

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Alison Crisman to James Kvaal Re: FYI Only - Personal Education Commentary [personal] [partial] (1 page)	12/01/2000	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Liberation Theology])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/30/1999 - 12/01/2000]

2019-0147-F

in451

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "LEXIS ("LEXIS /NEXIS Print Delivery" <lexis-nexis@prod.lexis-nexis.com> (R) (R) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-DEC-1999 11:46:01.00

SUBJECT: civil rights

TO: Irene Bueno (CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
LEXIS-NEXIS Universe Update Report: December 30, 1999 at 11:27

Results from this Update: 9

Next Update: December 30, 1999 at 12:00

Access your results at:
http://web.lexis-nexis.com/in.universe/pnews/emailAlert?_pnewsAlert=0x000101a9-0x00004b26%2f0x000101a9%2f19991230%2f11%3a27%3a09

1 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 National Public Radio (R). All rights reserved. No quotes from

the materials contained herein may be used in any media without attribution to

National Public Radio. This transcript may not be reproduced in whole or in part without prior written permission. For further information, please contact

NPR's Permissions Coordinator at (202) 414-2000.

National Public Radio (NPR)

SHOW: TALK OF THE NATION (2:00 PM ET)

December 29, 1999, Wednesday

LENGTH: 7850 words

HEADLINE: LIVING TO BE OVER 100 YEARS OLD IN THE 20TH CENTURY

ANCHORS: JUAN WILLIAMS

BODY:

JUAN WILLIAMS, host:

This is TALK OF THE NATION. I'm Juan Williams.

Imagine living to be 100. Imagine that your life spanned the last 100 years, even if you'd stayed in the same town on the same street and in the same house. There'd be a tremendous culture shock. You would have seen the invention of the airplane as well as space travel to the moon. You would have gone from legal segregation to news of lynchings and then the Brown decision and the civil rights movement. The music of your life would have gone through ragtime to jazz to hip hop. You could have seen boxing champions from Jack Dempsey to Marciano to Ali and Tyson. Women got the right to vote, gained legal access to birth control and abortion and today are a majority in the nation's professional schools. You may have witnessed two World Wars, seen the bomb fall on Hiroshima, tasted the bitterness of Vietnam and see the US use smart bombs in the Gulf War.

Maybe most startling of all would be the fact that you lived so long. In 1900, only a few dozen Americans lived to be 100. They were exotic creatures. Today, centenarians are the fastest-growing segment of the US population. There are 72,000 Americans over 100 and their number will triple in the next 20 years. And if you were 100, you would notice that everyone else seemed to be living longer, too. The average life expectancy for an American in 1900 was 49. Today, it's 76. Already 35 million Americans are over the age of 65.

And it's not just living longer; the conversations over the dinner table and at the bar have changed, too. With more psychotherapy, Americans are more revealing of their feelings, there are more divorces, more single-parent families and more acceptance of gays. Living to 100, a fast-forward trip through the century in one body, today on TALK OF THE NATION.

If you want to join the conversation, our number here in Washington is 1 (800) 989-8255. That's 1 (800) 989-TALK. To send an e-mail, you can write us at totn@npr.org. Please include at least your first name and where it is you're writing from. Let us know what you've seen in this century, especially if you're over 75. We really want to hear from you.

How have all the technological and social changes impacted your personal life? Is life better today than it was 100 years ago, 50 years ago, 25

years
ago? Let us know. Give us a call. Joining me for our look back is NPR
senior
news analyst Daniel Schorr. But first, we're going to speak with Dr.
Thomas
Perls. He's just written a book, "Living to 100," and is the chief of
gerontology at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center in Boston,
Massachusetts.

Welcome, Dr. Perls.

Dr. THOMAS PERLS (Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center): Oh, thank you.

WILLIAMS: Dr. Perls, let me ask you: Why the increase in the number of
people
living to a ripe old age of 100?

Dr. PERLS: I think there's two major reasons. One is that at around
the turn
of the century, we saw childhood mortality just plummet, so many more
people
were able to survive their childhood years and go on to reach old age that
they're experiencing now. And the other is that medical care, in
general, is
just much, much better for people over the age of 65 than it was much
earlier.
So we're enabling many more people in their 60s or 70s to get to a much
older
age.

WILLIAMS: I saw a report by the Joint Economic study and it said in
1900, the
three primary causes of death for Americans were pneumonia, tuberculosis
and
diarrhea. Today, the top three are heart disease, cancer and stroke. It
seems
as if we've done away with a lot of the virus-type diseases, but the
stress
diseases are what's killing us, in a way.

Dr. PERLS: Yeah. That's true. But I think one of the questions that
will
nag the listeners is, 'Well, if it's all these chronically related
illnesses
that people are dying from as they get older, if you wanted to live to
100, why
would you want to?' And, in fact, I think this idea the older you get the
sicker
you get is still very prevalent in people's minds, when instead what
we've found
with our study of centenarians based at Harvard Medical School is that
the vast
majority of their years, up through their early- to mid-90s, is spent in
excellent health. And it's only at the very end of their lives that they

experience poor health. So they're living 90 to 95 percent of their lives in tremendous health. You know, these are 40 years beyond the age of 60 of incredible health.

WILLIAMS: Yeah.

Dr. PERLS: It's an incredibly long period of time to gather a lot of the experiences that you're no doubt hoping to hear about today.

WILLIAMS: So it's not only the case that they're living to be very old, but they're living in good condition. They're healthy, able to get around, able to think clearly.

Dr. PERLS: Well, that's right. Instead of it being the older you get the sicker you get, it's really a matter of the older you get the healthier you've been.

WILLIAMS: All right.

Dr. PERLS: They couldn't have had Alzheimer's disease, stroke, cancer, heart disease, a lot of the diseases we associate with aging at the time that many of us might get those problems and get to 100. They really had to be healthy the vast majority of their lives. Many centenarians aren't doing so well at age 100, 102 and so on because they are naturally at the end of their lives. On the other hand, about 30 percent are still doing very, very well. The main thing to keep in mind is that, again, the way they got to their age was living the vast majority of their lives in terrific health. If all of us could be centenarians, we really wouldn't have a health-care crisis on our hands as aging baby boomers get into their 70s, 80s and 90s, because people, again, would be living the vast majority of their lives in terrific health.

WILLIAMS: You know, one of the things that stood out to me in your study was the attitude of these people who lived to be 100. It said that on personality tests they score very high for optimism, tremendously good sense of humor, they have a deep religious faith about them, no cynicism, fear or anxiety.

Dr. PERLS: That's right. And they score very low--this sounds a little funny, but they score very low on the personality feature called neuroticism, which means that they don't tend to dwell on things. They're able to move on easily. And all the features that you talked about in this feature, they translate into the ability to manage emotional stress extremely well. And we know from studies that stress is a--what we call an age accelerator, so the ability to manage your stress--not so much how much stress is in your life. Many of our centenarians have had tremendous stresses in their life. You'll be talking about some of them today, whether it be getting through the Depression with infirm husband, as in the case of one of our centenarians, or going through some horrendous experiences in the Holocaust. So many of them had tremendous stress in their life. But it's how they manage it that is so important. And things like their spirituality, their humor, this ability to just move on easily all are very important towards that end.

WILLIAMS: Let me just remind the callers again, we want to hear from you. The number here is 1 (800) 989-8255. That's 1 (800) 989-TALK. Dr. Perls, something else that stood out to me was that many of the people, according to the statistics, four out of every five, I guess it is, is women in this group. Is that right?

Dr. PERLS: Yeah, that's right. Eighty-five percent of centenarians are women and 15 percent are men. And it just speaks to the fact that by far men are the weaker of the sexes. Women are really the champions when it comes to aging. They just are physiologically stronger, but they have this double-edged sword. The fact that they're able to withstand the diseases associated with aging much better means that they can live longer. But they also may have to live with these diseases longer if they're not so centenarianlike and they're living into their 70s or 80s or 90s.

Now on the other hand, very interestingly, men, because they succumb to these diseases so much more easily, if they get to 100, they have to truly be spectacular. So, in fact, even though they make up a smaller proportion

of
centenarians, the men tend to be quite a bit better off than the women
because
they have to be so darn good to get to their age, in terms of just not
having
any of these diseases we associate with aging.

WILLIAMS: Well, let's talk about the women for a second, because I'm
fascinated with the idea that, you know, more than 80 percent of the
people who
live to be 100 are female. I noted in your study that a large percentage
of
these women had never married...

Dr. PERLS: Yeah.

WILLIAMS: ...and in some cases said that they didn't want to be married,
considered it a ball-and-chain, I think, was the language of one
participant.

Dr. PERLS: That's--yeah, that's right. It's not a large proportion,
but we
think that it's significantly greater than what the average population
was doing
in terms of not being married. And one way to think about it--we did go
ask,
you know, 'Why didn't you get married?' It wasn't because they were
homosexual
or it wasn't because they never fell in love. Truly, most of them said
they had
opportunities to get married, but they wanted to be independent. They
wanted--there were many things they wanted to do that didn't involve
having a
family or, for that matter, a husband.

WILLIAMS: Well, the other part of this that's so compelling to me is,
some of
them who had babies--the ones who had babies after the age of 40 did
better in
terms of longevity.

Dr. PERLS: This is true. And it isn't so much that the abil--it's not
so
much having a child in your 40s, as if there was some kind of boost in
estrogen
or something like that. It's merely that it's probably a marker of--and
it
wasn't that they waited till their 40s. This was when they had their last
child...

WILLIAMS: Right.

Dr. PERLS: ...and so it was merely a marker of their reproductive system
aging very slowly, and therefore the rest of them was aging very slowly

as well,
and that bodes very well for their ability to go on to be 100. And we think that that's actually a very powerful predictor, that, you know, this doesn't count if you go out and get help in terms of fertility assistance from your obstetrician-gynecologist. But if you are able to have a child after the age of 40 you have about a four to five times greater chance of going on to 100 than someone who doesn't have a child before then.

WILLIAMS: Now would you say that you could predict longevity in an infant on the basis of that child's genes?

Dr. PERLS: We are getting there, actually. I think one thing to realize--I think there are two things for the public to realize at this point. One is, for instance, John Glenn goes up in a rocket ship at the age of 77 and explains that this was the most amazing, fantastic time of his life. You know, he talked about all the scientific experiments being important. But I think a million-fold times more important was how he opened people's eyes to the idea that you could have the most amazing, fantastic time of your life in your 70s, when many people think that happens in your 20s and 30s. And it totally depends upon, of course, among--that you have your health as well. So we try to point out to people that it's very important if you've got your health that your 70s, 80s, maybe even your 90s, can be a tremendous time of your life and it's worth fighting for.

And we have discovered that genes play a critically important role and most need in what we call genetic booster rockets to get to your 100s. But for the vast majority of us, I think most people can get to their mid- to late-80s in excellent health and be centenary in life by compressing the time that they're sick towards the very end of their lives. But we live about 10 years less than that, an average life expectancy of about 76. But the way to add those 10 years has nothing to do with the discoveries that we're going to make in genes in the next 10, 15 years. But it means getting rid of half the obesity, half

the being
overweight rate in this country. Twenty percent of the country is obese.
Way
too many people smoke. We have terrible diets and only 10 to 15 percent
of
people over age 65 exercise. If we first realize how critically
fantastic it
could be to live an extra 20, 25 years beyond the age of 60 in exceptional
health, and all the wonderful things that go along with that, I'm hopeful
people
will have the will and energy to make a big difference...

WILLIAMS: So it's more...

Dr. PERLS: ...in their lifestyle to get to old age.

WILLIAMS: ...lifestyle. It's more lifestyle change than genetics, is
what
you would argue.

Dr. PERLS: No.

WILLIAMS: No? Both?

Dr. PERLS: Important to get to your mid- to late-80s, absolutely. But
to get
to 100, what we have found by looking at siblings of centenarians,
looking at
families highly clustered for extreme longevity that it probably comes
more like
90 percent genes to get those extra 20 years beyond the age of 80, 85 and
get to
100.

WILLIAMS: And do these people have sex? Do centenarians have sex?

Dr. PERLS: Do they have sex? You know, some people will admit to it
and some
people won't and we're actually quite--we resist the temptation that a
lot of
people--you know, that's quite a popular notion, but we don't ask our
centenarians that question.

WILLIAMS: All right.

Dr. PERLS: You know, everybody has different priorities at different
ages and I would really wager that people in their 90s, yeah, sex is a priority,
that's
great and I would say that people are going on to 100. Those people are
perfectly capable of having great sex. But on the other hand, I would
also
wager that perhaps they may have also entirely different priorities that
are
very important to them that also mean a great deal of quality of life.

Sex, of
course, is not everything.

WILLIAMS: Dr. Thomas Perls, thank you so much for joining us.

Dr. PERLS: My pleasure.

