracing gay causes too avidly remains potentially treacherous. Yet leading Republican candidates themselves are nodding to changing public attitudes by striking tones of rising tolerance.

Four years after then-GOP front-runner Bob Dole returned a check from a gay Republican group for fear of conservative backlash, candidate John McCain has accepted such donations and met with the Log Cabin Republicans group. Texas Gov. George W. Bush says he wouldn't hold such a meeting for fear of provoking a hubbub, but he joined Mr. McCain in endorsing the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy instituted by the Clinton administration for the purpose of curtailing inquiries into the sexual orientation of service members.

"I don't ask," Mr. Bush said in a debate last week, when asked if he would appoint gays to his administration. "Somebody's sexual orientation is their personal business, as far as I'm concerned."

"Among Republicans, there's something like a 'live-and-let-live attitude'

evolving," says Rich Tafel, executive director of the Log Cabin Republicans.

Sunday, the Reform Party's brightest star struck the same note. "It's my country, it's their country, it's all of our country," Gov. Jesse Ventura of Minnesota told the CBS program "Face the Nation," offering a vigorous defense of allowing gays to serve openly in the military.

New attitudes in both parties track the changes in American society during the past generation. During the 1980s and 1990s, increasing numbers of gays and lesbians began declaring their sexual orientation openly; popular culture punctuated the trend a couple of years ago when the lead character on a highly-rated TV sitcom declared herself a lesbian.

The trend heightened awareness among heterosexuals of their gay family members, friends and co-workers -- and helped make attitudes toward gays more a matter of tolerance than moral judgment. A Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll last summer found 75% of Americans favoring legislation increasing penalties for hate crimes based on a person's sexual orientation among other factors. An earlier survey found 72% backing Mr. Clinton's efforts to prohibit discrimination against homosexuals working in federal agencies.

"Mainstream America has become more supportive and understanding," says Jeff Soref, an investor and gay activist in New York. "That's a radical change from '92 and '93."

"The world has changed so much," says Andrew Tobias, an openly-gay writer and investor who also is treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. He praises Mr. Clinton for advancing the process by courting the gay constituency in his 1992 campaign, noting "People started talking about it publicly in a way that wasn't terribly embarrassing. Each year it gets talked about more, and in a more relaxed way."

It has yielded a payoff for Democrats. Though difficult to track, gay political contributions have become an important source of financing for the Democratic Party. In one three-week window in October, about \$2.5 million was raised at events targeting gay donors. Much of the money is headed to Democratic-friendly causes, including about \$850,000 for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. First lady Hillary Clinton, who is making a run for the Senate, took in \$125,000 at a December event organized by Mr. Soref, and the Democratic National Committee reaped more than \$800,000 at a luncheon aimed at gay donors that was headlined by the president.

"It's a way of letting the good guys know that, now that they have given us a place at the table, we want to pay our fair share," Mr. Tobias says. "We're good teammates."

Rep. Barney Frank, an openly gay Massachusetts Democrat, says the gay community's rising clout stems less from campaign donations than from the power of its votes. In the last two elections, gays and lesbians have gone

to the polls in numbers comparable to Hispanics, according to Voter News Service exit polls. In 1996, gays comprised about 5% of the total electorate.

The gay and lesbian constituency could be especially significant in this year's presidential primary in California. That March 7 contest could prove critical to the insurgent Democratic campaign of Mr. Bradley, who has jockeyed for advantage with Mr. Gore by calling for the 1964 Civil Rights Act to be reopened to cover gays. Gay turnout for the primary is expected to be unusually heavy because of a ballot initiative asking voters whether marriage should be limited to unions between a man and a woman.

Still, the fact that no major White House contender -- including Democrats Gore and Bradley -- has embraced the cause of same-sex marriages underscores the limits of the gay community's influence, as did Mr. Gore's shift on a litmus test for military appointments.

"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," Mr. Gore said at an Iowa news conference.

On NBC's "Meet the Press" Sunday, former Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman John Vessey said, "If presidents ... insist that the leadership of the military give them the advice that the presidents want to hear, rather than the best military advice these people can provide ... they'll have a difficult time finding people."

Social conservatives in the GOP continue to rally their troops by opposing the gay-rights agenda. Former ambassador Alan Keyes, a long-shot GOP presidential candidate, challenged Mr. McCain on the subject directly last week in South Carolina, where the Arizona senator will need votes from conservatives and veterans in the Feb. 19 primary to sustain his bid.

But gay Republicans point to the tone of the top-tier GOP candidates as evidence that the political tide is flowing in their direction. Mr. Tafel is even confident that Mr. Bush will eventually shift gears and meet with his group. "The world has changed," he says.

CHART:

Recent surveys of American adults suggest rising tolerance for gays and lesbians:

Do you favor passing legislation against hate crimes that would increase the punishment for a crime committed against a person because of the victim's race, religion, ethnic background or sexual orientation?

Yes 75%

No 21%

Which of the following changes that have taken place in society over the past 15 to 20 years bothers you the most?

Lack of respect for authority and elders 29%

The number of unwed teenage mothers 15%

Content of today's TV/music programming 13%

The tolerance of gay lifestyles 7%

And 1996 exit polls signaled the size and presidential preferences of the gay constituency within the overall electorate:

Gays 5%

Hispanics 5%

Jews 3%

Gay Voter Preferences (96):

Bill Clinton 66%

Bob Dole 23%

Others 11%

Sources: The Wall Street Journal/NBC News Poll, Voter News Service

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 10:47:33.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.11.00.2

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. DAYTON DAILY NEWS Letter thanks paper for editorializing against state DOMA
2. TOLEDO BLADE Letter says dump military's antigay policy
3. ERIE MORNING NEWS Columnist's take on Rucker's comments, including his own encounter with a "queer" on NY subway
4. FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM Letter applauds Vermont's ruling
5. ASHEVILLE NC CITIZEN-TIMES Gays find peace in Metropolitan Community Church

Daily News, January 11, 2000

45 S. Ludlow Street, Dayton, OH, 45402

(Fax 937-225-7302) (E-MAIL: edletter@Coxohio.com)

(<http://www.activedayton.com/ddn/>)

Letter: DDN took the right stand on Marriage Act

I want to commend and thank the Dayton Daily News editorial board for the insightful Jan. 3 editorial ("Marriage bill is misguided, redundant") in opposition to the alleged "Defense of Marriage Act" that will be introduced in the Ohio House and Senate by Jim Jordan and Jay Hottinger, respectively.

I was moved and impressed with the board's insight and willingness to take the stand that is morally just.

I also know the Daily News is the first publication in Ohio to take such

a stand, and that does not go unnoticed.

-- Eric Resnick, Canton

(Note: Resnick was an openly gay candidate for Congress in 1996.)

Toledo Blade, January 6, 2000

541 Superior St., Toledo, OH, 43660

(Fax 419-245-6191) (E-MAIL: letters@theblade.com)

Letter: Military should drop its anti-gay policy

I read the Readers' Forum letter, "Failure of 'don't ask, don't tell' no

surprise," and I agree that the policy has been a failure, but for a different reason. Since the military began, there have been times when minorities were not allowed to serve their country (including women and African-Americans).

I was not surprised to read the gentleman's comments, but it is a shame.

The fact remains that all Americans have certain constitutional rights, and

by not allowing gay men and women to serve their country is a tragedy. There are thousands of homosexuals in the military who have performed their duties, received medals of honor, and have risen through the ranks while hiding who they truly are.

The letter writer stated, ". . . the fact that homosexuality by its very nature is totally disruptive in the close confines of any military unit . . ." What does he mean by that? Just because someone is gay or lesbian doesn't mean that he or she cannot function in a close military unit. The gay soldier is not going to have a sudden urge to kiss his colleagues. Actually, it is the opposite. People like the Forum writer cannot function in a military unit with someone who is gay due to his own prejudices.

Often people who are ignorant in their understanding of gay people, and do not feel completely comfortable with their own sexuality, therefore, they feel threatened by someone who is gay.

Beware of people who make flippant statements without any proof. It is a shame that having entered a new millennium, we as a society cannot accept and respect each other.

Drop the entire anti-gay policy in the military. Many more important issues face this country.

-- CRAIG SMITH

Erie Morning News, January 10, 2000
205 W. 12th Street, Erie, PA, 16534
(Fax 814-870-1808) (E-MAIL: Letters@timesnews.com)
Aboard the Number 7 train, only one is off his Rocker

This summer I revisited New York City for the baseball pennant races. I hadn't been to New York since that eye-opening summer I spent there when I was in my 20s and I knew it all.

That summer, whenever the Mets were at home I'd take the Number 7 train to Shea Stadium. So I gave the train an especially close look when I boarded the Number 7 again for the first time in years.

I took a seat next to some kid with purple hair, some queer with AIDS and some 20-year-old mom with four kids.

"It's d'j? vu all over again," I thought to myself. "The same kinds of people as before. Riding through Beirut must look like this."

Then I noticed that one sort of rider from the old days was nowhere to be seen on the Number 7 any more: No dude who just got out of jail for the fourth time.

Dudes like that, they used to be all over the subways like mold on bad cheese. Now crime was way, way down. New York streets still weren't as safe as they ought to be but, hey, the city was making some real headway against

crime, just like the rest of the country.

The kid with the purple hair was an online trader of some sort. He talked on a cellphone while working a laptop computer. He used terms the chairman of the Federal Reserve never heard of. He was banking bigger sums than my mortgage.

The 20-year-old mom with four kids was a sad story. Youthful desires, promiscuity, bad judgment, bad luck. The troubles that combination can lead to. ...