WILLIAMS: You're listening to TALK OF THE NATION. I'm Juan Williams.
We're
going to take a short break right now. When we return, we'll continue
talking
with Americans who have lived through the 20th century. And we'll take
more of
your calls. Please do call at (800) 989-8255. If you'd like to comment
on the
program, you can send us a card to TALK OF THE NATION, 635 Massachusetts
Avenue
Northwest, Washington, DC 20001. The e-mail address is totn@npr.org.
Please
include your name and where you're writing from.

At 21 minutes past the hour, it's TALK OF THE NATION from NPR News.

(Soundbite of music)

WILLIAMS: Welcome back to TALK OF THE NATION. I'm Juan Williams.

Today we're talking with Americans who have lived through the 20th
century.
My guests are you, the callers. Please give us a call if you're 75 or
older and
would like to join the conversation. We'd like to know if you think life
is
better now moving into the 21st century, or are you nostalgic for the way
things
used to be? Give us a call here in Washington at (800) 989-8255. That's
(800)
989-TALK. You can also send us e-mail at totn@npr.org.

Senior news analyst Daniel Schorr is also with me for this hour. Dan,
are
you there?

DAN SCHORR (NPR Senior News Analyst): Yes, Juan.

WILLIAMS: Dan, you know, I was thinking to myself: This has been quite a
century for a newsman, and that's what you are, a great newsman. When
you think
back, do you find yourself surprised, one, that there are so many elderly
people
who've seen so much of the century? And I guess, in personal terms, are
you
surprised you're alive?

SCHORR: Yes, I'm always surprised I'm alive. Well, I've been thinking as I was sitting here, I've been thinking about this century and thinking about what we have today that we did not have when I was growing up. For example: Ball-point pens did not exist.

WILLIAMS: Right.

SCHORR: There were no nylons. There was no atomic energy. There was no electric refrigerator. There was no television. There was no atomic energy, almost as dangerous as television. It was a time when the word 'hardware' meant wrenches and hammers, and software was not in the dictionary yet. It was a time when a pot was something that you cooked in.

I myself witnessed the first demonstration of television at the New York World's Fair in 1926. And what makes me an analyst is the aim to perceive ahead; I stood in front of a camera that RCA had there and a girlfriend of mine could see me from 100 feet away and I said, 'This is a nice toy. It will not last.'

WILLIAMS: You know, but when did you come to realize that, in fact, TV was going to be the future?

SCHORR: I came to realize it after having done some work in radio and having found that--I came back working for CBS in 1953 and I saw the beginnings of television then. There was Fred Friendly already experimenting with something called "See it Now." And having lived in Europe until then, I had no idea of what television was or what television could be, or, in fact, that I could even work on television. And it was then I began to realize it was the coming medium, that after a while, you know, radio would take a certain place, certain niche in our society and television would be all.

WILLIAMS: All right. Dan, let's take a call right here from Bob, who's 83 in Palace Verdes, California. Bob.

BOB (Caller): Hi.

WILLIAMS: How are you? Tha...

BOB: I'm fine, thank you, sir.

WILLIAMS: Welcome to TALK OF THE NATION.

Yeah. Bob, what did you see in this century? Now, at 83, looking back, what stands out?

BOB: Oh, well, I guess everybody knows where they were when President Kennedy was shot. But I just happened--he just happened to have passed my office and I'd invited my wife down to my office, which was on Harwood Street in Dallas. And he and the other couple came by and waved, and I had my window pushed out, you know, and I was just--it looked like I could be out and touch him. And so when he went on by, why, my wife and I--I'd invited her down to see him--we went out to lunch. And the waitress's face was as white as a sheet. And we said, 'What's the matter with you?' And she said, 'They just shot the president.' And then it was on TV, live, there. And so after we--we couldn't eat any lunch, so we just got up and started home. And we went by Parkland Hospital, where they had taken him, and the whole area was just full of people on their knees, and just absolutely solid, packed. So when we got home, why, about two or three hours later--why, we lived just north of Love Field--and this--Air Force One came roaring overhead at a very low level and took a hard right and was on its way to New York.

WILLIAMS: This is an amazing story. So this is the large memory now at 83 that you carry with you.

BOB: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Is your wife still alive?

BOB: Absolutely.

WILLIAMS: And...

BOB: I can see it now.

WILLIAMS: And she's still alive and for her it's also the major memory of her

lifetime?

BOB: Yes. Absolutely. She is.

WILLIAMS: Well, thanks for your...

BOB: She's 82 and I'm 81 and we're getting along just beautifully.

WILLIAMS: Thanks for your call, Bob.

SCHORR: It is interesting, Juan, the way older people begin to associate themselves with events like the death of a president.

WILLIAMS: Right.

SCHORR: Of course, we all remember 1963, November, and the assassination of President Kennedy. But then some of us also remember 1945 and the death of President Roosevelt, which was really an all-encompassing event for us because so much of our lives in the war, Depression, had been associated with President Roosevelt. I myself was in the Army and remember that we were called out and told that 'President Roosevelt has died.' And I will not underrate what went through this country when President Kennedy was killed, the fact there was an assassination. But it is still vivid, still, in my mind, 1945 and the death of President Roosevelt.

WILLIAMS: Boy, I can hear it in your voice, Dan. Dan, let's take a call from William in Chicago. He's 80 years old. He grew up in the '30s that you were just talking about. William, are you there?

WILLIAM (Caller): Yes.

WILLIAMS: Welcome to TALK OF THE NATION.

WILLIAM: Thank you. I grew up in Rogers Park in Chicago and the World's Fair was a highlight, 1933 and '34, for us kids then. Recreation was virtually free. You could ride the double-decker buses for 10 cents. We could get on near Howard Street and ride all the way down Shiren Road(ph) on a double-decker bus to go to the fair and back. Later on, the big traumatic event was the attempted--almost traumatic assassination of President Roosevelt...

SCHORR: Mm-hmm.

WILLIAM: ...in Miami. And Giuseppe Zangara was executed, I think, within about 30 days of his arrest and conviction. They didn't fool around in those days.

WILLIAMS: Boy, 30 days.

WILLIAM: Something like that, yeah.

WILLIAMS: Amazing.

WILLIAM: Yeah. Not much more. So I remember how much fun it was living near the lake on the North Side and how cheap recreation was then for kids. You didn't--we didn't have television, of course. We had "The Lone Ranger" and we had Jack Armstrong on the radio.

WILLIAMS: Do you envy kids today, William, or do you think, in fact, you had a better time to grow up in?

WILLIAM: I have no way of knowing that, but I think it was a lot more fun because there was just not as much gimmickry around and you had to choose your own fun, you know.

WILLIAMS: Right.

WILLIAM: We used to go out in the alley and do all kinds of things and I was lucky to live near the lake because that was a great place and it didn't cost anything. So most of my time was spent at the lake in Rogers Park in the '30s and I loved it.

WILLIAMS: William, thanks for your call very much. Let's take a call now from Sid in Riverdale, New York. Sid, you were five when your dad died, a victim of the flu?

SID (Caller): Yes. That's right. That was March 31st, 1918. I remember it not too distinctly. He came down with the flu and within a few days he was gone and there was a lot of sadness around and grief and...

WILLIAMS: You don't see people die from the flu like that anymore.

SID: No, absolutely not. This was not just a pandemic here in the United States. It was a pandemic all over the world. Over 20 million people died all over the world. Nothing like that has ever been seen before.

WILLIAMS: So you were a child when you lost your dad.

SID: That's right.

WILLIAMS: And the difference--we were talking earlier with Dr. Thomas Perls of Harvard about this. The difference is today you don't see that kind of virus have that impact on the population...

SID: No. No. I--flu shots, so...

WILLIAMS: ...and take away your parents. Right.

SID: ...I'm reasonably secure about that. And then another thing about 1918, and it was only like--it was November 11th, 1918, it was Armistice Day. And my mother, who was working as a forelady in an embroidery shop, she had to go back to work when my father died. She dressed me and my brother, who was six at the time, in our little white sailor suits, complete with hats, and took us over to a photo studio and had our picture taken with--saluting the American flag. We were holding American flags in our right hands. And we still have those pictures around.

And another story I think that would be of--interesting--interest to WNYC, particularly, because I graduated from Pratt Institute in 1938 as an industrial designer. And I was working--jobs were hard to come by even then. And I was working...

SCHORR: Especially then.

SID: Yes. The Depression was still on in the late '30s. And I was working two--I was drawing furniture for a department store for their ads, you know, but I was still interested in a job as a designer. I preferred that to just copying other people's designs. And I registered with the New York State Employment Service, and a few days later I got a call from a manufacturer and it

seems that

WNYC had broadcast my credentials and abilities as an industrial designer at that time, and I got a call from this employer and I was hired...

WILLIAMS: Boy!

SID: ...as a result of WNYC's broadcasting my credentials.

WILLIAMS: Boy, the Depression really...

SID: You know? That happened almost 60 years ago.

WILLIAMS: Right. But the Depression has left a mark, I think, on...

SCHORR: That's right.

WILLIAMS: ...the whole generation. Well...

SID: No question about it that we went through difficult times during the Depression with my father gone and my mother going back to work. It was difficult to make ends meet.

WILLIAMS: All right. Sid...

SCHORR: And, you know, I share--that really is true that the--if you grew up during the Depression...

SID: Sure.

SCHORR: ...it marked you until this very day.

SID: Absolutely.

SCHORR: No one who grew up during the Depression can ever again feel financially secure no matter how financially secure you may be.

SID: That's absolutely true.

SCHORR: I mean, I remember that my education, which was at city college, which, Sid, I'm sure you know it very well, education at city college was...

SID: Yes, I went to city college.

SCHORR: And the only way I could have worked was because President Roosevelt had a program called National Youth Administration and I got paid 50 cents an hour for sorting library cards to help me get along.

SID: Yes.

SCHORR: And nowadays you would--people talk about prosperity and the possible stock market crash, maybe, sometime, or whatever, but in those days it seemed inconceivable that this roaringly optimistic country could suddenly come to a halt. They talk today about inflation. We had the problem of deflation.

SID: That's right.

SCHORR: We simply didn't have money to buy anything.

SID: That's right.

SCHORR: And we watched then--there were people selling apples on street corners. Do you remember that?

SID: Yes, I remember that very well.

SCHORR: Right. And, of course, there was some stockbrokers who were throwing themselves out of windows.

SID: That was the story.

SCHORR: We managed not to miss them very much.

SID: Yes.

SCHORR: But, yes, you cannot talk about the century without talking about the Great Depression.

SID: Yes. Well, there's another...

WILLIAMS: All right, S...

SID: ...little story that you might be interested in and I'm thankful--today

I happen to be legally blind. And I'm thankful for an act of Congress that made

it possible for me to get what they call a talking machine, and I get catalogs

from the New York Public Library that describes all the books that are out and I

can order any book that I want to and it comes in the form of a talking book.

It goes into the mail postage-free. And I play it on that machine and I can

mail it back to the library also postage-free. And all this is free and I'm

very thankful for that.

WILLIAMS: Well, you know, that's a big change.

SID: I listen to all kinds of books today.

WILLIAMS: Yeah.

SCHORR: Let me add, in your day, when you grew up, you couldn't have had that...

SID: That wasn't possible.

SCHORR: ...because audiotape...

SID: Oh, absolutely not.

WILLIAMS: Right.

SCHORR: ...did not exist in our youth.

SID: In our youth. That's right.

WILLIAMS: All right.

SCHORR: Never mind videotape.

SID: That's right. So there are things that we can be thankful for. I'm thankful to have my wife still with me to this day and she doesn't like to hear me tell her age.

WILLIAMS: Well, she's over 19, I guess.

SID: Absolutely.

WILLIAMS: Well, thanks for your call, Sid.

SID: Oh...

WILLIAMS: Virginia, you're on. You're 77 in Santa Rosa, California.

VIRGINIA (Caller): Yes. I'm a native West Virginian. I knew my Confederate soldier grandfather.

WILLIAMS: Now when was your--when was he born?

VIRGINIA: I don't know. I'd have to figure it out.

WILLIAMS: But sometime, I guess, early in the 1800s.

VIRGINIA: He was 14, left home, had a new stepmother. Of course, lied about his age. And was six feet tall and weighed 200 pounds. And the men called him Big Jim. He was a teamster, had the experience of driving a six-hitch

mule team

loaded--carrying ammunition and was ordered--when he told the commanding officer

that the stream that they were to cross was too dangerous, that they wouldn't be

able to make it, he was told to go ahead. And he thought he had to and they

lost...

WILLIAMS: Now you knew him.

VIRGINIA: Yes.

WILLIAMS: And you knew him as a little girl.

VIRGINIA: Right.

WILLIAMS: And what year were you born?

VIRGINIA: '22.

WILLIAMS: In '22.

VIRGINIA: Yes.

WILLIAMS: So you were--you--from the time that you were born, you had the

right to vote, which must have been--I mean, so it never struck you that,

'Gee,

women just gained the right to vote a few years ago.'

VIRGINIA: That's right. I just wrote an article about a woman who just had

her 100th birthday who voted in the first election and had her first

child four

days later.

WILLIAMS: Oh, gosh.

VIRGINIA: I was--it's war that's on my mind. I was in--I was a classmate of

the bombardier who--on the Enola Gay.

SCHORR: Yes.

VIRGINIA: My brother...

SCHORR: I think for those who don't...

WILLIAMS: Hang on a second, Virginia. Daniel wants to explain to the listeners a little bit about the Enola Gay.

SCHORR: That's right. The Enola Gay was the airplane that carried the atomic

bombs, the first atomic bombs, ever dropped in anger, and there was a lot of anger on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And the Enola Gay at one point was going to be put in the Smithsonian here, and because of the script that went with it, which indicated that some people did not approve of the use of the atomic bomb, there was a big flap over it and the Enola Gay was there without having any kind of explanation.

WILLIAMS: All right. Virginia, what was your experience then?

VIRGINIA: Yeah, I have a lot to say and think about. It's war that's on my mind. I stay horrified at how little we've focused on how to avoid war. I know that the Vietnam Veterans of America, in their landmine effort to stop--get rid of landmines, have a conflict resolution group. I--there was that--what my brothers--one brother flew a B-29 over Japan. Another one flew a fighter over the Libyan desert, was shot down in Sicily and rescued--taken back to his base by General Montgomery.

WILLIAMS: Gosh.

VIRGINIA: My background is full of that.

WILLIAMS: All right, well...

SCHORR: Could I say something about this whole question of peace?

WILLIAMS: Well, just a second, Daniel. Let me just say that I'm Juan Williams and you're listening to TALK OF THE NATION from NPR News.

Go ahead, Dan.

SCHORR: OK. The century--we think about this whole century--and let me mention, in passing--if you ask me why I'm in Los Angeles, it is, appropriately enough, celebrating the 95th birthday of my mother-in-law here in Los Angeles. And she is hail and hearty...

WILLIAMS: Congratulations.

SCHORR: ...at 95 and I'm glad to report that. I'd like also to say that all through this 83 years, which is the number of years that I have lived, every now and then people wonder about peace. Peace is wonderful, they say, but

where is
peace and when do we get peace? And there have been efforts made from
the very
early part of the century, there were naval limitation treaties that were
signed
between Russia and Japan. There was, after first World War, the effort to
establish something called the League of Nations, which the US Senate let
go
down the hill. After the second World War, the United Nations--all of
these were
the efforts of people who thought very deeply about trying to achieve an
enduring peace in this world. And the fact that we reach this point near
2000
and we're still saying, 'Well, will we or will we not have another little
war
there? How many wars can we afford to fight?' it is really such a sad
moment to
contemplate that we've spent a whole century looking for peace and we
haven't
found it.

WILLIAMS: Virginia, thanks so much for your call.

You're listening to TALK OF THE NATION. I'm Juan Williams. My guest
is Dan

Schorr. We're going to take a short break right now. When we return,
we'll

continue talking about the 1900s as they draw to a close and we'll take
more of

your calls at (800) 989-8255. I'd like you to comment on the program.

Please

send us a card or letter, TALK OF THE NATION, 635 Massachusetts Avenue
Northwest, Washington, DC, 20001. The e-mail address is totn@npr.org.

Please

include your name and where you're writing from.

At 40 minutes past the hour, it's TALK OF THE NATION from NPR News.

(Announcements)

WILLIAMS: Welcome back to TALK OF THE NATION. I'm Juan Williams.

Tune in at this time tomorrow for a discussion about the future and
what it

could bring. Will we have eradicated all defects from the human genome?

Will

we have to redefine the idea of work as advancements in computers and
technology? Well, can technology take over, in fact, tasks formerly done

by

humans? Will it be an improvement, a nightmare, or something we couldn't

even

comprehend?

Today we're talking with older Americans about living through the 20th

century. My guest is senior news analyst Daniel Schorr and you, the callers.

Please give us a call if you're 75 years or older. We'd like to hear from you about the technological and cultural changes that have impacted your life. Are you optimistic about life in the 21st century? If you want to join the conversation, our number here is (800) 989-8255. That's (800) 989-TALK.

Let me go now to Bill Bailey(ph), who's 67 years old, a United Methodist minister. Bill, are you there?

Pastor BILL BAILEY (Caller): Yeah, I am.

WILLIAMS: Welcome to TALK OF THE NATION. Bill...

Pastor BAILEY: Glad to be here.

WILLIAMS: ...in--one of the things we were talking about earlier, in the last call with Virginia, was war, the idea of war.

Pastor BAILEY: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Now you must have seen and been on both sides of this war issue, because I think that it's your son who was a conscientious objector in Vietnam.

Pastor BAILEY: That's right.

WILLIAMS: What did you do, personally? World War II, Korea?

Pastor BAILEY: Well, in World War II, I was just entering into my teens. And so what I found myself doing was--you know, in school, we knitted wash rags for the soldiers and we packed Band-Aids and things like that in little packages that--waterproof packages for the armed services to have. We bought war bonds. On the weekend, we went out, and in those days when tobacco was king, why, they had aluminum foil on their packages and we'd peel that aluminum foil off and make balls out of it and we was then--turn that in. We would go on scrap drives every Saturday. We were deeply involved, but it was a different kind of involvement in war.

WILLIAMS: You know, this is very interesting to me because an earlier caller and Daniel Schorr both have mentioned the Depression as leaving a telltale mark

on the lives of people who have lived for most of this century and here you are talking about that experience as well.

Pastor BAILEY: Yes, yes, I would. And this is true. I was born in 1931 and my--I lived with grandparents, both sets of my grandparents lived side by side. And one of them had lost everything in the Depression, and I remember on the--for Christmas we always started baking fruitcakes in September and all the way till November, and that was just part of the family economy in order to survive. There was only one person in the family of three plus myself that had a job. That job would have been about \$ 20 a week.

WILLIAMS: You know--now you, as a young person, you were in North Carolina.

Pastor BAILEY: That's correct.

WILLIAMS: But what strikes me now is that in a way your life tracks with a demographic change in American society, which is that early in the century most Americans lived in rural settings. Now most Americans, 70 percent, live in urban settings.

Pastor BAILEY: That's correct.

WILLIAMS: You think it's--what's better?

Pastor BAILEY: Well, they both have their assets and they both have their liabilities. In the small community that I grew up in, which is Mt. Airy, North Carolina, which is known as Mayberry, where--that's Andy Griffith's hometown.

WILLIAMS: Right.

Pastor BAILEY: And we lived in a community where everybody knew everybody and you knew everybody in your geography so you could name every person on the street you lived on. You knew all the merchants downtown, usually by their first name, if they allowed you to call them that. But now I live in an urban environment and my association with people I know are more in networks. They're the people I visit and work with during the daytime, and there are many different networks, so it's not so much neighborhood-oriented like it

used to be
as it is network-oriented.

WILLIAMS: Bill, thanks so much for joining us today.

Let me go now to Lionel Williams, who's 70 years old. Lionel is an African-American, lives in Baltimore, Maryland. Lionel, welcome to TALK OF THE NATION.

Mr. LIONEL WILLIAMS (Caller): Hello.

WILLIAMS: Lionel, what have the changes been as a black man in America, for you, living, as you have, during most of this century?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Well, I'm in North Carolina now living and one of the big differences that I can see now is not only where I can live but in travel. I can recall when travel was a very difficult task that had to be well-planned because you had to be able to figure out how far you could go in one day and where you could stay, and even just going to the bathroom was a problem. But now traveling is enjoyable. We travel like anybody else.

WILLIAMS: Now you went to school in Boston, graduate school, to become a jet...

Mr. WILLIAMS: I went to Northeastern, the Boston area.

WILLIAMS: And you became a jet engineer?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes.

WILLIAMS: That's an incredible level of achievement.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Well, I think if one is well-focused and applies themselves, anyone can do it.

WILLIAMS: Well, the reason I said that was considering that you are an African-American, there was limited educational opportunity for blacks early in the century.

Mr. WILLIAMS: That's true, but a lot of people had home background in which education was really put to the fore. It was important not only to get an elementary education, secondary education, but to go on to college. That was the aim of many families and they worked toward it. It was a star in their hat,

if you will, if somebody in the family, particularly their sons or daughters,
could go off to college and my parents were no exceptions. They were proud to
be able to send me off to college.

WILLIAMS: Now does anything stand out in your mind in terms of your 70 years
in this 100-year period? Does anything stand out in your mind? Many have
mentioned the Depression. I don't think anyone has mentioned the civil
rights
movement. What stands out for you?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Well, I go back to the Depression era, too. And I can recall
how difficult it was just to exist and make a living. I can recall that
some of
the people who had the best job on the street were working for the WPA
(technical difficulties).

SCHORR: I think I have to explain.

WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

SCHORR: WPA, Works Progress Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Yes.

SCHORR: That was one of the so-called New Deal programs.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Right.

SCHORR: They built bridges, they built infrastructure for this country,
a lot
of which still exists today. The Duke Ellington Bridge in Washington was
a WPA
project. And I guess it's because you and I just have to say WPA, but I
think
that for a lot of younger people I have to step in and say what WPA means.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Daniel. And thank--Lionel, yes, go right ahead.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I was going to say the older people were WPA, but then we
had
the younger people that were in the CCC.

WILLIAMS: Which was?

Mr. WILLIAMS: The Con...

SCHORR: Civilian Conservation...

Mr. WILLIAMS: Civilian Conservation Corps.

SCHORR: Very good.

Mr. WILLIAMS: And they built a lot of drainage systems and retaining walls,
and they were the older teen-age males. And I can recall members of my family,
you know, going off to CCC. It was kind of sort of like a--well, like an Army
camp, if you will. They lived out in tents out in the woods and they worked on
the environmental--I think our environmentalists would have been proud of those
people now.

WILLIAMS: OK. Lionel, thanks so much for joining us today.

Let me take a call here from Marv, who's 81 and lives in Madison, Illinois.
Marv, welcome to TALK OF THE NATION.

MARV (Caller): Hi. Hi. Hi, Juan. I want to say hi, Dan.

SCHORR: Hi, Marv. Good to talk to you.

MARV: For once, I'm not the oldest guy in the room. I'll be 82 next August.

SCHORR: Oh, I'm a little ahead.

MARV: Yeah.

SCHORR: I'll be--I'm 83, will be 84 next August.

MARV: Right. I was born in Muscatine, Iowa, a twin. My mother went back
there--she lived in Chicago and she met my father and got married, and so forth,
and she wanted to be with her mother. So she took me back there. He went with
her. And about--oh, everything was fine. I was--I think I weighed two and a
half pounds. I had to be put in an incubator. But anyhow, we came back to Chicago and then the flu came in November. So it took my sister, my twin sister,
when we were about four months old.

WILLIAMS: Gosh.

MARV: So that, of course, was an awful blow to my mother, who never had a
girl. She wanted a girl so bad. She came from a family that had about seven
sisters. And later on she had a--I had a younger brother.

WILLIAMS: You know, Marv, it's so striking, again, people have mentioned that, you know, disease had a real role to play, much more prominent role to play, in American life than it does today. You could lose a mother, a sister to the flu.

MARV: Oh, yes, that's true. But, well, if you want to talk about that. What I think is that, if I remember, Harry Truman, in one of his speeches, State of the Union speeches, said that we needed a national health care system in this country, and that's really true. We--despite the fact that there are many, many new innovations and new progress and so on and so forth, it only goes to certain people. There are many, many older people who need more help and they're going to die earlier than they really should have.

SCHORR: That's right. Can I say something here, Juan?

WILLIAMS: Please, Daniel. Please. And thank you for your call, Marv.

SCHORR: It is a remarkable thing about this century that we made so much science progress, technological progress, we've flown to the moon and we've done all these great things. And we have not yet built up the morality and the kind of ethics that make it possible for us to spread these miracles around. The idea that Truman--I remember his speech very well when he proposed a national health insurance system--that to this day now they are still trying to solve the problem not of medicine but how to deliver these miracles to people who need it is really a reflection on the century and a reflection of what it is when you build yourself up technologically and don't bring along necessary social conscience and morality to use it right. Excuse the editorial.

WILLIAMS: No, I--but I would say this, Daniel. Isn't it, though, the case that because we see people living longer that, you know, somehow that--the technological and medical advances have benefited much of the population?

SCHORR: Yes, but there are still margins of difference between classes and colors.

WILLIAMS: All right. Let's go now to--well, first let me say I'm Juan Williams and you're listening to TALK OF THE NATION from NPR News.

Let's go now to Lucy, who's 70 years old and lives in Hollywood, Florida.

Lucy, welcome to TALK OF THE NATION.

LUCY (Caller): Well, hi. Welcome. Thank you very much. Let me just be quick about it and say that an outcome of being a Depression child myself was that I could not go to college. And my twin sister and I had to go to work to earn money to help my divorced mother. Aside from poverty, the most outstanding thing in my life when I went to work right after the war...

WILLIAMS: This is World War II?