She was a Hooters waitress until she got pregnant. Her boyfriend promised he'd always take care of her. She always believed him until the day he walked out for good.

Her former boyfriend, the jerk, was a professional ballplayer. He never sees the children he fathered and doesn't pay his child support.

I sat down next to the queer with AIDS. The train was crowded and I said I was sorry for squeezing in. The queer was cool about it. Nobody appreciates common courtesy like thick-skinned New Yorkers, maybe because they get so little of it from each other.

Naturally, I didn't call my seatmate a queer. I haven't called anybody that since I was 10 years old and my mom washed my mouth with soap. My seatmate surprised me by referring to himself as a queer. Maybe that was his own way of being a sardonic New Yorker. Or maybe it was his small gesture of defiance toward a world that had called him names for a long time.

The Number 7 rolled toward Shea. People got on, people got off. The variety of foreigners was astounding -- Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything. Except they weren't foreigners. They were immigrants and refugees on their way to becoming Americans.

I guess that still happens in stages. You could walk through whole cars on the Number 7 and not hear anybody speaking English. The older folks, I mean. Their kids chattered away in English about everything. I sensed that made their folks a little uncomfortable as well as proud. Some of the kids told me their parents are very Old Country, so it isn't easy for them to ask their sons and daughters for help understanding the newspaper, TV and radio, not to mention all the forms their employers and the government make them fill out.

So there we were, all of us aboard the train together.

One white, healthy, privileged young man in back started being mouthy and obnoxious. Other riders asked him to tone it down but he wouldn't. He was practically heckling the rest of the train, almost as if he was trying to pick a fight.

The Transit Authority police wanted to expel the guy. Some wanted to inform his employer so he'd lose his job. A few were ready to heave him onto

the tracks while the train was still moving.

Some riders quietly but firmly prevented that-some kid with purple hair,
some unwed mother, some queer with AIDS and some foreigner. They formed a little protective circle around the guy. "Hands off," they told the rest of us. "We don't give people the third-rail treatment around here. Not for holding an opinion."

(About this column: Gary Wesman's Good Morning is a parody of recent comments made to Sports Illustrated by Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker. For the record, Rocker was ordered Thursday by Major League Baseball to undergo psychological testing because of the interview, in which he delivered a tirade against gays, minorities and others.)

Star-Telegram, January 10, 2000

P. O. Box 1870, Fort Worth, TX, 76101

(Fax 817-390-7789) (E-MAIL: letters@star-telegram.com)

(<http://www.startext.net/>)

Letter: Here's to Vermont court

Congratulations to the Vermont Supreme Court! The ruling that gay and lesbian couples must have the same rights and privileges as married heterosexuals was a huge step forward for the equality of all people.

By standing up against institutionalized bigotry and discrimination, the

court has sent a clear message that the principles upon which this country was founded -- life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness -- are not dead.

I encourage Texans to join with the people of Vermont in upholding justice and equality.

Thank you, justices of Vermont's Supreme Court! You are a beacon of light in a world frequently dimmed by ignorance, intolerance and bigotry.
-- Jim Elder III, Fort Worth

Asheville Citizen-Times, January 8, 2000

Box 2090, Asheville, NC, 28801

(Fax 704-251-0585) (E-MAIL: editor@citizen-times.com)

Gay Christians find peace in Metropolitan Community Church

By DALE NEAL

ASHEVILLE, N.C. -- They come from all kinds of Christian backgrounds, evangelical to Pentecostal to liturgical.

Many of them struggled with the doctrines of the churches of their childhood, but they couldn't walk away from their faith.

"It was the hardest journey of my life," admitted Sandi Rice, a Buncombe native and Southern Baptist who found a home in the Metropolitan Community Church of Asheville. "This church meets my spiritual needs. This is a very Christ-centered fellowship where I can be fully and totally myself."

In other Christian denominations that follow a literal interpretation of the Bible, their homosexuality is considered sinful. But on Sunday

evenings,

Rich and others come together to worship as a community that celebrates gays,

lesbians and others who've often felt shunned by other churches.

Same-sex couples sit together, sharing hymnals and prayers for each other

and those absent, who may be suffering from AIDS.

While many churches bill themselves as "welcoming" congregations for gays, the Metropolitan Community Church caters mainly to the gay, lesbian and

bisexual community. Founded in 1968 in Los Angeles by a defrocked Pentecostal

minister, the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches has grown into a denomination of some 300 churches in 17 countries with an estimated membership of 32,000.

Brent Pack, a native of Mars Hill, helped start the local church in Asheville in 1992. Now, Pack currently serves as worship director for the 30-member church, selecting hymns and liturgy each Sunday, and leading the weekly communion.

Coming out about his sexuality as a teen, Pack remained in the Southern Baptist church of his childhood. But he later moved into the Metropolitan Community Church. "Here I can be Christian and gay. They're not mutually exclusive."

After Pack's announcements and the community prayers led by Rice, the Rev. Carlene Wood stands before the congregation. She preaches a sermon on John the Baptist -- emphasizing the need for repentance.

Wood grew up Baptist in California. Moving to Asheville 13 years ago, Wood soon found herself divorced, and slowly realized her sexuality as a lesbian. She also began attending various churches, exploring her spirituality.

But it was the Metropolitan church that quickened her spirit. "I felt at

home the first time I walked in. I really wanted to be accepted at first, then I wanted to be affirmed for who I am. Now I want to be celebrated."

The Metropolitan Community Church is theologically conservative in its doctrine, following the Nicene and Apostles' creeds, proclaiming the Bible as

divinely inspired, and the justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. The church recognizes two sacraments in baptism and holy communion.

What the Metropolitan Church does not preach is homosexuality as any kind

of sin or sickness, running counter to a literal interpretation of scripture.

Wood calls these "the texts of terror," six verses in the Bible that have been used over the centuries to condemn homosexual acts.

Leviticus 18:22 reads, "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a

female, it is an abomination." In the New Testament, Paul also deplores homosexual behavior in Romans 1:24-27.

Wood believes those scriptures have been taken out of context and grossly

exaggerated. The prohibitions in Leviticus may have referred to homosexual rape, while the New Testament verses may be talking about temple prostitution

practiced by some religious cults in Paul's day.

The Rev. Ralph Sexton, senior pastor of Trinity Baptist Church, holds to a literal interpretation of those verses and the orthodox Christian view that homosexuality is a sin. "That's obviously based on the scriptures. The Bible is quite explicit that this particular sin is considered by the Lord God an abomination. Of course, God doesn't have big or little sins, and God doesn't hate the sinner. Scripture tells me I'm a sinner, that all of us are sinners. That's a common ground that we share."

Wood holds to the Baptist doctrine of the Priesthood of the Believer, allowing each person to read and interpret scriptures. "I may not agree with your interpretation, but we can disagree as brothers and sisters in Christ," said Wood.

While battling society's stereotypes of lesbians, Wood also endures suspicions in the gay community. "I've come out of the Christian closet," said Wood. "Being a gay Christian helps me to offer Christ to a group of people who have flat-out been denied access. They've been told that 'God abhors you, that God would rather you be dead than queer.'"

"It's incredibly important to help people reconcile their faith and their sexuality, but my relationship with God is more significant than who I sleep with. I don't have gay values. I have Christian values."

While mindful of the issues facing the gay community, Wood and her church also seek to reach out to others facing exclusion from mainstream society, including the poor and minorities.

"Sunday morning remains the most segregated time in our society both racially and economically, and that's just pitiful."

Helping Christians from a variety of backgrounds feel comfortable, the Metropolitan church blends worship styles from traditional hymns and high liturgy.

Communion is served each Sunday either by intinction, where the wafer is dipped in the goblet, then placed on the communicant's tongue, or by drinking or dipping the wafer in the common cup. Each communicant is prayed over by Wood or another communion server. In a service, the congregation will hear more about the Gospel than about being gay.

"This is church," said the Rev. Dorri Sherrill, a Baptist visitor to the service. "You can see and feel the love they have for each other."

Only a few months ago, Wood lay close to death in an Asheville hospital, suffering from pancreatitis.

In her three months of recovery, Wood was visited by many of her church, and pastors from other denominations, whose prayers she is grateful for. "We are a part of the Body of Christ, whether the Church Universal wants

to accept that or not."

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 13:28:07.00

SUBJECT: Gays may hold key to California for Gore, Bradley

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

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

TEXT:
San Diego Union-Tribune
January 11, 2000
<http://www.uniontrib.com>

ANALYSIS

Gays may hold key to state for Gore, Bradley
Timing of primary emphasizes 'don't ask, don't tell'

By Stephen Green
COPLEY NEWS SERVICE
WASHINGTON - The military's "don't-ask, don't-tell" policy on homosexuality erupted as a political issue in New Hampshire and Iowa, but the positioning of the Democratic presidential candidates appears geared more toward California's primary.

With Proposition 22 to ban homosexual marriages on the state's ballot, gay and lesbian voters are expected to turn out in record numbers March 7.

Both Vice President Al Gore and former New Jersey Sen. Bill Bradley "realize the gay and lesbian vote will be extremely important in California," said David Mixner, a California gay activist and former adviser to President Clinton. "It's a major reason you're seeing this issue emerge."

Both candidates repeatedly underscore support for gays to serve openly in the military, which accepts homosexuals only if they don't proclaim their gender preference.

California public opinion expert Mark DiCamillo suggested that Proposition 22, as a "highly charged" ballot measure, will energize voters on both sides, with a majority of Democrats opposed and a majority of Republicans in support.