LUCY: ...World War II--was the sexual harassment I encountered at practically every job. I was so afraid to quit because we so desperately needed the money. And I went through hell and I had nowhere to turn for help, and I'm so very grateful for the national laws about sexual harassment today.

WILLIAMS: So that--at the time, what was going on? People were pressuring you for sex or making demands that they would fire you if you didn't do a quid pro quo?

LUCY: That's right.

WILLIAMS: You know--you mean, you couldn't go to the courts at that time.

LUCY: No. That's right. There was nowhere to go. It was either stay and be sexually harassed or quit and have no money.

WILLIAMS: Now, Daniel, as a man living during that period, did you have any consciousness of this kind of thing that was affecting Lucy? And, Lucy, thanks for the call?

SCHORR: Well, I should say I had consciousness of it. The fact of the matter was that that was the way things were, and you took that for granted. And when some woman complained to you exactly of that, of harassment, you say, 'Well, that really is too bad. You want me to go punch him in the nose or what?' It has been a long time since we had this Civil Rights Act and then, along with the

Civil Rights Act, extending protections to women as well. That is one of the happier developments of this century.

WILLIAMS: All right. Let's go to Bill in Heidelberg, Germany. Bill, you're 82 years old and we have something in common. You love Daniel Schorr.

BILL (Caller): Yes. That's one of my two reasons for calling. I have long realized that Daniel Schorr is one of our elder statesmen, but I hadn't realized is that he and I are contemporaries, so thank you very much, sir.

SCHORR: Welcome aboard.

BILL: Appreciate you, sir. I never miss one of your reports.

SCHORR: Thank you.

BILL: The other thing, I detected a note of impatience with war. I started as a private in the Army and made it up to colonel, and living in Europe as I do, we're a little closer to some of the wars than you folks in America. There are many countries which are in turmoil because their governments have not seen fit to equip themselves to maintain law and order. And I think that's very important. And we're very proud of our people in Bosnia and Kosovo and other places of current interest. And we should not be ashamed of supporting our armed forces.

WILLIAMS: So you think--and just very quickly--but you didn't think Vietnam changed that attitude in the country?

BILL: Well, I--I've spent much of my life in Europe and so I had no immediate association.

WILLIAMS: All right. Bill, thanks for your call.

That's all the time we have for today. I'd like to thank all of you who called in and wrote during this hour, especially my guest, senior news analyst Daniel Schorr. Dan, thank you so much for joining us from the Los Angeles bureau.

SCHORR: My pleasure. And have a good weekend.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Dan.

In Washington, I'm Juan Williams, NPR News.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

2 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 The Tribune Co. Publishes The Tampa Tribune

The Tampa Tribune

December 29, 1999, Wednesday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NATION/WORLD, Pg. 12

LENGTH: 1467 words

HEADLINE: Religious arrogance;

BODY:

The Tribune editorial "The bitter fruit of religious insult" (Dec. 24) falls far short of the mark when it comes to making people aware of the many methods of insult Americans must endure.

Yes, the painting at the Brooklyn Museum was offensive to Catholics. But Catholic bashing pales in comparison to the myriad ways Catholics and other religious fundamentalists have bashed and assaulted secular society. Almost daily the Tribune acts as a conduit for insults to gays, lesbians, abortion doctors, atheists, humanists, equal rights advocates, civil rights advocates, the ACLU or any other group the religious establishment cares to target. The recent lap-dancing fiasco is a perfect example of the religious assault on secularism. Interestingly, neither the Tribune nor any other outraged Christian group cries foul.

When columnist Cal Thomas heaps dung upon secularist views, his paintings are hung in the Tribune gallery of opinion without batting an eye. I cannot praise the painting in Brooklyn, yet I must empathize with the urge to slap the

face
of religious arrogance that assails our every human right and freedom.
Religious interests would do well to reconsider their assault upon
secularism
before crying foul.

When outraged secularists vent their frustrations on canvas, an
important
message is being sent to America. Like it or not, it is
constitutionally protected free speech. Instead of trying to silence or
vilify
that voice, we should lend an ear to what it is trying to say and why.
JAMES A.
YOUNG Lithia

Regarding: "The bitter fruit of religious insult" (Editorial, Dec. 24):

It's a little tough for me to get all choked up about the insults those
poor
Catholics have to put up with. Considering that atheists and agnostics
are
regularly demonized by your paper and that most of the churches
advertise in
the Tribune, I find it hard to get worked up about an artist who flings
dung on
a painting. Of course, let's not forget all the others you regularly
bash: gays
and lesbians, liberals, lap dancers or just about anyone not fitting
into your
Limbaughesque vision of the way things ought to be.

No, I'm not particularly impressed by the Dung Virgin, but then I'm less
impressed by the tacky used car lots - oh, excuse me, those are homes -
featured in your paper as "decorated for the season." In fact, I
apologize to
used car dealers, as the gaudy red and green and multicolored displays
of most
homes make the worst car lots seem mighty tasteful. Of course, were I to
note
that I find these displays offensive, I'd just be called a "Scrooge" or a
"Grinch" and ignored.

Funny how easily hypocrisy is overlooked by your newspaper when you're
committing it. BRENT YACIW Tampa Proud to be an Aggie

I was very pleased to read Jennifer Barrs' article "For the spirit,
Aggies
accept risk of tragedy" (Commentary, Dec. 10) on the Bonfire tragedy at
Texas
A&M. As the father of two A&M students, I had a few moments of intense
fear
until they were both accounted for.

Texas A&M is unlike any other university. When alumni from other schools gather, you can hear the stories of all the frat parties, the great drunken escapades and the harassment toward the fans from the visiting teams. When Aggies get together, they reminisce about Silver Taps, Muster, Midnight Yell Practice and a host of other traditions and experiences that drew them together from their first "Fish Camp."

My son first experienced that Aggie spirit when he saw the Texas A&M Corp of Cadets and the "Fightin' Texas Aggie Band" at a Baylor game when he was 11 years old. He stood in awe and said, "Dad, that's what I want to do." He applied for admission and spent four years in the "corps" as a member of that band. One year from now, I will pin gold bars on his shoulders as he is sworn into the U.S. Marine Corps as a second lieutenant. His sister graduates in May with a degree in kinesiology.

Here is an academic institution that has as its motto "Aggies never lie, cheat, or steal, nor associate with those who do." Those are values that are sorely missed in our society. Perhaps the late Gen. George Patton summed it up best when he said, "Give me a company of West Pointers and I will win the battle. Give me a few Aggies, and I will win the war." DARRYL HUNT
Tampa A
knee-jerk response

"There ought to be a law." Everybody has said it. The guy who is experiencing road rage and the guy who "caused" the rage both say it. Most of these proposed "laws" are knee-jerk responses that benefit only the proponents.

Of course, the inherent problem with that solution is that it requires the use of force. By definition, government is force. It is the ultimate force within a society. The best solutions to problems are generally achieved through the application of reason and do not require the use of force. However, reason requires rational thought, and that requires time. Apparently there is never enough time, so the expedient use of force is the common answer.

I believe the proposed Hillsborough County ordinance on the use of

"handicap"

toilets qualifies as one of these knee-jerk responses (Florida/Metro, Dec. 24).

It is one thing to provide preferred parking to those who cannot safely navigate parking lots or access businesses, and quite another to slide down the

slippery slope to toilets. The inconvenience of waiting in line to use facilities is a condition common to all. It will only be made worse if society's inventory of facilities is reduced by this ordinance.

The logical extension of this concept requires that able-bodied individuals

be prohibited from using the ramps at businesses and road intersections to

ensure availability. Enhanced solutions could include "handicapped only" sidewalks and highway lanes and no-wait "handicapped only" elevators.

Businesses could be required to provide priority to individuals with handicaps

over all other customers. With the application of sufficient force, all things are possible.

The original charitable thought behind this ordinance is to be commended.

However, politicians should be reminded that charity is a personal act and, by

definition, does not include forced participation. In addition, expedience is

no excuse, even when terminating the services of politicians.

My limited experience with Commissioner Jim Norman leads me to believe that

he is a rational representative who just suffered from "there ought to be a

law" syndrome. Of course, there ought to be a law against politicians experiencing this syndrome, since they can impose their knee-jerk responses.

ROGER DAPSON Lithia Is terrorist threat real?

I'm puzzled by all the brouhaha over international terrorism. Puzzled with

what could be the motive or motives. Yasser Arafat has been entertained at the

White House. Both he and Syrian President Hafez Assad are being appeased by us

at Israel's expense. Nothing has been done to upset Muammar Gadhafi. We have

compensated Afghanistan and Sudan for our bombing raids. Russia is being permitted to destroy Chechnya to offset our destruction of Serbia. And the

president has recently pardoned 14 Puerto Ricans. What more can these people possibly want?

The amateurism of their discovered efforts puzzles further. Two clowns with Arab names, loaded for bear, have tried driving through border checkpoints! With thousands of miles of unguarded border, why pick checkpoints to cross? Why carry explosives and/ or triggering devices? Aren't these vaunted terrorists capable of manufacturing triggering devices and obtaining explosives in-country? Isn't anhydrous ammonia - the explosive used on the federal building in Oklahoma City - still being sold at most farm stores in the United States? Can't anyone still get the information on bomb-making from the Internet?

Why risk importing these materials through a border checkpoint and alerting everyone when they are so readily available? Why not bring the plans through the checkpoint in your head and build it after you're safely in-country?

Two answers to these questions appear possible:

1. There is a real terrorist threat; or
2. It's another Clinton administration-generated crisis! If a terrorist attack really is being planned or is under way, these clumsy border-crossing attempts could be intended to divert our attention from the true target. Certainly, from what we have seen so far, such people are in greater danger of blowing up themselves than us!

On the other hand, if the whole thing is White House-generated, hold on to your hats because another Monica or something worse could be coming 'round the bend! P.E. CHAMBERLAIN Valrico

TYPE: LETTERS

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

3 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 National Public Radio (R). All rights reserved. No quotes from the materials contained herein may be used in any media without attribution to National Public Radio. This transcript may not be reproduced in whole or in part without prior written permission. For further information, please contact

NPR's Permissions Coordinator at (202) 414-2000.

National Public Radio (NPR)

SHOW: ALL THINGS CONSIDERED (9:00 PM ET)

December 27, 1999, Monday

LENGTH: 1866 words

HEADLINE: COURTS AND LAWMAKERS STRUGGLE TO PROVIDE PROTECTIONS FOR PRIVACY
AS
TECHNOLOGY MAKES PERSONAL INFORMATION MORE AND MORE ACCESSIBLE

ANCHORS: ROBERT SIEGEL

REPORTERS: LARRY ABRAMSON

BODY:

ROBERT SIEGEL, host:

This is NPR's ALL THINGS CONSIDERED. I'm Robert Siegel. Toward the end of the last century, the Supreme Court helped define a right Americans have come to depend on, even though it's not explicitly mentioned in the Constitution. It's the right to privacy. Throughout this century, courts and Legislatures have added to the list of privacy protections, but technological innovations have moved just as quickly to erode privacy. The growing popularity of computers and the Internet has led many to declare that privacy is dead. NPR's Larry Abramson reports that while technology is raising new fears, the public's attitudes toward the issue will determine the future of privacy.

LARRY ABRAMSON reporting:

If you have any doubt that privacy has come of age as a hot-button, front-burner issue in America, just turn on the TV. In a recent episode of NBC's "West Wing," a White House staffer urged the fictional president to dump a Supreme Court nominee who admits he does not believe in a constitutional right to privacy. Actor Rob Lowe clinches the deal by pulling out this capsule history of civil rights in the 20th century.

Mr. ROB LOWE: (From "West Wing") It's about the next 20 years. '20s and '30s, it was the role of government. '50s and '60s, it was civil rights. The next two decades are going to be privacy. I'm talking about the Internet, I'm

talking about cell phones, I'm talking about health records and who's gay and who's not. Moreover, in the country born on the will to be free, what could be more fundamental than this?

ABRAMSON: If that battle sounds familiar, it may be because the same charges helped to spike the nomination of Robert Bork to the high court in 1987. For much of our history, the Supreme Court defined privacy mostly in terms of property. In 1928, the court stuck by that view, saying that police wiretaps did not constitute an illegal search since they occurred away from a citizen's home. But in 1967, the court moved the privacy boundary again, saying the Constitution protected people, not places. That put new constraints on police wiretaps.

Like the court, society's notions about privacy have shifted as technology evolves. Following the 1960s, growing awareness about the dangers of government surveillance enlisted some unlikely recruits into the fight to protect privacy, like Richard Nixon.

Former President RICHARD NIXON: (From historical recording) A system that fails to respect its citizens' right to privacy fails to respect the citizens themselves.

ABRAMSON: In 1974, President Nixon appointed a commission to examine threats to privacy. The man who bugged the White House, who used government records to investigate his enemies spoke about privacy as a cherished American value.

Mr. NIXON: (From historical recording) The well-intentioned government bureaucracies seem to thrive on collecting additional information. But there must also be reasonable limits on what is collected and how it is used.