But, he said, Californians in general are "ahead of the curve" because they are more tolerant than other Americans. Thus, both Gore and Bradley also probably have helped themselves with California voters other than

homosexuals, DiCamillo said.

As vice president, Gore cultivated gay Democrats.

During the campaign, however, Bradley has spent considerable time with gay and lesbian activists in California as well as calling for gays to serve openly in the military.

Not to be outdone, Gore last week went a step further, responding "yes" to a question about whether he would apply a "litmus test" on gays serving openly when evaluating an appointee to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

After a barrage of criticism from Republicans that he would politicize the chiefs, Gore clarified his position. He explained he would not require military leaders to agree with him about gays but would require them to carry out his policies.

Rep. Jerrold Nadler, D-N.Y., a Bradley supporter, said Gore had "retreated, changing his position to match Sen. Bradley's."

But "there's no flip-flop," countered Gore campaign adviser Bob Shrum. "What he (Gore) said both times is that he would insist that people appointed to the joint chiefs support his policy as president."

The GOP candidates have opposed allowing gays to serve openly, but gay activists say it is significant that the GOP front-runners, Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Arizona Sen. John McCain, have carefully avoided a hard line.

While criticizing Gore, both have expressed support for "don't ask, don't tell," meaning they have not taken up the refrain of some conservatives, including GOP presidential candidates Alan Keyes and Gary Bauer, that gays shouldn't be allowed to serve at all.

The two other GOP candidates, Steve Forbes and Sen. Orrin Hatch of Utah, didn't express opposition to the current policy but said they oppose gays serving openly.

Rich Tafel, executive director of the Log Cabin Republicans, a gay GOP organization, said he interprets McCain's position as allowing a alteration of "don't ask, don't tell."

"If we're going to change it, I don't think we talk about that in a political campaign," McCain said Sunday on CBS's "Face the Nation." "We talk about it after we become president and say, 'I'll have a review of the policy.' "

Rep. Barney Frank of Massachusetts, an openly gay Democratic House member, said the positions of the Democratic presidential hopefuls and of the two major GOP candidates, suggest society has become more tolerant.

"It may have been that allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the military 40 years ago would have been disruptive, but society is evolving," 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: Fenceberry@aol.com (Fenceberry@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 11:15:29.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.11.00.3

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. BOSTON GLOBE At stake in the battle over gays in the military
2. SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE Op-ed by Mark Leno: What Are You Hiding, Sen. Knight?
3. SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE At Long Last, They Are Family; State permits adoptions by unmarried couples
4. THE RECORD (NJ) Two snotty little letters
5. LAS VEGAS SUN Letter: Same-sex marriages aren't a matter for government

BOSTON GLOBE, January 11, 2000

Box 2378, Boston, MA, 02107

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

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

At stake in the battle over gays in the military

By James Carroll

Gays in the military: Of all the issues raised in the recent round of presidential debates, nothing threw sparks like this one.

First Bill Bradley and Al Gore categorically affirmed their intention to

open the ranks of the services to homosexuals, with Gore's further assertion

that he would appoint only military chiefs who agree with the policy. He later backed down from that, saying he would not require of the brass an a priori litmus test.

Then the Republicans, in rare unison, gleefully denounced the idea, amazed that once again the Democrats had handed them this spiked club of an issue. Voters could be forgiven a feeling of deja vu.

The early liberal hope that the presidency of William Clinton might initiate an era of humane social change was dashed when he first stated his intention to eliminate antigay discrimination in the armed services and then

backed down from it. As president, Clinton never assumed the authority proper

to the commander in chief, a failure that undercut him in his most important

task - nuclear arms reduction. That failure began here.

It was one thing when a junior sailor publicly declined to salute Clinton

as he boarded a ship, but the same insult was played out at the other end of

the chain of command when the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin

Powell, publicly declined to implement the president's order to fully integrate gays into the military.

The corollary of the so-called compromise of "Don't ask, don't tell" was the brass saying to the president of the United States, "Don't tell us, we'll tell you." Perhaps ashamed of his own youthful war resistance and apparently intimidated by the warrior caste's machismo mumbo-jumbo, Clinton bowed. A river separates the Pentagon from the White House. From then on Clinton's blood was in the water.

Conservative critics faulted Clinton for advancing the antifamily agenda of a gay "interest group," while his liberal critics faulted him for bringing up gay rights when so many other more "important issues" were on the agenda, like health care reform. I believed at the time, and believe still, that Clinton's profound commitment to civil rights gave him no choice but to redress the injustice represented by America's institutionalized discrimination against men and women because of sexual preference.

Clinton's initial instinct that there was no more important issue than this one of basic justice was exactly right. What was wrong was his inability to stand up to Powell.

How ironic, therefore, that last week Gore found it necessary to back off from the powerful assertion he had made on the issue of gays in the military, while at the same time he felt obliged to offer incense at the altar of Colin Powell because an aide had dared refer to the general's usefulness as a fig leaf covering the GOP's racial politics.

Gore had said he would do for gays in the military what Harry Truman had done for blacks. Can anyone imagine Harry Truman, confronted with a demurring Colin Powell, as Clinton was, or a whining Powell, as Gore was, deferring to the self-iconic general?

Gore is, of course, right to invoke the Truman analogy, and here is hoping he more fully recalls what the man who fired Douglas MacArthur was capable of. ("With deep regret," Truman's statement began, "I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support ...")

Justice for Americans who happen to be gay is not the only thing at stake here. Equally important is whether or not "wholehearted support" of national values can be expected of the American armed forces. The same slogans now used against gays - "the primacy of mission," "unit cohesion," "commander's discretion," "the morale of a fighting force," "combat camaraderie" - were used in the late '40s against blacks and in the '80s against women.

Today's soldiers and sailors reluctant to serve shoulder to shoulder with homosexuals are the progeny of racist and sexist soldiers and sailors who

were told to get over it or get out.

Racist and misogynist traditions of the military were officially disavowed, despite the "morale" problems, not only because the civil rights of blacks and women were at stake but because in a democracy a military culture that fails to evolve in synchrony with the civilian culture inevitably becomes a threat to that democracy.

The American principle of "civilian control" is about more than who is ultimately in charge of the guardians of the nation. It is also about whether the attitudes of those guardians are firmly rooted in the civil culture of the nation. Nothing would be more dangerous than the separate evolution of a martial elite that regarded itself as morally superior to the "decadent" civilian population it was supposed to protect - whether that decadence were defined by interracial marriage, careerist females, or the openly gay.

America's nobility lies in its having found ways to expand the dream of equality in every generation. The nobility of this nation's fighting force, likewise, lies in its having found ways to defend that dream of equality for all - not by seeking to be exempt from it, but by embodying it.

The argument over gays in the military, therefore, is over nothing less than whether this country will continue to be worthy of the name America.

James Carroll's column appears regularly in the Globe.

SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, January 11, 2000
901 Mission St., San Francisco, CA, 94103
(Fax 415-896-1107) (E-MAIL: chronletters@sfgate.com)
(<http://www.sfgate.com>)

What Are You Hiding, Sen. Knight?
Mark Leno

As a fellow elected official, as a gay man and as one of the founders of the statewide No On Knight Campaign, I invited you, Sen. Knight, to debate your initiative four months ago. The March 7 election is now just two months away and you have yet to accept the invitation.

Given that you attempted three times to pass this measure through the Statehouse and that you gathered the necessary signatures to place Proposition 22, "The Limit on Marriage" initiative, on the ballot, I would think you would be eager to explain your position to the voters of this state.

When I came out to my family 30 years ago, my father reacted not unlike you have reacted to your son, David's, homosexuality -- fearfully. My father had no context with which to deal with me as a gay man, and we became estranged. My family, which had always been loving, supportive and communicative, suddenly became splintered.

Over the years, my father and other family members overcame their fears.

For more than two decades, my entire extended family, without exception, has honored and supported me. My parents travel often to San Francisco to share the joys and sorrows, celebrations and transitions of my life. When my life partner, Douglas Jackson, was alive, they were the first to rejoice in the beauty and strength of our union, and they are the first to defend any encroachment by policymakers on my rights.

It is my sincere belief that if you were able to reconcile your relationship with your son, David, you would no longer support this ballot initiative. I say this because you could then attempt to understand and embrace his life and more clearly see the real pain and denigration that is inherent in this measure. You would recognize the unnecessary hardship it may cause to someone you love. You would come to know that the fear and distrust that is behind Prop. 22 is the same that has divided your family in recent years.

I make these statements not cavalierly, but from personal experience. Public policy that divides our families will also divide our society. As David Knight stated in his October 14 op-ed piece, "We as a society are growing and allowing more people the opportunity to share in the ultimate dream of happiness. We are expressing our own family values based on the same basic principles that he (you, Sen. Knight) so fervently protects."

You have consistently claimed that your initiative is not mean-spirited and merely defends and protects marriage. You have stated that Prop. 22 does not discriminate against same-sex couples and is not anti-gay. If that is your intent, why did you recently vote against state laws that would establish a statewide registry for domestic partners, protect lesbian and gay students from harassment at school and prohibit discrimination against lesbian and gay Californians in housing and employment? It doesn't add up.

I believe Prop. 22 to be unfair, divisive and intrusive. It is clearly an assault on the gay and lesbian community and the equal rights that we have gained in recent years. In states where similar laws have been enacted, they have been used as a legal tool to deny basic rights to lesbians, gay men and their families. Nondiscrimination policies that include domestic partners benefits, hospital visitation and inheritance rights along with custody and adoption rights have all been attacked as a result of such laws. Rather than shine a light on how we are different, we should create public policy that recognizes our similarities. Our common humanity is nowhere more evident than in our quest for the comfort and support of our partners, friends and families. We all deserve the chance to live our lives and pursue our work without fear of attack, whether by bullet or ballot measure.