ABRAMSON: Nixon ended up being an unwitting crusader for privacy. Revelations about Watergate and other government excesses helped pass the Privacy Act of 1974, and in the following years, other restrictions have clamped down on what the government can do with information about its citizens. Yet, the battle over government invasion of privacy pales when compared to the challenges created by

the commercial collection of information in the computer age. Ten years ago, NPR broadcast a report about privacy concerns raised by a new marketing database known as Lotus Marketplace.

BRUCE GELLERMAN: (From previous broadcast) With a click of the mouse, a user can custom design a mailing list or a phone survey of prospective contacts. But as impressive as Marketplace Business is, an even newer Lotus product to be introduced early next year is even more powerful. Its database contains detailed information about the buying habits of 120 million American consumers. When this inf...

ABRAMSON: Horrified reaction by the public helped torpedo the Marketplace database. But privacy groups say Marketplace is nothing compared with the threats created by Internet marketing tactics. For George Orwell, the threat came from government-controlled intrusion technologies. At a recent privacy conference, Jeff Chester of the Center for Media Education described his version of "1984," represented in the advertising newspeak used in an ad for a new online advertising network.

Mr. JEFF CHESTER (Center for Media Education): New precision Web targeting from Navion combines physical-world data with online behavior for the very first time. So you can deliver customized banner ads without the waste of scattershot messaging. With acquiring of IQ2Net(ph), we're taking data integrity to a level it's never been reached before that includes name, address, demographics, psychographics and click-stream behavior.

ABRAMSON: Click stream--that's the trail left by every click you make on your mouse when you're online. Chester and others say this kind of precision has created a surveillance tool Orwell never could have imagined. Web sites can store and search records of what you bought, whether you've visited a site with health information, whether you've visited a porn site. Yet, Web advertising firms say the goal is not surveillance, it is the delivery of personalized service. Marty Abrams of credit giant Experian describes a future that restores

the intimacy of the shop on the corner.

Mr. MARTY ABRAMS (Experian): In today's marketplace, we've lost the intimacy of that old neighborhood shopping district, and we've tried to replace that intimacy with knowledge to give us the same sense of unique service, unique value for the consumer, and information technology allows us to do that in ways that are revolutionizing the market.

ABRAMSON: But privacy advocates say consumers would be shocked if they knew their online activities are being tracked and stored. Shari Steele of the Electronic Frontier Foundation says many consumers think they are anonymous online. She says the analogy with the well-meaning shopkeeper is off-base.

Ms. SHARI STEELE (Electronic Frontier Foundation): It would be a shopkeeper who was watching you as you were browsing through their store. They're following you down the aisles, peering at everything you pick up and look at. It's also the shopkeeper who you've walked in and you've got stamped on your forehead all of the purchases that you've made at previous stores that you've gone to.

ABRAMSON: Clearly, the Internet has changed the privacy landscape. The big question is whether the law needs to change to keep up. Commercial interests are careful to frame the issue as a battle for their constitutional rights, not as a fight for profit. They insist that as long as they gather data about consumers fairly, they have a First Amendment right to use that information as they like. And some constitutional scholars like UCLA Law Professor Eugene Volokh agree. Volokh argues that putting shackles on the use of data necessarily violates someone's right to free speech.

Professor EUGENE VOLOKH (UCLA Law Professor): When we talk about people having control over personal information, what that means is control over others speaking about them, because when people are complaining about informational privacy--not the other kinds of privacy, but informational privacy--what they're asserting is a right to stop others from speaking about us.

ABRAMSON: In the US, laws typically protect information that has been abused.

For example, we can thank would-be Supreme Court Justice Robert Bork for the video rental law, which was passed after his cinematic interests became public knowledge. That's why many say in the computer age, law will never be able to keep up with technological change. Many feel technology itself must be harnessed as a tool to enhance privacy rights. Harvard Law Professor Lawrence Lessig writes in his new book "Code" that will only happen if we pass a law that looks at information as a piece of property.

Professor LAWRENCE LESSIG (Harvard Law Professor; Author, "Code"): But if a law were to, for example, create a property interest in the individual to control the data, then there would be an incentive created to actually facilitate negotiation about exchanging this kind of property, and just create the incentives and the market will build the technology for doing it.

ABRAMSON: Lessig and others envision software that would allow you to control who gets your information. You might specify that only your doctor has access to health-related information, but you might decide that records of your purchases would only go to merchants who offer a discount in exchange. All this high-minded talk about privacy presumes that Americans hold this issue high on their list of human rights. But reality offers a different picture of Americans' willingness to share their secrets.

(Excerpt from "Jerry Springer")

Mr. JERRY SPRINGER (Host): Welcome to the show. Today we're talking to guests who want to tell their loved ones, 'I've been sleeping with another lover behind your back.'

(Soundbite of audience reaction)

(End of excerpt)

ABRAMSON: How are we to reconcile privacy with a world of "Jerry Springer" shows and kiss-and-tell best sellers, a world where people carry on personal conversations on their cell phones in the middle of the grocery store? Many Americans say that what they really want is something in return for their privacy, a fair exchange for their personal information. It may be then

that

Americans will end up with the power to bargain for their privacy rather than with an inviolate bubble of personal space. And many say it would be good if privacy was viewed a bit more realistically.

Mr. AMITAI ETZIONI (Author, "The Limits of Privacy"): We do need to remember that privacy is not an absolute right. All rights have to be balanced against public interest.

ABRAMSON: Amitai Etzioni says that Americans have come to overvalue privacy.

His new book, "The Limits of Privacy," argues that guarding personal information has cost lives--for example, because most states do not require AIDS tests for new mothers, even though it could save babies from the disease. Etzioni says keeping some information public is just as important as protecting privacy.

Mr. ETZIONI: Within a community, the right to gossip, so to speak, or to share information, accurate or inaccurate, is essential for the fabric of the community to work. My way of saying this in one sentence is it takes a village to prevent an indecent act.

ABRAMSON: Others go further, saying our fixation on privacy now is symptomatic of a narcissistic society. They say the growth of public information isn't harming anyone. Information gathered by online merchants might lead to targeted advertising, but is that an invasion of privacy? In the end, the key issue here may be one of equality, not privacy. Janlori Goldman of Georgetown University's Health Privacy Project has been lobbying for better privacy protection for years. She says that whether the government or a corporation wants information about you, citizens must be on an equal footing and be able to say no.

Ms. JANLORI GOLDMAN (Georgetown University's Health Privacy Project): You are forced to give up information about yourself to fully participate in society: to get a driver's license, to apply for insurance, to see a doctor. So the real question is: Do we consider information to be so fundamental to ourselves that

we should get to decide who gets to know what about us under what circumstances?

And it's not always about ownership; it's about a privacy right in information.

ABRAMSON: Goldman insists that citizens should not have to trade privacy for basic services. But any absolute prohibitions on how companies use information are unpopular in Washington and in state Legislatures these days. The trend is to let Americans choose for themselves whether to limit how others use their information. That means that regardless of the public debate over privacy, Americans in the 21st century will have to define the limits of their personal sphere in private. Larry Abramson, NPR News, Washington.

(Soundbite of music)

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

4 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 American Lawyer Media

The Legal Intelligencer

December 23, 1999 Thursday

SECTION: FRONT PAGE ; ncaa; Pg. 1

LENGTH: 1084 words

HEADLINE: 3rd Cir. OKs NCAA's Use of SAT Scores

BYLINE: By Shannon P. Duffy, U.S. Courthouse Correspondent

BODY:

Court Determines NCAA Can't Be Sued Under Title VI

A federal appeals court yesterday overturned a lower court ruling in favor of minority student-athletes who claim the National Collegiate Athletic Association discriminates against them by using SAT scores to decide eligibility for freshman year play.

The ruling in Cureton v. NCAA says little about race or standardized tests,

however, since the appellate court was concerned almost entirely with the threshold issue of whether such a lawsuit can be brought against the NCAA under

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. It's a total victory for the NCAA's lawyers,

David P. Bruton and Michael W. McTigue Jr. of Drinker Biddle & Reath who said

yesterday that they were "gratified" that the court adopted some of the arguments they've been making all along. At the same time, it's a stunning setback for the plaintiff's team attorneys Andre L. Dennis and Danielle Banks of

Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, along with J. Richard Cohen of the Southern

Poverty Law Center and Adele P. Kimmel of Trial Lawyers for Public Justice in

Washington. The plaintiffs were victorious in the lower court when U.S. District

Judge Ronald L. Buckwalter struck down the NCAA's "Proposition 16" after finding

that it had a disparate impact on African-Americans and that there were several

alternatives that would serve the NCAA's goal of raising graduation rates among

athletes while resulting in less racial disproportionality. Now a three-judge

panel of the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled, over a partial dissent, that the case must be dismissed because the NCAA is not a "direct"

recipient of federal funds. Although an NCAA affiliate, the National Youth

Sports Program, does directly receive federal funds to operate a summer education and sports instruction program at NCAA schools, the court found that

such a connection was not enough to go forward with the type of Title VI claim

brought in *Cureton*. As a statute, Title VI prohibits only "intentional" discrimination claims. The *Cureton* suit was filed under regulations that allow

claims of disparate impact ones in which a race-neutral practice is found to

have an impact on a racial minority group. But U.S. Circuit Judge Morton I. Greenberg said that because such disparate impact claims are brought under the

regulations instead of the statute, they are "program specific." As a result,

Greenberg said, the NCAA can't be sued based solely on its connection to the

NYSP for conduct that has nothing to do with the NYSP. Greenberg also rejected

the argument that the NCAA can be held liable based on its connection to its

member schools, all of which are recipients of federal funds. That theory, he

said, was flatly rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *NCAA v. Smith*

which held
that the NCAA is not subject to Title IX merely because it receives funds
from
members who receive federal funds. Turning to the regulations, Greenberg
found
that they require recipients like NYSP to make assurances that the
program will
not discriminate on the basis of race. But Greenberg said it was improper
to
extend the regulations so far as to allow suits over anything other than
the
federally funded program itself. "Clearly, these provisions cannot possibly
accommodate a reading of the regulations so that as a matter of course
their
discriminatory impact aspects are applied beyond the specific program
receiving
federal assistance," Greenberg wrote. "We are constrained to reach this conclusion, as it is obvious that a recipient of
federal financial
assistance
need not give an assurance of nondiscrimination with respect to programs
in no
way affecting the federally assisted program." Greenberg, who was joined by
Senior U.S. Circuit Judge Walter K. Stapleton, also rejected the argument
that
the NCAA can be held liable based on the federal funding its member
colleges
receive. In a partial dissent, U.S. Circuit Judge Theodore A. McKee said he
agreed that the liability could not be established by looking to the NYSP
funds. But McKee said he would have remanded the case to Buckwalter for
further
exploration of two theories the plaintiffs advanced for basing NCAA
liability on
the federal funds that its member schools receive. Under the first theory,
McKee
said, the plaintiffs wanted to show that the NCAA is the "controlling
entity" of
its member schools; under the second theory, they argued that the NCAA is
the
alter ego of the NYSP and is therefore a direct recipient of federal
funds. But
Greenberg flatly rejected the theory that the NCAA controls its member
schools. "The ultimate decision as to which freshmen an institution will
permit
to participate in varsity intercollegiate athletics ... belongs to the
member
schools," Greenberg wrote. "The fact that the institutions make these
decisions
cognizant of NCAA sanctions does not mean that the NCAA controls them,
because
they have the option, albeit unpalatable, of risking sanctions or
voluntarily
withdrawing from the NCAA." NCAA general counsel Elsa Cole had a technical
comment for a ruling that turned on a technicality. "We can't violate a
law we're

not subject to," Cole said. But she added that the NCAA regularly reviews and modifies its eligibility rules in order to ensure they are fair. The NCAA rule was challenged by four black athletes in Philadelphia who contended they were denied athletic scholarships or sports eligibility because they did not score the minimum on the Scholastic Assessment Test or American College Test. Dubbed Proposition 16, the rule dictates minimum eligibility guidelines for freshmen in the 302 schools that comprise the NCAA's Division I. They include minimum scores of 820 on the SAT or 16 on the ACT, a core group of high school courses and a minimum grade-point average in that core. Plaintiffs' attorney Dennis said he was disappointed by the ruling and is considering an appeal. He said, however, the ruling was only based on a technicality and does not absolve the NCAA from any wrongdoing. "The appeals court ruling does not disturb the lower court's ruling that Proposition 16 causes a disparate impact on African-American athletes," said Dennis. The tests have long been a subject of debate in the academic and athletic worlds as to whether they are discriminatory. The Associated Press contributed to this report. (Copies of the 38-page opinion in Cureton v. NCAA, PICS NO. 99-2363, are available from The Legal Intelligencer. Please refer to the Pennsylvania Instant Case Service order form on Page 2.)

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

5 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 Microsoft Corporation

Slate Magazine

December 21, 1999, Tuesday

SECTION: Kausfiles

LENGTH: 909 words

HEADLINE: Dumb and Dumber!