By opposing Prop. 22, Californians can clearly state that we won't allow our differences to be used as a weapon against us. Our aim is to pursue peace

and camaraderie and to build a safer environment in which all of our can families flourish. It is for these reasons that I restate my invitation for us to debate your ballot initiative. Time is short and the stakes are high.

Mark Leno is a San Francisco supervisor

SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, January 11, 2000

At Long Last, They Are Family

State permits adoptions by unmarried couples

Elaine Herscher, Chronicle Staff Writer

Just a few months ago, Jennifer Bader and her partner, Valerie Breedlove,

were told by the state of California that they could not possibly be legal parents together.

But thanks to a recent change in state policy, the Madera women have become the first of what are likely to be hundreds of rural gay and lesbian couples to be recognized as equal parents.

The state Department of Social Services decreed in November that social workers could stop automatically rejecting unmarried couples as adoptive parents. That policy, ordered 12 years ago by former Gov. George Deukemejian and continued under former Gov. Pete Wilson, worked largely against lesbian and gay couples.

Despite the policy, so-called second-parent adoptions became common in the Bay Area, where judges tended to interpret state law liberally. But not so in California's heartland.

Bader is the birth mother of Addason Bader, now 12. Last month, Breedlove became Addason's legal second mother. They were the first lesbian couple in Madera County to be granted equal parental rights.

The December 13 decision in Madera County Superior Court was the direct result of changes under Gov. Gray Davis' administration, said the couple's attorney, Kathleen Bakergumprecht Davies.

"It makes me feel like we're really a family," Bader said. "We can't get married. But we can be a family the same as anyone else."

Same-sex couples in California, as in every other state, are not allowed to marry. Second-parent adoptions are one of the few legal avenues available to such couples to ensure that a nonbiological parent and child are not separated.

Because of the change this year, lesbians and gay men outside urban centers are likely to apply for adoptions in greater numbers than ever before, advocates for gay parents say.

"Finally, California law treats lesbian and gay parents by the same standard as it treats heterosexual parents," said Kate Kendell, executive director of the National Center for Lesbian Rights, based in San Francisco.

"This is one of the single-most important determinations for the safety and security of lesbian and gay heads of households that's ever happened in the state of California, and it's been a long time in coming," Kendell said.

Bader became pregnant with Addason as the result of a previous relationship with a man. The father abandoned the boy and did not object

when

Bader and Breedlove moved to terminate his parental rights. The women have been raising Addason together for three years.

They petitioned for what is called a second-parent adoption, in which a birth parent agrees to share parental rights with a partner. Such arrangements are made routinely in Bay Area courts. But the Madera family's social worker initially turned down their petition, saying Bader could not legally retain her parental rights if Breedlove adopted Addason. Single people are allowed to adopt children in California.

She also was bound to turn them down based on the no-unmarried-couples policy.

Davies, the couple's attorney, was prepared to bring the matter to trial

when the state changed its policy and the family's social worker gladly revised her recommendation.

"If we had had to try the case, I don't know what the outcome would have been," Davies said.

Bader said the whole family is elated that the adoption went through, but said it should not have been so difficult.

"We pay the same taxes as everyone else. We get the same bills. We both work hard," she said. Bader is a hair stylist, her partner a Madera County sheriff's deputy.

"My partner puts her life on the line for this county every day," Bader said. "She should be treated as an equal citizen."

Since the late 1980s, judges in the Bay Area, Los Angeles and other urban centers have shared that view. If the social worker's report ended in the requisite rejection but was otherwise favorable, judges understood: The social worker was under state orders to give a final no. It was the rest of the report that counted.

But judges in the rest of California either have been unwilling to consider adoptions by gay and lesbian couples or reluctant to go against the state. Kendell said most lesbian couples in rural areas already raising children have not even petitioned the courts for fear of losing. The same holds for gay couples in which only one of the men is the natural or adoptive father.

Lawyers who handle these cases say that sometimes the state's ultimate stamp of disapproval scuttled adoptions that should have gone through.

Deborah Wald, an attorney in San Francisco, said the state's policy blocked a gay couple from adopting the baby of an out-of-state relative of one of the men, even though all parties wanted the men to have the child.

The adoption eventually came through, but the problems increased the couple's legal fees by \$5,000, and the birth mother had to take up residence in California in order to relinquish the baby. The Midwestern state

where she lived refused to approve an adoption officially rejected by the state of California, even though the rest of the report on the men was glowing.

Even for couples whose adoptions ultimately are approved in court, an official denial by the state can spoil the joy of being new parents.

"It tainted the experience," said Micah Altman, birth mother to Lucy Altman-Newell, who turns 5 today and lives with her two moms in Benicia. Altman's partner, Pat Newell, became Lucy's legal mother more than three years ago.

"You could say, 'Big deal, you were going through these motions, filling some protocol to get where you want to go.' But it isn't just that. It was like so many subtle -- or not so subtle -- experiences of discrimination against minorities," Altman said. "When you are confronted with it, it reminds you that you are a minority class that people hate."

It meant so much to Andrew Walmisley and his partner that the couple wept when their social worker told them she could say in print that they were the best parents for 6-month-old Mary Sophia.

Since birth, the baby has lived with the two men, who were chosen by the birth mother to adopt her.

"There's always this kind of specter out there. There's always the chance that it won't happen or this anxiety that it won't happen," said Walmisley, who is pastor of All Souls Episcopal Church in Berkeley. "And everybody's winking and saying it's a good thing you live in the Bay Area and not in Madera County or Lake County."

As happy as lawyers and their gay clients are over the new regulation, Wald said many of the state's social workers are figuratively popping champagne corks as well.

"It's a huge relief for me and all those who do second-parent adoptions," said Diane Deering-Paulsen, a child welfare worker with Alameda County Social Services. "We're the ones out there seeing these wonderful families, and to have to deny them at the end was something none of us wanted to do."

"For those of us in the field," she said, "it's something we've wanted and hoped for a long time."

THE RECORD, January 11, 2000
150 River Street, Hackensack, NJ, 07602
(Fax 201-646-4135) (E-MAIL: LettersToTheEditor@bergen.com)
(<http://www.bergen.com/>)
Letter: On messages behind signs

Regarding "A sign of support" (Editorial, Jan. 4):

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

-- Barry Scharch, Bogota

Regarding "A sign of support" (Editorial, Jan. 4):

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

heard of AIDS?

-- Joseph Bonazzo, Westwood

LAS VEGAS SUN, January 11, 2000

Box 4275, Las Vegas, NV, 89107

(Fax 702-383-7264) (E-MAIL: letters@lasvegassun.com)

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

Letter: Same-sex marriages aren't a matter for government

Richard Ziser's drive for an initiative to constitutionally ban gay marriages in Nevada tags him as a narrow-minded, prejudiced homophobic. Is he

totally unaware that discrimination is illegal in this state, and the country

for that matter? Historically, isn't this the acceptance that interracial marriages first received? And still there are people who struggle with acceptance of the reality of it, but it is real and will continue to exist. Gay marriages, like interracial marriages, are a matter of personal choice. Apparently Ziser doesn't believe in personal freedoms. I wonder how he would

react if someone were attempting to deny him a personal choice that he felt was right for him. It is not up to the government to tell us who we must marry any more than it is the government's responsibility to tell us who we cannot marry.

If this initiative actually makes it as far as to get on the ballot, I hope the voters of Nevada are intelligent enough to soundly reject it. If not, we may as well go backward another 100 years and deny rights to women, reinstate slavery and persecute people for their religious beliefs. After which, of course, I will move to a state where intelligence prevails.

Mr. Ziser, welcome to the 21st century, where bias and bigotry will not be tolerated. You are entitled to your beliefs. Just keep them to yourself, don't try to impose them on the thinking public.

-- JIMMY G. MCFADDEN

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 20:35:59.00

SUBJECT: Articles 1.11.00.4

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

1. ABC-TV Transcript of "This Week" with Col. Grethe Cammermeyer (and a couple of confused homophobes)
2. THE SARATOGIAN Police officer suspended for harassing another officer by falsely saying he's gay
3. DALLAS MORNING NEWS Routine article about same-sex marriage, plus a blatantly homophobic advertisement inserted in a box in the middle of the article
4. NEWSDAY Liz Smith: Charlie Hunnam, the young star of England's "Queer As Folk" TV series, is a hot contender for the role of Anakin Skywalker in "Episode II" of "Star Wars"
5. IOWA STATE DAILY Column: Re-Hashing Gay Bashing; As a heterosexual soldier (Winchell) falls victim to hate, 'Don't ask, don't tell' comes under fire.

ABC, January 9, 2000

<http://www.abc.com>

This Week: Gays in the Military?

COKIE ROBERTS: The issue of gays in the military was back on the front burner this week. Bill Clinton ran into tough political problems with the issue, and now his vice president has as well. And at the end of the week, Al Gore was trying to do damage control.

(VO): It started Wednesday night in the debate in New Hampshire after both Democratic candidates said they supported gays serving openly in the military.

PETER JENNINGS (From tape): If you become president, will you nominate members of the joint chiefs who only support your gay policy? In other words, would it be a litmus test?

VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE (From tape): 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.

COKIE ROBERTS (VO): The next night, the Republicans were quick to disagree with most of them supporting the current policy which allows gays and lesbians in the armed forces as long as they don't reveal their sexual orientation.

GOV. GEORGE W. BUSH (From tape): Yeah, I'm a "don't ask, don't tell" man.

COKIE ROBERTS (VO): By Friday, Gore was backtracking on his earlier statement.

VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE: 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.

COKIE ROBERTS: Joining us from Portland is retired Gen. Tony McPeak, former chief of staff of the Air Force and an outspoken opponent of attempts to liberalize the current "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Thanks for being with us, General McPeak.

GENERAL TONY MCPEAK, RETIRED, US AIR FORCE CHIEF OF STAFF: Good morning, Cokie.

COKIE ROBERTS: And from Seattle, retired Col. Margarethe Cammermeyer who, in the days before that policy was discharged from the Army National Guard for admitting to investigators that she was a lesbian. She later won re-instatement in federal court.

Nice to have you with us, Col. Cammermeyer.

COL. MARGARETHE CAMMERMEYER: Nice to see you again.

COKIE ROBERTS: And also with us for the questioning is George Will. Sam, you wanted to start here.

SAM DONALDSON: Well, yeah, I think there are two questions here. Let's

take the first one first and that is, Gen. McPeak, why do you oppose allowing gays and lesbians to be open about their sexual preference and still be members of the military services?

GEN. TONY MCPEAK: Well, Sam, I distrust simple answers to complicated question like that, but if I had to sum it up in one line it would be my concern about the military efficiency of our front line combat units. That's

my concern today and it was the concern of all the chiefs in '93 when Clinton brought this issue up the first time.

SAM DONALDSON: Well, General, what is it about being gay and lesbian that wouldn't allow you to be efficient in the front lines?

GEN. TONY MCPEAK: Well, being gay and lesbian is not the issue. It's open homosexuality in the ranks. We have homosexual in the armed forces, have going back to the Revolutionary War. They've served honorably and well.

The issue is not can homosexuals serve. They can and do. The issue is, in our front lines, hard combat units, the tooth part of the military ? you saw

the film Saving Private Ryan. The guy at the ? the Rangers that have to go up that cliff. Would their military efficiency be improved if we allowed declared open homosexuality in those units? The chiefs were concerned that it would not. That it would seriously degrade their readiness and that's why

we insisted that "don't tell" be part of the compromise.

SAM DONALDSON: Col. Cammermeyer, if you had to go up that cliff, could you do it?

COL. MARGARETHE CAMMERMEYER: I don't ? yeah ? I don't know how my sexual

orientation is going to make me more efficient climbing the cliff or being in a foxhole. I think that the notion that your sexual orientation has anything to do with either military readiness or your ability to do your job is ? is rather ludicrous. I still have a hard time ? you know, this is eight years ago that we had this discussion before I don?t quite understand the rationale because how is it that my sexual orientation has anything to do with anyone else?

COKIE ROBERTS: George:

GEORGE WILL, ABCNEWS: General, let me read the relevant portion of the law that Sam was already talking about. It says ?the presence in the armed forces of persons who demonstrate a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts would create an unacceptable risk to the high standards, morale, good order and discipline,? etc. Are we not talking there about acts itself, and therefore the ?don?t ask, don?t tell? is perfectly satisfactory?

GEN. TONY MCPEAK: Well, I regard it as perfectly satisfactory. But you have to remember that we insisted, and the Congress put this in the law that ? that declaring homosexuality ? in other words, openly parading it in the units ? was a kind of act and a dismissable offense. In fact, that?s what?s happened. The rate of discharge for homosexuality has gone up since ?don?t ask, don?t tell? came in because the law is working. People who declare their homosexuality and try to be open about it have to leave. That?s what the law says and it?s working as intended.

GEORGE WILL: But General, ?don?t ask, don?t tell? was itself a compromise, a move to the left, if you will, from the prior policy. Why is it that no one really seems to be pushing to go back to the policy prior to ?don?t ask, don?t tell??

GEN. TONY MCPEAK: Well, I think the chiefs were quite content not to ask the question. It is true that people of ? as Col. Cammermeyer has asserted, people of homosexual orientation is not the problem as long as they're circumspect about it. We know how to deal with this. I mean, we have a certain amount of sophistication, even us hard-line military guys. So it?s the openness of it, it?s appearing on the Phil Donahue show or Oprah Winfrey show, carrying a sandwich board around. That?s what?s divisive inside a unit where you have to have cohesion. And let me make a point here. It?s not so bad in the motor pool. It?s a non-issue in the commissary. In the Nurse Corp of the Washington State National Guard, whether they have unit cohesion ? probably a good idea if they did have. But if they don?t it?s not ? doesn?t have mortal consequences to the republic. It?s in the fighter squadrons, it?s in the nuclear submarines, it?s in the Rangers and the special forces...

GEORGE WILL: Colonel...

GEN. TONY MCPEAK: ...and the airborne. That's where we have to have unit cohesion.

COL. MARGARETHE CAMMERMEYER: Yeah. But that's not ? but that's not what this law is about. The law is about, you know, even they ? the words of ?coming out? ? you know, if I ask the general, you know, ?Did you have a nice time over the Christmas holidays?? And he said, ?Well, you know, I spent it with my wife and my grandchildren.? And he said, ?How? ? you know, he might say to me, you know, ?How ? how did you have ? did you enjoy your Christmas?? and I would have to be mute. I would have to say, ?Well, you know, I'm not allowed to talk about having a family.? And so you know, what they're confusing is ?acts? and words. It's not like people are going to be changing uniforms and going around with triangles on. This is ? this is really an absurd policy...

GEORGE WILL: Colonel...

COL. MARGARETHE CAMMERMEYER: ...that really affects women much more so than men. You know, if a ? if a woman rebuffs a man's advances, all of a sudden she's a lesbian and then becomes part of a witch hunt. And so this is really ? it makes no sense.

GEORGE WILL: Colonel...

COL. MARGARETHE CAMMERMEYER: What is it that you fear?

GEORGE WILL: Colonel, the supposed proof that ?don't ask, don't tell? is failing is that there have been, it is said, a large increase in the number of people discharged. Let me give you some numbers and ask you to comment on them. The number of people discharged for homosexual acts is actually down since 1994. Eighty percent of all discharges are for voluntary statements, most made early in first-term enlistments. And most result in honorable or non-classified, non-declared discharges. It looks to some people as though this is just an easy way of getting out of military.

COL. MARGARETHE CAMMERMEYER: And if you listen to what people are saying from the Department of Defense, in sort of defense of the policy and the increase in discharges, they're saying heterosexuals are using this policy as a way of getting out. When I joined the military in 1961, women couldn't have dependents and be in the military. And so part of the notion was, ?Well, gee, I'll go get of a free education and then just get pregnant and be discharged from the military.? I mean, it seems to me like the easiest way is to leave the laws as they exist elsewhere, get rid of this policy, and then have people judged on their ability to do their job rather than non ? in a red herrings, if you will.

SAM DONALDSON: Gen. McPeak, we're out of time, but one question to you on the litmus test issue. Al Gore has backed off on that now, but he has

said that he does want people that he nominates to agree with him on this policy which he wants changed. Is there anything wrong with that? Presidents have ? appoint people to the Supreme Court on the idea that they will agree with them, although they often run off and not.

GEN. TONY MCPEAK: Well, the president has the right to choose whoever he wants and I ? and by the way, senior officers will obey orders. But the Constitution gives the Congress the authority to regulate the armed forces and this is not just a policy, it's a law, passed by an overwhelming majority ? a veto-proof majority in both Houses. So I expect that ? that no president, Al Gore or any other candidate for president, will ask any senior officer if he agrees to violate the law.

COKIE ROBERTS: Thank you, Gen.McPeak. Thank you, Col. Cammermeyer.

The Saratogian, January 11, 2000
20 Lake Avenue, Saratoga Springs, NY, 12866
(Fax 518-587-7750) (E-MAIL: saranews@nycap.rr.com)
City police officer suspended; awaits hearing
By ROBIN AMBROSINO

SARATOGA SPRINGS ? A local policeman has been suspended without pay for 30 days pending the outcome of an internal hearing.

According to Police Chief Kenneth King, veteran police officer Lawrence Castell was served with five charges on Dec. 30 following a Dec. 16 incident with fellow officer Robert Dennis.

King couldn't specify what the charges are because of confidentiality reasons, and said a hearing date hasn't been set yet.

Castell, who's been on the force since 1976, had previously been named in a sexual harassment lawsuit along with several other members of the police department for falsely accusing Dennis of being homosexual. He was accused of blowing kisses to Dennis and saying to him, 'I saw you with your boyfriend last night at the mall.'

Dennis' lawyer, Richard DiMaggio, said Dennis dropped Castell from the lawsuit he filed in 1998 since the alleged incidents took place in 1995. That lawsuit is still in progress, with King, Assistant Chief James Cornick, Lt. Michael Salisbury, Mark Leffler and Nicholas D'Alessandro (now retired) as defendants.

However, when DiMaggio said Castell again blew kisses at Dennis in the police locker room on Dec. 16, Dennis reserved his right to file second lawsuit by filing a notice of claim Jan. 5.

'We give Castell a break by dropping the charges, and here we are, five months before trial, and he starts blowing kisses again,' DiMaggio said.

'As an excuse for his actions, he claimed Bob Dennis was menacing him with a loaded shotgun. That wasn't true.'

DiMaggio suggested Castell filed a false police report, which was part of the basis for his suspension.

Neither Castell nor his lawyer, Mark Major, were available for comment. King has forwarded the department's Dec. 30 charges against Castell to District Attorney James A. Murphy III for review for possible criminal wrongdoing.

'Criminal law rises to a much higher level than civil law,' he said. 'Since (the D.A.) would have to prosecute us, he would have to make the determination.'