BYLINE: Mickey Kaus

BODY:

Liberal Media Bias Lives! Exhibit A: "Minority Growth Slips at Top Private Schools," read the headline on yesterday's front-page New York Times story by Randal C. Archibold. You could have been forgiven for muttering, "Uh oh," and thinking here was another example of the project of racial integration collapsing. But the alarmist headline was a Nixonian trick--Nixonian in the sense of that president's notorious declaration, while prices were soaring in the early 1970s, that "we have slowed the rise in the rate of inflation." Prices were still rising. The rate at which prices were rising was still rising. Only the rate at which that rate was rising wasn't rising anymore.

The Times headline wasn't quite that deceptive, but it was close. It turns out that minority enrollment isn't falling. It's increasing. It was 11 percent in 1970, and 19 percent in 1990, and it's "about 21 percent" now. What's the problem, then? It seems, Archibold ominously notes, that "the pace of growth has slowed." But should we really expect the minority share of enrollments not just to keep growing but to keep growing at its initial pace? Even in the best of all possible civil-rights environments, the rate of increase would have to slow down sometime, wouldn't it, as minority admissions approached a fair, non-discriminatory level? ...

It turns out there is a story buried in Archibold's piece, but it's mostly a success story. Minority children are indeed accepted at private schools, but even though "they can afford the steep tuition," their parents "often choose other options, including parochial schools and a move to the suburbs" where the public schools "have a better reputation." Isn't this basically a heartening trend? Integrating the suburbs is arguably more important than integrating Fieldston. At elite private schools, Archibold tells us, minority students fear cultural isolation. They also fear becoming the "subject of speculation" as to whether they are beneficiaries of race preferences. Yet the overall

picture is
positive: The private schools are becoming more integrated while the
suburbs are
becoming more integrated, too. "Private School Minority Enrollment Holds
Steady
Even as Qualified Students Move to Suburbs" would have been a more
accurate
headline. ...

Liberal Media Bias Lives! Exhibit B: Meanwhile, on Page B3, the spread
of
half-baked faux-Dowdism continues with John Kifner's "Metro" section story
headlined "Giuliani's Hunt for Red Menaces." Kifner writes: "A decade
after the
fall of the Berlin Wall signaled the swift collapse of communism's Evil
Empire,
Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani is still darkly wary of Marxist influence in
the nooks
and crannies of the city." It seems the mayor didn't like it when the
leader of
a dissident group of transit workers decried "an orgy of profit-making"
by New
York business over Christmas. The union leader said, "They're not going
to rake
it in if the trains aren't running." Giuliani argued that that "means
taking
jobs away from people," and said it reflected a "true misunderstanding of
what
America is all about. That comes from the influence of Marxism, and if
you need
any better indication of it, it was said at a Marxist study group."

Kifner implicitly ridicules this statement--the mayor, he says, "has
discerned a sinister Marxist tinge"--but he never explains why it's
ridiculous.
Are there no Marxists left after the fall of the Wall? Was the power of
Marx and
Marxism entirely bound up in the fate of Eastern Bloc capital "C"
Communism?
That's not what they taught me in my Marxist study group! Has Kifner
heard of
the New Left? And isn't it true that Marxists have a vision of class
conflict
that is at odds with a vision (embraced by Giuliani) that sees an "orgy of
profit-making" as a good thing because everyone has an interest in
capitalist
prosperity? ... Kifner doesn't even tell us whether the union leader's
statement
really was "said at a Marxist study group." Giuliani apparently must be a
wacky
McCarthyist paranoid regardless of whether he's telling the truth. ...
Kifner's
piece makes sense only as an appeal to the unexamined liberal
(anti-anti-Communist) biases of his readers. ... A couple of Kifner's

other
examples do show that Giuliani has a tendency to view any deploring of
class
disparities as "Marxist." But the mayor pays Marx more respect by
recognizing
that his philosophy has some meaning worth criticizing than Kifner does by
acting as if it is so dead and meaningless that anyone who takes it
seriously is
a fool. ...

In the middle of his piece, Kifner veers off and makes fun of Giuliani
for
having "expanded his horizon to foreign affairs last week." It seems the
mayor
lamented that Fidel Castro had been "romanticized," and urged asylum for
6-year-old Eli n Gonz lez. And this was ridiculous because ... why,
exactly?
Because Castro is a Marxist? But Giuliani didn't use the word "Marxist" to
describe Castro (though it surely would have been appropriate). He was
adding
his two cents to a controversy in the news, and his position on asylum was
hardly outlandish. ...

Kifner's smug, sneering piece wasn't labeled "News Analysis." But that
wouldn't have saved it. ...

[So the Times has a liberal bias. Isn't that an easy target?--ed. "First
shoot the fish in the barrel." Plus the Times seems to be getting worse,
playing
to its target NPR demographic the same way NBC Nightly News plays to
geriatric
women.]

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

6 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 Microsoft Corporation

Slate Magazine

December 15, 1999, Wednesday

SECTION: Movie Club, The

LENGTH: 666 words

HEADLINE: Hankering for the Old Hanks

BYLINE: David Edelstein; David Edelstein is Slate's movie critic. Sarah
Kerr is a
regular contributor to Slate and the New York Review of Books. Elvis

Mitchell

currently reviews films for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, but will soon be doing so for the New York Times. Roger Ebert is the film critic for the Chicago Sun-Times and co-host of the television program Roger Ebert & the Movies.

BODY:

As I'm sure someone has reminded you, Sarah, Samantha Morton in Sweet and Lowdown isn't a "deaf-mute" but a mere mute: How else could she worship the protagonist's artistry? Better than a mute, I might add: She is a mute who does laundry. It's the talent for laundry that puts her closest to Woody Allen's heart, I bet.

Yes, we can all agree, Roger demonstrates unparalleled "consideration for readers" and "habitual fairness." Roger, you have evolved into the conscience of the American cinema. But I ask you: Isn't that role sometimes paralyzing? You treat The Green Mile as if it's a humanist milestone on the order of To Kill a Mockingbird. But it has been more than a third of a century since Mockingbird's Great White Father and that shambling, saintly black martyr who pays for the sex crimes of white men--and in-between came the civil-rights movement. Isn't it time to retire this archetype? Isn't it so violently at odds with reality that it threatens to do more harm than good? (How disillusioning that some African-Americans have rough edges.) And while I'm at it: Why'd you like that damn Jar Jar picture???

I'm sympathetic to your complaints about critics who loudly swap opinions at screenings, but I think it's more an issue for you (and Elvis, now) than for me. I could broadcast my views over the PA system and no one would much care, whereas word of your likes or dislikes would promptly make its way through the ranks to studio presidents, CEOs, and world leaders. (I refrain from saying what I think after most movies not because I want to tantalize people but because I reserve the right to change my mind in the course of writing a review.) Anyway, I'm always happy to eavesdrop on what people are saying in screening rooms or

theaters--I often use that stuff in my columns, the tackier the better.

Sarah: I hate to say it, but the "guyness" in this year's movies might be the corollary to all those young, hot-dogging male directors whom we've been celebrating. But there have still been a ton of great female performances. John Sayles, the last proud liberal-feminist, wrote a beautiful part for Mary Elizabeth Mastrantonio in *Limbo* that she turned into one of the comebacks of the decade. Like Janet McTeer in *Tumbleweeds*, she plays a woman who's a, well, tumbleweed who gravitates to men she shouldn't gravitate to and takes her long-suffering daughter along for the fall. I suppose you'd say these are soft roles, victims' roles, but both actresses give these women complex consciousnesses--they fall and watch themselves falling, and they subtly comment on their trajectories.

A very, very strange performance is Sigourney Weaver's in *A Map of the World*.

As in *The Good Mother*, the issue is a woman's self-destructive impulses in a society that has fixed expectations of how mothers and caregivers should behave.

She can't forgive herself for a tragic accident on her property, and in ways that I'm still trying to sort out, she helps to bring about her own--and her family's--near ruin. Weaver plays this woman from the outset as unhinged, and the first-time director, Scott Elliot, doesn't modulate her craziness enough.

But by the end, the performance makes sense: It's as if she's scything her way home through a thicket of her own unmanageable emotions--and she gets there.

As for Hanks, let me say that I think he's still a wonderful actor but am sorry that such a heavy spirit has descended upon him. He was once the breeziest of goofballs--but with a greater emotional range than almost any other goofball.

A few weeks back I was reminiscing about the old Hanks with Pauline Kael. (Yes,

I admit it--I've talked to her. I'm a fellow traveler.) We both confessed a fondness for *Turner and Hooch*. Then I said, "It's too bad they had to kill Hooch, though. I mean, what big-funny-dog movie ends with the dog getting blown away?"

"Be thankful," said Pauline. "If Hanks made it today there would be a

memorial service."

See you tomorrow.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

7 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 Information Access Company,
a Thomson Corporation Company;

ASAP

Copyright 1999 Cahners Publishing Company

Publishers Weekly

December 13, 1999

SECTION: No. 50, Vol. 246; Pg. 46 ; ISSN: 0000-0019

IAC-ACC-NO: 58352360

LENGTH: 32 words

HEADLINE: FREE PRESS; Review; book reviews

BODY:

I May Not Get There with You: The True Martin Luther King, Jr. (Jan.,
\$ 25)

by Michael Eric Dyson challenges readers to embrace the humanity and
radical
genius of the civil rights leader.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

IAC-CREATE-DATE: December 29, 1999

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

8 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 Microsoft Corporation

Slate Magazine

December 6, 1999, Monday

SECTION: in other magazines

LENGTH: 1123 words

HEADLINE: Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell

BYLINE: Eve Gerber

BODY:

New York Times Magazine, Dec. 12

The cover story heralds *The Talented Mr. Ripley*--a forthcoming movie about a man who assumes the identity of an aristocrat--as a brilliant meditation on the

American dream of self-reinvention, but spoils the film by quoting its dialogue,

describing its scenes in detail, and revealing almost every plot twist. A profile laments Jesse Jackson's evolution into "the outsider's insider."

His

Wall Street Project, a campaign to diversify boardrooms and broaden access to

capital, is "trickle-down civil rights." The primary beneficiaries are middle

class, and the downtrodden receive no direct benefit. An essay skewers public

figures who remain coy about their sexual orientation. Gore campaign manager

Donna Brazile, Ed Koch, Rosie O'Donnell, and Ricky Martin will reveal every

detail of their private lives, but won't say whether they're gay or straight.

The "Kinda Ask, Sorta Tell" approach insults open-minded Americans.

Newsweek and Time, Dec. 13

A Newsweek cover story depicts the anti-World Trade Organization demonstrators as the "new face of protest." The protesters, who ranged from

violent anarchists opposing private property to topless Lesbian Avengers objecting to bovine-growth hormone, shared "a new mood of radical activism" and

a "sense of alienation" from global capitalism. Time declares the WTO meeting a

"disaster" for free-traders. "From now on, every objection [to global trade]

will be illuminated by the fires of last week." (Slate's "" explains how the WTO

became a boogeyman.)

Time's cover package lionizes Sen. John McCain. The anchor profile argues

that McCain's amazing life story is his "running mate," but to broaden his support he must "build a bridge from his bio to his issues." An article

says

Disney's *Fantasia 2000* film project may invigorate middlebrow culture with its

fusion of classical music and brilliant animation.

A Newsweek piece claims that "Internet brain drain" is hobbling big corporations. New talent and lower-level executives are lured to startups by the promise of wealth and career fulfillment. Businesses are fighting back by offering more stock options, creating "pseudo-entrepreneurial" environments, and pointing out dot-com failure rates. A profile urges Pete Rose to apologize for past bets. Seventy-four percent of Americans believe he should be allowed back in baseball. An overdue, abject confession could help his cause.

U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 13

The cover story claims a "new generation of wireless services" will change the way the world communicates. Finland is leading the way toward a "networked society," with wireless services such as phone banking and mobile sports updates. Sixty-seven percent of Finns carry cell phones (usually domestically made, user-friendly Nokias.) ... A piece claims that George W. Bush and John McCain share a common mission to redefine conservatism. Both pols "have little patience for the libertarian aversion to government." An article explores the incredible panda industry. The most sought-after zoo animals, pandas are rented out by China for exorbitant prices. The National Zoo just paid \$8 million to house a pair for 10 years. (Slate's Hsing-Hsing "" argues that the quasi-bears aren't worth the fuss.)

The New Yorker, Dec. 13

An article wallops biology guru Stephen Jay Gould for providing intellectual cover to creationists. "America's unofficial evolutionist laureate" opposes biological progressivism--the belief that evolution is inclined toward developing complexity--because it was used to justify racism. His shoddy pop science bolsters the creationist cause by exaggerating holes in the fossil record and stressing the randomness of evolution. A review pummels Gail Sheehy's *Hillary's Choice*. The book analyzes its subject's psychosexual history based on little but gossip. (Read Slate's take in ".")