Regarding the sexual harassment charges, King stressed the Police Department and City Hall have policies in place.

DiMaggio said he is currently opposing a motion to have the harassment case thrown out of court.

'If we're successful, then we proceed with the trial on or around May 1,' DiMaggio said.

If it's thrown out, he and his client 'absolutely' will appeal.

Dennis has been on the police force since 1990.

Meanwhile, Castell will return to the police force if and when the charges against him are resolved. He will resume collecting his paycheck if that process takes more than 30 days.

Dallas Morning News, January 10, 2000

Box 655237, Dallas, TX, 75265

(Fax 972-263-0456) (E-Mail: letterstoeditor@dallasnews.com)

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

Texas set for debate on same-sex unions

As Vermont rewrites laws on couples, conservatives plan countermeasure

By Brooks Egerton, The Dallas Morning News

After nearly 30 years of living together, doing the dishes together and paying the bills together, Louise Young figures it's time to marry her partner.

Soon, for the first time, it may be legally possible for her to wed her beloved, Vivienne Armstrong.

"Heterosexual couples can get married two or three or four times, and each time they have all the rights and privileges marriage can provide," Dr.

Young said. "We've been together all these years and have none."

Like lesbians and gays around the country, the Far North Dallas women are ready to run off and tie the knot in Vermont, whose Legislature convened last

week with a historic challenge: implementing a recent state Supreme Court ruling that requires equality for same-sex couples.

Dr. Young and Ms. Armstrong say they hope to come home and assert the sort of rights ? spousal health insurance, hospital visitation, inheritance, bereavement leave ? that other married people enjoy. Texas officials say they are bracing for legal challenges that would surely follow from such a scenario.

"We are aware, obviously, of what's going on in Vermont," said Heather Browne, a spokeswoman for Texas Attorney General John Cornyn. She declined to comment on what he might do and said he was unavailable for comment.

Conservatives react

Some Dallas-area conservatives, meanwhile, are running a radio and online voter-mobilization campaign that cites this issue, along with others that they say should concern traditional Christian families.

They are pushing support for Texas lawmakers in the March 14 primary who back "defense of marriage" legislation, which would prohibit recognition of same-sex unions performed in other states. Ordinarily, a marriage in one state is honored by all.

"We believe that this campaign will change the lack of involvement from North Texas citizens and create an army which can seriously impact our culture," said Pete Thomson, general manager of the Christian radio station KWRD-FM (94.9).

In a taped message about the Vermont case that's airing on KWRD, lawyer Kelly Shackelford asks: "Do you think that marriages in Texas should be as God intended, between one man and one woman? That's one of the major issues that will be coming up in the next Texas Legislature. Are you registered to vote?"

About 30 states have passed laws barring recognition of same-sex marriages. A Texas attempt died last year in the House state affairs committee led by Rep. Steve Wolens, a Dallas Democrat.

Mr. Wolens gave the bill a hearing but "did not allow [the] bill to have a vote, which would take it out of committee," according to a Web site run by the Plano-based Free Market Foundation, of which Mr. Shackelford is president.

Don't read anything into that, Mr. Wolens said. He recalled relatively little interest in the matter and said he focused on more pressing issues championed by the foundation, including parental notification of abortion.

"If another state were to recognize same-sex marriage, I think it would become an issue in the Texas Legislature," Mr. Wolens said. But talking about what to do before Vermont acts "is sheer speculation."

Vermont's high court ruled Dec. 20 that the New England state "is constitutionally required to extend to same-sex couples the common benefits and protections that flow from marriage."

Vermont issues

Now that state's Legislature is debating ? with no clear resolution in sight ? whether to simply adjust its marriage law to allow same-sex unions or

to set up a separate-but-equal domestic partnership system. There has been some talk of trumping the court by amending the state constitution, though it's considered difficult to change.

Some opponents are now in the unusual position of what they may see as lesser-evil advocacy for domestic partnership. That, Mr. Shackelford and others said, would at least limit the situation to Vermont residents; there is no precedent, as there is with marriage, of one state recognizing another's institution of partnership.

In California last week, hundreds of couples began registering as domestic partners. A new law there provides few of marriage's benefits ? only hospital visitation and, for state employees, health insurance.

Hawaii was the first state to move toward same-sex marriage. Its

Supreme

Court ruled in 1993 that restricting matrimony to opposite-sex couples was unconstitutional, but voters amended the constitution in 1998.

Partner benefits

On a smaller level, many corporations and cities now provide domestic-partner benefits to their employees. Austin began doing so in 1993

but was forced to stop in 1994 by a ballot initiative.

Travis County Clerk Dana DeBeauvoir, however, has continued to accept domestic-partnership declarations. The documents are sometimes used in authorizing emergency medical care, she said, though they carry no legal authority.

About 1,000 couples have filed the declarations in Austin, including Dr.

Young and Ms. Armstrong. About half the filings have come from heterosexual couples, Ms. DeBeauvoir said.

When a couple tried such a filing last year in San Antonio, Bexar County's district attorney sought an opinion from the attorney general. In December, Mr. Cornyn concluded that county clerks are not required to record partnership declarations. (Ms. DeBeauvoir said she plans to continue doing so; the attorney general's opinion allows her to, Mr. Cornyn's spokeswoman confirmed.)

"Such a document, like the purported judgments of the 'common law courts'

of the [secessionist group] 'Republic of Texas,' . . . is a stranger to the laws of Texas," Mr. Cornyn wrote.

"Generally, such affidavits as these are apparently made in an attempt to secure some legal recognition for unions of persons of the same sex. . . . However, the laws of Texas do not recognize marriages between persons of the same sex, whether ceremonial or informal," he wrote.

The last sentence speaks only to Texas' prohibition on same-sex couples marrying here, Mr. Cornyn's spokeswoman said. She would not comment on whether he would extend that logic if Vermont changes its marriage law.

Possible test case

Dr. Young and Ms. Armstrong say they aren't looking to create a local test case but might be willing to do so if denied marital recognition. Should that happen before Texas legislators pass a "defense of marriage" bill

? they don't reconvene until next January ? then it's anybody's guess what might happen in court.

"There aren't any answers to it," said Southern Methodist University's Lackland Bloom, a constitutional law expert. "There are tools out there to argue it one way or the other."

The general rule of nationwide recognition of marriages and other contracts "is by no means absolute," he noted. States can reject outside agreements, he said, if "there is a really strong public policy concern."

Public policy ought to recognize the fact of same-sex couples and encourage stability and responsibility, Dr. Young and Ms. Armstrong say.

The women, both 52, speak repeatedly of what lies ahead as they grow old

together ? health-care decisions, funeral arrangements, making arrangements to notify next of kin.

"Every time you have to write down your nearest relative, I don't want to write down my sister," said Ms. Armstrong, director of long-term care for the Visiting Nurse Association. "I want to write down Louise."

Dr. Young, a Raytheon software manager, says she senses much common ground with her opponents ? a belief in commitment, a patriotism that leads her to fly the flag on national holidays in memory of her father, a World War II veteran.

"I get chills up and down my spine when I say the Pledge of Allegiance," she said. "I particularly get chills now, when I say, 'liberty and justice for all.' "

[Inset in a Gray Box in the middle of the article is the following:]

Free Market Foundation president Kelly Shackelford made this taped message in late December before the Vermont Supreme Court ordered equal treatment for same-sex couples. The message has aired in recent days on the Dallas-area Christian radio station KWRD-FM (94.9).

Mr. Shackelford: "Did you know there's an attempt to legalize homosexual marriages in Texas? Did you know that in Vermont, currently the Vermont Supreme Court is considering ... whether they will legalize homosexual marriages in Vermont? If that happens, homosexual activists across Texas have announced that they will fly to Vermont, get married and come back to Texas and demand recognition. Do you think that marriages in Texas should be as God intended, between one man and one woman? That's one of the major issues that will be coming up in the next Texas Legislature. Are you registered to vote?"

Announcer: "The Free Market Foundation and The Word 94.9 want to register you to vote. If you're not registered, call The Word at 972.402.WORD, extension 949, or go to our web site at thewordfm.com."

Second Announcer: "This Free Market Minute made possible by GenCorp Technologies. GenCorp ... Everything Internet ... Get There. www.gencorptech.com. Striving to make a difference in 2000, we're The Word at 94.9 FM."

FEEDBACK from Selig602@aol.com:

I have spoken with several gay journalists (both print and broadcast) in Dallas about the "Fight Against Same-Sex Marriage" grey box inserted in the Same-Sex Marriage article published in today's Dallas Morning News." They stated that this practice is extremely unusual and that it is activist oriented and not news reporting. When a story is run about a group that is against gay rights, the paper never puts contact information for gay supportive groups in the middle of the story. The journalists stated to me that for this to occur, there had to be an editorial decision made by the paper's editorial to include it.

Contact information:

Robert Mong, President & General Manager (rmong@dallasnews.com)
Gilbert Bailon, Executive Editor (gbailon@dallasnews.com)
Stuart Wilk, Managing Editor (swilk@dallasnews.com)

Faxes can be sent to all three at (214) 977-8285. Letters to the editor can be e-mailed to: lettertoeditor@dallasnews.com or faxed in at (972) 263-0456. Letters to the editor or to Robert Mong, Gilbert Bailon and Stuart Wilk can be mailed to the at: The Dallas Morning News, PO Box 655237, Dallas, TX 75265.