Weekly Standard, Dec. 13

The cover story argues that George W. Bush's management of the Texas Rangers

indicates he would be an effective president. Bush delegated day-to-day decisions but was a constant cheerleader in the ballpark, raised morale enormously, and was beloved by everyone he worked with. The traditionalist stadium he built jacked up attendance and revenues. An article about the

WTO

protests contends that "Seattle had it coming" because it's filled with liberals

who support banning discrimination against transsexuals, resist kicking disorderly drunks out of parks, and affectionately call their city "Sodom on the Sound."

The Nation, Dec. 20

The cover story reveals that Ralph Nader is preparing for a White House run.

Nader will actively campaign on the Green Party ticket to secure public funding

for lower-level party candidates and publicize his view that corporations excessively dominate civil society.

New Republic, Dec. 20

A cover story argues that it pays to play dumb in politics. While Al Gore

"has the appearance of a man who prepared for a spelling bee and found himself

in a swimsuit competition," George W. Bush's apparent "boredom with the details

of governance" is a political asset. Voters are seeking "a president who will

make us proud--and do little else." A cover story traces the similarities between George W. Bush and John F. Kennedy. Both were privileged, preppy "reluctant dauphins" to political dynasties, who caroused and earned C's

at

college. Both relied on daddy's allies, outspent their opponents, and sought to

avenge their fathers' political defeats. An article celebrates the Battle in

Seattle: Protests against such minor matters as genetically modified food demonstrate that the world has conquered more critical problems. (Slate's

""

explains how the World Trade Organization became a boogeyman.)

Economist, Dec. 4

The cover editorial applauds the establishment of a power-sharing parliament

in Northern Ireland as providing "a realistic hope for durable peace."

The new

North-South council will appease Nationalists, and the British-Irish council

will reassure Unionists. Dispersed government, European Union membership, affluence, and secularization could defuse ancient animosities. (For more

on

Northern Ireland, see ".") A piece explains how the "open content movement" will transform the way we work. Open-source projects--such as the operating system Linux--rely on online collaboration to improve. An "Open Law" experiment asks

Web surfers to contribute arguments to a high-tech legal brief. An article

recommends the LifeShirt--a turtleneck with six built-in medical sensors. LifeShirts measure vital signs and relay the information to palm-sized computers, which download the data for online diagnosis.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999

9 of 9 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 1999 Information Access Company,
a Thomson Corporation Company;
ASAP
Copyright 1999 America Press, Inc.

America

November 6, 1999

SECTION: No. 14, Vol. 181; Pg. 20 ; ISSN: 0002-7049

IAC-ACC-NO: 57234452

LENGTH: 1238 words

HEADLINE: Second Thoughts; efforts by post-baby boom Catholics to close the School of the Americas

BYLINE: Beaudoin, Tom

BODY:

Tom Beaudoin is a doctoral candidate at Boston College and the author of Virtual Faith: The Irreverent Spiritual Quest of Generation X. He is at work on a book about Catholic identity.

hen that nostalgic softening of the lines around middle-aged eyes joins the voice of resignation, disappointment and old-fashioned scolding- that's when I know the criticism is coming: "Your generation." (Pursed lips, both of us.)
"What happened? Why don't you care about politics, like we did?"

For good reasons, many of our parents and mentors wonder if today's young adults inherited their passion for-or even literacy about- national political causes. They rightly wonder if the torch of activism for civil rights and feminism (and church reform) is being passed on.

For many of us in the post-boomer generations, the campaign to close the School of the Americas is a prime opportunity to redeem ourselves and cancel the popular image of us as self-centered materialists. Many young Catholics are risking this stance almost anonymously, in the midst of a post-Vietnam generation that has never had to commit itself en masse to a serious public political decision.

In attempting to inform my conscience better on this issue, I recently visited the school at Fort Benning, Ga., in the flesh and without fanfare or placard, bullhorn or camera crew. In doing so, I confronted the shadow side of my self-satisfaction with my stance in the S.O.A. debate. The clarity and certainty of my conscience were disrupted by meeting S.O.A. employees, human beings whom I had been prepared to revile, and by walking inside the halls I had wanted to condemn with a prophetic, dramatic gesture, a condescending blessing, a smug Sign of the Cross. Face to face with real people, not devils, I was up against the knowledge that despite my conviction that I was on the "right" side of the issue-or because of it-my conscience could be enticed to cloak righteousness in self-righteousness. As I entered the building my raised pulse rate registered an impending sense that I could not reduce this experience, and maybe the larger debate over the S.O.A., to a matter of The Brave Priest versus Cowardly Colonels, David versus Goliath, or even Good (Us) versus Evil (Them).

The school, which had the self-important, muted bustle of an academic building, was brightly polished and studded with the symbol system of the U.S. and Latin American militaries. Under the courteous-and not at all sinister-eye of my chaperone, I toured classes in which soldiers from Latin American countries plotted military strategy, learned about human rights and studied first aid. Everyone was real, not demonic; human, not Government

Automaton. I

had to admit that S.O.A. staffers were other than what I needed them to be in order to feel confident about my own politics.

The undramatic details worked on me: the gentle drawl of the long-haired

S.O.A. librarian who spent several minutes explaining a loan system only a librarian could love; the faces of the Latin American soldiers, in their countries' uniforms, revealing pride, acid roughness, world-weariness and even

thin, deep trenches engraved in the most rugged brown face by years of laughter.

I am embarrassed to report that I noticed I did not sense objective evil in

anyone. And yet, I thought, the memory of every violently interrupted life at

the hands of S.O.A.-trained soldiers demands that I not allow seductive dehumanization entry into my imagination, no matter how prophetic I consider my stance to be.

This dehumanization is too easy to come by. I fear that, like myself, both sides in this debate could be tempted to it.

One "Frequently Asked Questions" document published by the school alleges

that "many critics [of the S.O.A.] supported Marxism-Liberation Theology-in

Latin America-which was defeated with the assistance of the U.S. Army." It is

hard to know what is more execrable, the simple equation of Marxism with liberation theology, or the Army's reported defeat of this theology. Thus are

the school's critics cast as Marxists, Others, Not Like Us. Although the school's major critics at School of the Americas Watch do not typically stoop so

low, I have attended many talks in which the S.O.A. is referred to repeatedly-often in a disarming but condescendingly loving tone-as the "School

of the Assassins," and the S.O.A.W. Web site features a distorted S.O.A. logo

displaying a human skull wearing a beret with a dangling noose. Thus do S.O.A.W.

staffers risk being cast as Assassins, Others, Not Like Us.

Dehumanization thrives when dialogue withers. For various reasons, attempts

at dialogue between the two sides have been abandoned several times. Yet a series of dialogues is exactly what is needed to clear the fog of charges, countercharges and insinuations that lead to demonization and that now cover

this debate like the summer smog over Atlanta, just northeast of Fort

Benning.

Facing the shadow side of my convictions gave rise to difficult questions.

How much of my desire to shut down S.O.A. is motivated by a thirst for revenge-surely an unacceptable motive-against those who killed or caused the

disappearance of thousands of Latin Americans, including some of my own Catholic

heroes? Such necessary soul-searching on the part of critics like myself, however, does not absolve the S.O.A. The school cannot continue to point to the

good their graduates do while disclaiming any ability to "track" graduates after

they're gone. If they claim the successes of their alumni, they must also take

some responsibility for their failures. While I must check my thirst for revenge

and my temptation to deny the human dignity of S.O.A. supporters, the S.O.A.

must fully and publicly make an act of apology and repentance for sins of commission or, especially, omission in preparing the ground for past graduates

to commit atrocities. The failure to make this act only quickens the determination of those of us who work to shut down the school.

Imagine with me the scandalous possibility of the S.O.A. staff and its critics sharing a eucharistic celebration. Because denominational limitations

keep us from celebrating the Eucharist formally together does not mean that both

sides cannot adopt a eucharistic spirit toward this debate, imaging those Not

Like Us as fully dignified members of the body of Christ. It is the only appropriately Christian spirit I can conceive in these tense days of threatened

funding, mutual suspicion and the impending protest in November.

As of this writing, S.O.A.W. has proposed two debates for November, one at

Columbus University in Georgia and one at Fort Benning. I hope the S.O.A. will

accept the offer and that the participants will strive to make the debate a

eucharistic dialogue. It is up to all of us who sympathize with S.O.A.W. to make

sure that, at least for "our side," that happens.

I will be at the School of the Americas Watch protest this November at the

gates of the S.O.A. I will be just one member of my generation trying to find

the right tenor for my Christian political voice, not so shrill that I become

more confident of my salvation than that of those across the fence-but
not so
humble that I refuse to act with justice, to speak with and for those
whose
voices have been amputated from history. "I came not to call the
righteous, but
sinners"-protestors, defenders and assassins.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

IAC-CREATE-DATE: December 29, 1999

LOAD-DATE: December 30, 1999 ***** Email Completed *****

Time of Delivery: December 30, 1999 11:27 am EST

Email Number: 40:0:5333891

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "LEXIS ("LEXIS /NEXIS Print Delivery" <lexis-nexis@prod.lexis-nexis.com> (R) (R) [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-JAN-2000 11:49:24.00

SUBJECT: civil rights

TO: Irene Bueno (CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
LEXIS-NEXIS Universe Update Report: January 27, 2000 at 11:29

Results from this Update: 6

Next Update: January 27, 2000 at 16:00

Access your results at:
http://web.lexis-nexis.com/lm.universe/pnews/emailAlert?_pnewsAlert=0x000101a9-0x00004b26%2f0x000101a9%2f20000127%2f11%3a28%3a51

1 of 6 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company

Los Angeles Times

January 27, 2000, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: Metro; Part B; Page 9; Op Ed Desk

LENGTH: 726 words

HEADLINE: COMMENTARY;

PERSPECTIVES ON THE STATES OF THE UNION;

THE PROGRAM IS IN THE PREVIEWS;

A PRESIDENT USED TO COUNT ON A CAPTIVE TV AUDIENCE. NOW THE ELECTRONIC
BULLY
PULPIT HAS BEEN REDUCED TO A SOUND BITE.

BYLINE: MATTHEW A. BAUM and SAMUEL KERNELL, Matthew A. Baum is a fellow at
the
UC Institute on Global Conflict, and Cooperation. Samuel Kernell is a

political
science professor at UC, San Diego

BODY:

"The State of the Union is no longer an evening, but a month." With these words, one of President Clinton's chief policy advisors may have signaled the beginning of the end of a nearly century-old tradition of using the annual State of the Union message to introduce the president's legislative agenda.

For the past several years, in the weeks prior to his annual report to the nation, Clinton has introduced a number of proposals that his predecessors would have saved for dramatic unveiling in the State of the Union address.

Two years ago, plans for extending Medicare to uninsured senior citizens, strengthening federal support for child care and additional money for civil rights enforcement were unveiled weeks before the address. Last year, pre-address initiatives included increased defense spending, tax credits for long-term care of the disabled and new money for food safety. This year's early announcements have featured the war on drugs, gun control, new investment in inner cities and extending health insurance to uninsured, low-income families.

Why would Clinton prematurely reveal so many of his legislative ideas and drain his signature address to the nation of its attention-grabbing novelty?

He might be thinking about 1997's fiasco, when, after working on the address for weeks and carefully priming his audience with "leaks" about what the address might say, he found his speech upstaged by the O.J. Simpson civil trial verdict. While the broadcast networks opted to stay with the president's speech, many local news affiliates and cable networks broke away for the jury's verdict.

"With no disrespect to the president of the United States, we will bring you

the verdict as it is read," chimed one Los Angeles affiliate as it prepared to leave the president to cover the verdict. This and other stations that shifted to the O.J. story saw their ratings soar, while network ratings simultaneously plummeted.

Although Clinton does not have to worry about another evening of O.J. during this year's address, neither can he risk putting all of his eggs in the State of the Union basket.

The American television audience has become too fickle for that strategy. With more than 70% of American households subscribing to cable, whenever the president appears on television, an ever-nimbler audience increasingly is switching channels. Rather than trust his ability to keep Americans from reaching for their remotes, Clinton has opted to stretch out his message over the month.

Since 1995, on average, 31% of American households have watched Clinton deliver his addresses. This compares to 53% who watched Richard M. Nixon in 1969. These figures indicate that first-year presidents typically attract larger audiences--undoubtedly a curiosity factor.

President Bush also bucked the downward trend in 1991, when the just-concluded war with Iraq gave Americans a special reason to watch.

In 1998, thanks to the breaking Monica Lewinsky scandal, Clinton enjoyed his largest audience since his first State of the Union. Yet these periodic upward spikes do not mask the stark downward trend in presidents' audiences.

The emergence of television as the ubiquitous household appliance in the late 1950s ushered in an era in which presidents enjoyed a captive television audience and frequently staked their influence in Washington on their ability to mobilize public opinion behind their policies. The rise of cable has ended this brief "golden age" of presidential television. Clinton has quickly adapted to this new fact of presidential life.