NEWSDAY Liz Smith says young "Queer As Folk" actor is hot contender to play Anakin Skywalker in the next Star Wars movie

NEWSDAY, January 11, 2000

Liz Smith Gossip Column (excerpt)

JONATHAN JACKSON of "General Hospital" says Newsweek jumped the gun when reporting he is a "top bet" to play Anakin Skywalker in "Episode II" of "Star Wars." ... We wish Jackson well, but our rumor-grinder tells us Charlie Hunnam, the young star of England's wildly controversial "Queer As Folk" TV series, is a hot contender.

Iowa State Daily, January 11, 2000

108 Hamilton Hall, Ames, Ia., 50011

(E-MAIL: letters@www.daily.iastate.edu) (<http://www.daily.iastate.edu/>)

Column: Re-Hashing Gay Bashing

As a heterosexual soldier falls victim to hate, 'Don't ask, don't tell' comes under fire.

Andy Gonzales, Daily Columnist

Etch this into your memory because it's going to be the last you'll hear

of this if Al Gore or Bill Bradley become president: The "don't ask, don't tell" policy won't be around much longer.

In an age when everything seems to be going well, a soldier at Fort Campbell was murdered because he was suspected of being gay. He affirmed that he was in fact not gay and despite this, Pfc. Calvin Glover's hatred of gays drove him to take a bat to Barry Winchell.

Worst of all, the Army did nothing to curb the harassment Winchell endured for four months before his death.

At Glover's trial, Staff Sgt. Michael Kleifgen, Winchell's platoon sergeant said, "Everybody was having fun," referring to the attacks on Winchell during his stay at Fort Campbell.

Gore and Bradley want to get rid of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy and openly accept homosexuals, but that won't happen if officers turn a blind eye to soldiers who don't conform. That's the "Army" way: If it makes the

Army look bad, ignore it and forget it.

In Saturday's Des Moines Register debate, former Sen. Bradley stated, "As commander in chief, I can trust soldiers to be soldiers." That ignorant realization cost a mother and father their son and the Army its credibility.

According to the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network, anti-gay incidents against service members increased 120 percent in 1997.

In death, it seems Winchell had suffered more than just a brutal murder; he was betrayed by the very men who asked him to put his life on the line.

The "don't ask, don't tell" policy is just another social experiment by left-wingers. If elected, Gore and Bradley should stick to their ideas and implement full acceptance of gays in the military. Above all, they should protect those who can't defend themselves, including soldiers such as Barry Winchell.

GOP hopeful Alan Keyes said that with the military "what you see is what you get." Considering that, we have to assume the 120 percent rise signifies the policy is ineffective.

If ineffective, gays shouldn't serve. There are no standards in place to protect them as evidenced by the Army's lack of control over its soldiers.

The current policy not only begs reform, but this question: What are we doing to educate our young soldiers about bigotry and hatred? Obviously, nothing.

If so, gay incident reports would be falling rather than rising. Sharp criticism from anti-gay groups state that gays aren't family-oriented and are in direct contrast to the moral majority.

The moral majority should be properly classified as mob majority. The Christian values they espouse are in fact not Christian and are based on maintaining their view of social stability. Anything deviating from this course is blasphemous.

In an age of "understanding" and "compassion," the truth is that we don't like gays. It's that simple. They stand against everything the majority of Americans stands for. They don't have normal families ? at least as defined by what average Americans define as ordinary. Gays want to destroy the notion of the family.

Still, despite all the false rumors spread around by people, homosexuals are citizens and should be treated as such. To do otherwise not only defies "normal Christian" values but sends the message that moral America perhaps isn't as understanding as it claims to be.

The tragic part is Winchell was a good soldier at the top of his unit, the best marksman and an exemplary leader. His downfall was that someone thought he was gay and that alone warranted his death.

Until soldiers can serve openly without fear of reprisal or lynching,
how
can we tolerate the "don't ask, don't tell" policy? Sure, within the
letter
of the law it may be legal. But our standards define who we are and what
we
stand for. Open the ranks and let soldiers stand on their merits.

If they can't hack it, toss them out. It's that simple. But if the
institution is biased from the beginning, how can we expect our soldiers to
do the right thing in times of crisis? These soldiers need a strong,
family-oriented leader. If our president and his policy can't live up to
the
expectations, how can our soldiers?

? Andy Gonzales is a junior in political science from El Paso, Texas.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 09:20:48.00

SUBJECT: Letter to Rep. Barney Frank

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THOMAS A. SWANN
39360 Peterson Road Space 100
Rancho Mirage CA 92270-3098
(760) 324-5670
TASwann@aol.com
Www.proud-gay-veteran.com

January 11, 2000

The Honorable Barney Frank
Member of Congress

Dear Rep. Frank:

Bless your heart. I was just looking at my web page at the picture of you presenting me the Desert Stonewall Democratic Club Lifetime Membership Award.

It is a shame I was too blind to see where the camera was which explains why

I am looking down. The doctors at UCLA Stein Eye Institute said they couldn't do anything at this time to improve my vision. So we need to continue AIDS medical research funding. Anyway, I am writing to you because

instead of being sad I prefer to be happy and focus on your continual and constant great leadership in lifting the military ban.

I received a letter from your hardworking staff member (Peter Kovar) indicating that someone thought Cliff Arnesen of the New England Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Veterans of America (GLBVA) felt you had not responded with sufficient vigor on something regarding the military ban. Please let me share the limited information I have on this issue:

At every meeting of Desert Stonewall, Fred Bilodeau or I read something from the Internet or newspaper about Barney Frank leading the fight to lift the ban. I generally post these on the Internet. Cliff Arnesen reads my Internet postings and has never challenged Desert Stonewall statements that you (Rep. Frank) are fighting hard for civil rights. I know Cliff is dedicated, honest, eloquent and a great supporter of you and the Democratic Party. There must be a misunderstanding. That's all I can say on this

recent matter.

Fred Bilodeau is a former Air Force sergeant. He is a key person in the Palm Springs chapter of the GLBVA. Fred and I will certainly assist you in communicating your almost daily statements that the military policy must be changed.

Fred, California Democratic Party Region 19 Director Clark McCartney and I are organizing a Veteran's Caucus of the California Democratic Party. Barney, we have almost 3 million high-propensity voting veterans in California. The Republicans wave the American flag and cut veteran's benefits. As you so eloquently stated in Los Angeles when you received the Stonewall Los Angeles Lifetime Achievement Award; it is nice for veteran's to march in pride parades but we need to start marching to the voting booths and elect a new Congress.

The President can tinker with "Don't ask? Vice President Gore and former Senator Bradley can debate the issue but the next President will appoint Judges to the U.S. Supreme Court that will ultimately decide the gays in the military issue. We need you (Rep. Frank) as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. You will have the most important and pivotal position Barney in the next Congress. I salivate each and every time I think about you leading the House Judiciary Committee. I just can't wait any longer.

Barney, that's why I gave Jon Gordon \$500 and at the Desert Stonewall Unity Breakfast the day after the Primary election I am giving the nominee of our Party in the 44th District a check for \$1,000. I think the GLBVA leadership (Ed Clayton, Jim Donovan, James Darby, Mel Tips, Cliff Arnesen, Bud Robbins and Cliff Anchor) are superb. They have a great program. I am helping them.

Fred and I worked to elect Joe Baca to Congress to keep that seat for our Party. We are building the Veteran's Caucus. If everyone does their part we will attain civil rights.

Fred and I were elected unopposed in the March 7 Primary to the County Democratic Party Committee. If you thought Fred and Desert Stonewall was great last summer - you haven't seen anything yet. Fred is a Godsend for civil rights.

Yes, Barney that was me and the Palm Springs Gay Veterans on CNN Headline News marching for the first time in the Palm Springs Veteran's Day Parade. We have a great group out here. Jim Buresch who worked so hard in the Harvey Milk Democratic Club is our secretary and organized the parade for us. You remember meeting with him in 1993. If you need anything, Jim Buresch is

the
person to call.

It is hard to believe the blind guy with AIDS (Tom Swann) can have such a hectic schedule. We have the State Convention next month and a Desert Stonewall fundraiser for Sheila Kuehl the same day the GLBVA has a national convention in Las Vegas. I am a \$1,000 backer of the Desert Stonewall Kuehl event and I need to be in Las Vegas.

I have an idea, Barney. You take my place at the Kuehl event so I can go to Las Vegas and meet with the gay veterans. What do you say? Fred can set everything up for you.

Rep. Frank, I responded to Gen. Mundy's nonsense in the New York Times. I wrote about the first time we met at your party during the 1993 Inauguration.

In summary, your support for lifting the military ban is the strongest of anyone. The ACLU is so grateful for your support of their fine work. Jon Davidson, Morris Kight - everyone loves you. I love you.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Swann
Proud Gay Veteran

P.S. I haven't met with you since June 12 up on Capitol Hill. I pray for your good health and happiness. You are so vital and I know you are taking good care of yourself.

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JAN-2000 01:50:13.00

SUBJECT: WOCKNER/QUOTE UNQUOTE #164/11 Jan 2000

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

TO NEWS EDITOR

=====

= QUOTE UNQUOTE #164 - Jan 11, 2000 =

= by Rex Wockner =

=====

<<<1>>>

"I would like to say that if I were gay, I'd be out. But I think that's not fair because I'm not gay, and I don't know personally what pressure is brought to bear on you if you are. My short answer, without a lot of reflection, is that if you were out, your career would suffer. Would Rock Hudson have had the career he had if he'd been out? No way."

--Actor Matt Damon to the Advocate, Jan. 18.

<<<2>>>

"Middle America knows that its next-door neighbors could, in fact, be gay. They can't pretend any longer that it's not possible. And that, unfortunately, is very upsetting to some of them. People should recognize that homosexuality just is. Personally, I think it's genetic. That's always been my theory because I have friends who are gay and who really don't want to be and who say that they don't have lives that are conducive to it ... because being gay makes their lives more difficult professionally."

--Actor Matt Damon to the Advocate, Jan. 18.

<<<3>>> (3 & 4 must run together)

"Imagine having to take the [Number] 7 train to the ballpark, looking like you're [riding through] Beirut next to some kid with purple hair next to some queer with AIDS right next to some dude who just got out of jail for the fourth time right next to some 20-year-old mom with four kids. It's depressing. The biggest thing I don't like about New York are the foreigners. I'm not a

very big fan of foreigners. You can walk an entire block in Times Square and not hear anybody speaking English. Asians and Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything up there. How the hell did they get in this country?"

--Atlanta Braves player John Rocker to Sports Illustrated, Dec. 22.

◇◇<4>◇◇

"While I have evidenced strong competitive feelings about New York fans in the past, and take responsibility for things I have said publicly, including the Sports Illustrated article, I recognize that I have gone way too far in my competitive zeal. [I] let my emotions get the better of my judgment, and have said things which, when read with cold, hard logic, are unacceptable to me and to my country. Everyone makes mistakes and I hope everyone can put this aside and begin the 2000 season with a fresh start. I am contrite."

--Rocker in a press statement a day later.

◇◇<5>◇◇

"I tried to say gays should be able to serve in the military without lying about it. But if the military code of justice says that homosexual acts are illegal, if they keep it, then they'd have to observe that. But when we went to 'don't ask, don't tell,' it was all we could get through the Congress. The Congress had a veto-proof majority to reverse the policy I recommended. ... What we're doing now -- in August, we issued some new guidelines to try to correct some of the abuses, because the policy, as it was articulated in '93, has been often abused, and that's what's led to some of these expulsions, some of this harassment. The Secretary of Defense is absolutely committed to faithfully implementing the policy. It's really 'don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue,' under those circumstances. ... If the policy were faithfully applied, we would not have many of the problems that we've had these last few years, and I think the Secretary of Defense and the leadership of the Pentagon is now -- with these new guidelines and with the work they're doing to try to make sure people are trained and they understand they're not supposed to go in and harass people and what can and cannot trigger an inquiry, I think we can make it better now."

--Bill Clinton on Larry King Live, Cable News Network, Dec. 23.

◇◇<6>◇◇

"I think we've come a long way. We're a long way from where we were just in '92, and '93. I think vast majorities of the American people support hate-crimes legislation that protects gays as well as people with different racial and religious backgrounds. I think most Americans strongly support

nondiscrimination in the workplace and would vote for the Employment Nondiscrimination Act if they were in Congress. I hope that the Congress will vote for it this year, this next year. I think that -- the real problem, I still believe, is the absence of open, personal contact. I think there are too many people who don't know gay men and lesbian women in the ordinary course of their lives, and they don't see that there are people who -- their friends, their sisters, their brothers, their sons, their daughters, their coworkers, and that it is -- my judgment is, it's not a lifestyle people choose. It is the way people are. It's too hard -- it's too hard a life for people to just up and choose it. I think that my view is that every American that works hard, obeys the law, plays by the rules ought to be treated with dignity and respect and have a part in our American family. That's what I believe."

--Bill Clinton on Larry King Live, Cable News Network, Dec. 23.

◇◇<7>◇◇

"I think that's a good thing [the Vermont Supreme Court ruling on equal rights for same-sex couples]. That's always been my position, that -- you've got gay couples that, for example, have been together for years now. One of them -- and I'm beginning to think about this, because I'm moving into this age bracket now -- one of them has a heart attack, one of them gets sick, one of them is in the intensive-care unit in the hospital and only family members can come in and sometimes they're not allowed in - - that kind of thing. You know, I think that -- in terms of health-care coverage at work or in terms of property and willing of property to your closest family member, that sort of thing, I think they ought to be able to do that."

--Bill Clinton on Larry King Live, Cable News Network, Dec. 23.

◇◇<8>◇◇

"Marriage in our culture and to me has a certain connotation, meaning for me, that has not gotten me to where I could accept that [gay marriage], because I think it's basically a union for the purpose of, among other things, having children and -- so that's why I've never supported the term of 'marriage,' although there are a lot of increasing numbers of people, even in the clergy, who believe that they should be able to do that."

--Bill Clinton on Larry King Live, Cable News Network, Dec. 23.

◇◇<9>◇◇

"My acting career has nothing to do with my sexuality. I was gay last year, I'm gay this year, I'll be gay next year and I just can't be bothered to go on about it all the time. There must be more interesting things than just being gay. ... I don't want to be the Shirley Temple of the gay world."

--Actor Rupert Everett to Playboy magazine, January issue.

◇◇<10>◇◇

"When we're able to be open, those places are less necessary. There are other clubs and a number of ways for us to meet one another now and pursue other types of relationships, like monogamy."

--Larry Hughes, president of the Palm-Springs-area gay Desert Business Association after local officials shut down the Cathedral City gay bathhouse Club Palm Springs, saying it was prohibited by state law.

◇◇<11>◇◇

"The push for [gay] marriage is not an isolated phenomenon but signals hostility to sexual liberation. I wonder if we will all one day look back from another world and think about what gay life was like before the freedom from marriage was extinguished -- in the same way that some look at (and remember) what life was like before AIDS."

--Longtime New York activist Bill Dobbs in a Dec. 27 e-mail to this column.

◇◇<12>◇◇

"In the '90s, we ... find that gay issues are being reported in the mainstream press quite regularly. So, we have to look at ourselves and think, well, how does this affect us and how do we continue to operate? Does there continue to be a need for a gay and lesbian newspaper?"

--Max McLean, editor of the Melbourne (Australia) Star Observer, to the daily newspaper The Age, Dec. 29.

◇◇<13>◇◇

"There's been a change in a generation which you wouldn't see in any other community. I don't think there's a social comparison. In a way, we have almost done ourselves out of a role. And if we'd been asked at the start, I think we'd have said this is what we'd like to see happen. The gay community has become more of a niche market than a marginalised community. I think being gay is rapidly becoming no more extraordinary than being lefthanded."

--Danny Vadasz, founder of the gay Melbourne (Australia) Star Observer, to the daily newspaper The Age, Dec. 29.

◇◇<14>◇◇ {acute accent on second o in Almodovar}

"Even people who work with me don't know [who I'm dating]. I just

don't talk about it so that I won't implicate others. Just because they're dating someone famous doesn't mean they have to lose their privacy. But am I involved? Yes. It's nice to be wanted romantically, to be desired and, right now, I am."

--Gay Spanish filmmaker Pedro Almodovar to Atlanta's Southern Voice, Dec. 23.

◇◇<15>◇◇

"Unfortunately, I'm agnostic. I wish I could arrive at something I could believe in at some point. But you can't fool yourself about that. I really envy people who have faith. I would love to believe in Catholicism or anything, any other credo. Reincarnation, that would be fantastic. I wish someone would explain it to me in a way that I could believe it. That would solve everything for me."

--Gay Spanish filmmaker Pedro Almodovar to Atlanta's Southern Voice, Dec. 23.

◇◇<16>◇◇

"I'd love to make music with George one day. I've worshipped him for years. He's fantastic. I like his smile, as well."

--Ricky Martin on George Michael according to Melbourne, Australia's Sun Herald, Dec. 28.

◇◇<17>◇◇

"In late December, our [Vermont] state Supreme Court ruled that same-sex couples are legally entitled to the same benefits and protections as married heterosexuals. And despite the fact that I'm a big, tough, out lesbian who doesn't need a court ruling to know that my relationship counts, even despite the fact that I like living in sin -- I felt really, well, validated. I've often suspected that there's an aspect of sour grapes to my radical politics. Like, if I can't be in your club, fine. It's a stupid, smelly, heteropatriarchal club anyway. This is a useful, self-affirming attitude up to a point. But eventually, you start getting bitter and developing nervous tics."

--Dykes To Watch Out For cartoonist Alison Bechdel to the Phoenix gay publication Heatstroke, Dec. 30.

◇◇<18>◇◇

"[The weekly] Trannyshack [night at The Stud] might be the last stand of San Francisco's gay bohemia, decimated by a yuppie invasion, ever-rising rents and Banana Republic conformity."

--San Francisco Examiner columnist David Bonetti, Jan. 2.

◇◇◇<19>◇◇◇

"When I was growing up in Utah, my perception of gay life was that gay men were promiscuous, anti-family and that it was all about gay bars and cruising. When I finally 'came out' to myself, I realized there was a whole lot more to being gay than the stereotypes. I realized I didn't have to change any of the values or beliefs that I held about families, relationships and commitments just because I was gay."

--Hero magazine co-founder Sam Francis to the Salt Lake Tribune, Jan. 3.

◇◇◇<20>◇◇◇

"It [gay monogamy] is more threatening than a gay pride parade with drag queens because straight people can laugh at that and say: 'See, those queers, they're all like that.' But when they see these guys [portrayed] as best friends, athletes, jocks -- just regular guys, it's just very confronting."

--Hero magazine co-founder Sam Francis to the Salt Lake Tribune, Jan. 3.

-end-

Italics is shown like _this_.

"Quote Unquote" is archived at
<http://www.qrd.org/qrd/www/world/wockner.html>

"Quote Unquote" can be searched by keyword at
<http://www.wockner-news.com>

Read the weekly opinion column "The Wockner Wire" at
<http://www.planetout.com/wocknerwire/>