Except for his unavoidable apology to the nation, a declaration of victory in Kosovo and his obligatory State of the Union addresses, Clinton has

stayed off
prime-time television throughout his second term. This compares to Ronald Reagan's 25 prime-time television appearances during the first half of his second term.

Now the president is downsizing the State of the Union address. Clinton is counting on television news to carry his message to the people. It is unclear whether a series of pre-edited, 10-second sound bites will preserve his capacity to define national issues. What is clearer is that he has little choice.

(BEGIN TEXT OF INFOBOX / INFOGRAPHIC)

State of the Union Ratings

Percentage of U.S. households that watched

*

Source Nelson Ratings

GRAPHIC: GRAPHIC: State of the Union Ratings, Los Angeles Times

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: January 27, 2000

2 of 6 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company

Los Angeles Times

January 27, 2000, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 11; National Desk

LENGTH: 597 words

HEADLINE: COMMUNIST SYMPATHY LEADS GROUP TO HELP ELIAN, CRITICS SAY

BYLINE: ROBERT L. JACKSON, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

The National Council of Churches, which has plunged into the middle of the
Elian Gonzalez case, is a controversial organization that often has
espoused liberal causes. Critics accuse it of having been too cozy with Marxist governments abroad.

The 50-year-old council, which includes 35 Protestant and Orthodox denominations with 52 million members, is a longtime supporter of the civil
rights movement in the United States and has helped rebuild burned-out churches
in black communities of the South over the last two years. Its president is
Andrew Young, the former United Nations ambassador and associate of the late
Martin Luther King Jr.

But critics say that the council often has been too friendly toward the Communist governments of Cuba and North Korea and say that it has failed to
speak out against human rights abuses in those nations, a charge that the organization disputes. It cites its decades of work to alleviate poverty abroad
and resettle refugees here.

Detractors say it is no surprise that the council is on the same side as Fidel Castro in the Gonzalez case. Castro is supporting the efforts of the 6-year-old's Cuban family--his father and grandparents--to have Elian returned
to his homeland.

Roy Lloyd, a council official, said of its longtime involvement with churches
in Cuba: "We were there before Castro and we'll be there after Castro."

The journey of Elian's grandmothers to the United States on an aircraft chartered by the council originated with a Dec. 9 phone call from the head of
Cuba's church council, Lloyd said.

The Gonzalez case fit squarely with the U.S. council's mission to work for
family unification and promote understanding among religious people worldwide,
officials said. A council brochure says that the organization "works for peace
and justice in the United States, addressing issues ranging from poverty and
racism to the environment, family ministries, disability and much more."

Overseas, the council has undertaken "cooperative efforts with U.S. denominations and their congregations that have resettled some 400,000

refugees
in this country," according to its literature.

"Any group that works for social justice gets accused of being Communist,"
observed Carol Fouke, a council executive. "Certainly a lot of nuns and priests
have been tarred with that brush, as well as civil rights leaders.

"We maintain relations with church councils all over the world." In some cases, she said, the U.S. government and the government of another country have good relations. In other cases, the "governments are hostile" or "unconcerned."

In the case of Elian, the council's new general secretary, Robert W. Edgar, a former Democratic member of Congress from Pennsylvania, flew to Havana with others early this month to help clear the way for the grandmothers' visit. Edgar and his party met with the child's father as well as Castro, who personally expressed satisfaction that the two church councils were working to resolve the situation, officials said.

Edgar, a United Methodist minister, is president of the School of Theology at Claremont, Calif.

Some of the council's detractors, including Mark Tooley, a director of the Washington-based conservative Institute on Religion and Democracy, charged that the council began losing members and became "radicalized in embracing the Marxist-influenced liberation theology of Latin America in the 1970s." Its "left-wing politics," he said, have left the organization millions of dollars in debt, a financial situation acknowledged by council officers.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: January 27, 2000

3 of 6 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company

Los Angeles Times

January 27, 2000, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: Part A; Page 1; Foreign Desk

LENGTH: 1111 words

HEADLINE: COLOMBIAN JUNGLE BASE IS FOCUS OF U.S. ANTI-DRUG AID

BYLINE: ERIC LICHTBLAU, TIMES STAFF WRITER

DATELINE: TRES ESQUINAS, Colombia

BODY:

This base in the lush South American jungle is ground zero for President Clinton's emergency proposal to help fund a massive expansion of Colombia's anti-narcotics operation.

"This is an island in a sea of guerrillas and narco-traffickers," U.S. Army Lt. Col. Jan P. Ithier said as he toured the base--where U.S. special forces troops train and monitor the performance of Colombian soldiers--with an American delegation last week.

U.S. and Colombian authorities are now engaged in an elaborate round of salesmanship to promote the \$ 1.6-billion aid package, which Clinton announced last month, to skeptics in both Washington and Bogota, the Colombian capital, who charge that heaps of new money and old aircraft will do little to ease an intractable problem.

Moreover, some fear that despite the United States' insistence that its soldiers aren't "advising" the Colombians, only training them, Washington could get sucked into another nation's civil war.

Billed as a way to reduce the drug production of a country that supplies 80% of the world's cocaine, the aid package could turn out to be merely "a smoke screen" for fueling Colombia's 40-year battle against leftist guerrillas, said Winifred Tate, a Colombia specialist at the Washington Office on Latin America, a nonprofit research group.

"This isn't good drug policy, and it isn't good human rights policy. I

think

this is going to make everything much worse," she said. While the Colombian army's role in human rights abuses has diminished in the past five years, there is increasing evidence of ties between the military and right-wing private armies that now commit the bulk of violations against civilians.

Colombian President Andres Pastrana is preaching a very different message in Washington this week in meetings with Clinton, congressional leaders and others.

At a speech Wednesday before the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Pastrana said the U.S. can't afford to turn its back on the problem of rampant drug production in Colombia. In U.S. cities and the Colombian countryside alike, he said, "the stakes are too high."

U.S. Army Secretary Louis Caldera and Tom Umberg, the deputy of White House drug czar Gen. Barry R. McCaffrey, visited Colombia last week to determine how the money--if approved by Congress--would be spent. Although the Tres Esquinas base is generally off-limits to the media, U.S. officials invited a Los Angeles Times reporter to accompany them on their visit.

Members of the delegation stressed that Colombia has become the glaring weak spot in the U.S. war on drugs.

Although recent increases have made Colombia the No. 3 recipient of U.S. aid--last year, Washington provided \$ 289 million in anti-narcotics assistance--the country's production of cocaine and heroin has risen sharply in the last few years.

New CIA estimates scheduled for release soon are expected to show that cocaine production is 300% higher than current estimates, officials say.

The U.S. delegation's trip was aimed chiefly at verifying Colombia's progress in reining in drug traffickers. But U.S. officials also faced skeptical questioning from Colombian military officers and media in Bogota.

Why, one officer asked Caldera, doesn't the United States move more aggressively against Colombia's guerrillas by exposing them for "what they really are"--terrorists?

A local reporter suggested that the United States is filling the aid

package
with beat-up old Huey helicopters and "just giving whatever you don't
want to
Colombia."

And another reporter wanted to know what assurances the United States
had
that Colombia's military and its police force, institutions prone to
corruption
in the past, would use the new infusion of aid for fighting drugs.

Caldera appeared unfazed. "We trust the Colombian leadership," he said.

The 60-plus helicopters the Clinton administration wants to give
Colombia for
anti-narcotics operations include both new and used aircraft, all in fine
working order, Caldera said.

"We don't consider these helicopters to be scraps," he added.

As for the guerrillas who control large swaths of Colombia's southern
region,
Caldera said that the United States wants to pursue anyone supporting the
country's drug trade. With increasing frequency, he said, that includes
the
guerrillas, who have financed their attacks on government forces by
extracting
millions in "protection money" from traffickers.

The guerrillas, he said, "made a deal with the devil to run drugs in
order to
generate resources. . . . Once we control drug trafficking, we're going to
control violence in this country."

Aiding Pastrana's administration in the fight against traffickers is
"one of the most important things we're doing here in our own hemisphere,"
Caldera said
in an interview.

If the United States does nothing to help Colombia wage war against drug
producers and traffickers, Caldera said, "you will have a much worse
problem
five years and 10 years from now."

Behind-the-scenes differences remain between the U.S. officials and
their
Colombian counterparts.

U.S. officials, for example, argued that the Colombian police--who,
unlike
the military, are not known for human rights abuses--must more actively
aid the
army in anti-narcotics operations, including intelligence gathering and
lab

work.

During the delegation's visit to the Tres Esquinas military base, where Colombia's first anti-narcotics battalion began operations just last month, U.S. officials were irked to see little sign of a police presence.

"Get them down here!" one U.S. official bluntly told the national police chief after touring the base.

At the same time, U.S. officials said the Colombians have improved operations at the base, about 300 miles south of Bogota.

The base is still primitive by U.S. standards, with most of the Colombian soldiers sleeping outdoors on makeshift cots. But an operations center once run from an oversized tent is now in a new warehouse. An underground bunker was built, and a barbed-wire fence is going up on the perimeter, just a few miles from a town that is controlled by the country's oldest and largest rebel group, known as the FARC.

U.S. observers also said that Colombia's soldiers seem to have shed their ragtag image and assumed a crisper professionalism. They also said the military appears to be placing a higher premium on human rights.

Further progress in human rights "is necessary and achievable . . . if every single soldier, down to the lowest-ranking private, appreciates that due process and respect for human rights are fundamental to the military's larger mission," Caldera told Colombian officers.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: President Clinton escorts Colombian President Andres Pastrana out of the White House. The South American leader was in Washington to seek more anti-drug aid. PHOTOGRAPHER: Associated Press

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: January 27, 2000

4 of 6 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 Chicago Tribune Company

January 27, 2000 Thursday, CHICAGO SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: COMMENTARY; Pg. 20; ZONE: N; Voice of the people (letter.)

LENGTH: 463 words

HEADLINE: COMMUNITIES MUST WELCOME DISABLED

BYLINE: Ray Campbell.

DATELINE: GLEN ELLYN

BODY:

Your Jan. 20 editorial "The new suburban palette," discussing the recent racial profiling and other problems in Highland Park and Mt. Prospect, couldn't have been more on target. Suburban communities need to come to grips with and embrace diversity. That means they must embrace all diversity, not just racial diversity.

The largest minority group in the United States that crosses racial, ethnic and gender boundaries is people with disabilities, about 54 million. It is the only minority group that any individual can join at any time, usually without warning. Communities need to take steps to ensure that people with disabilities can participate in all social, cultural and economic opportunities. This involves more than just following the letter of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the 1990 civil rights law protecting people with disabilities from discrimination in employment, government services, public transportation and public accommodation.

We must look to go beyond the letter of the law to following the spirit of the ADA.

Regardless where a person with a disability chooses to live, he or she should have streets that are safe and accessible for travel. This means curb cuts, accessible pedestrian signals and detectable warnings should be installed.

People with disabilities must have ready access to the transportation services that will help them participate fully in society. Not only does

this

mean that adequate parking must be made available for those in our population who drive, but it also means we must make a commitment to make sure any person with a disability who cannot drive has transportation available to him or her so that he or she is not left imprisoned in his or her home and prevented from being a part of society.

Speaking of participating in society, one of the most rewarding ways to do that is to hold a job. Yet nearly 70 percent of people with disabilities who are of working age are not employed. As a society, we must commit ourselves to hiring the many talented people with disabilities who can perform all sorts of jobs. Kudos to such places as Jewel/Osco and Dominicks who are doing this. More big and small companies need to follow their lead.

We, as people with disabilities and as the only minority that is open to anyone, are just as much a part of the diverse makeup of our communities as are blacks, Hispanics, Asians and women. As a society we must do all that we can to show people with disabilities like me that it is realized that our diversity is just as important as anyone else's. That commitment has not always been there, but with the dawn of the new millennium, now is the best time to make our nation a better, more accessible place, where people with disabilities do not face barriers.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: January 27, 2000

5 of 6 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Tennessean

The Tennessean

January 15, 2000, Saturday CITY EDITION

SECTION: LIVING, Pg. 4D, MS. CHEAP

LENGTH: 1174 words

HEADLINE: CHECK OUT TRIBUTES TO MLK THIS WEEKEND

BYLINE: MARY HANCE

BODY:

With the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. holiday coming up Monday, there are a number of public events honoring the slain civil rights leader that you may want to attend.

Tonight, there is a Nashville Symphony "Let Freedom Ring" concert in Jackson Hall at TPAC, with tickets \$ 10 and \$ 15. Tickets for students and seniors are \$ 5 to \$ 15.

Tomorrow, there's a free gospel concert at 6:30 p.m. at Jefferson Street Missionary Baptist Church, 2708 Jefferson St.

And thanks to Bank of America, a special celebration will be held Monday in Murfreesboro at Childrens Discovery House and the Center for the Arts. First, a legacy to King through music and the arts will be held at 1 p.m. at the Center for the Arts, 110 College St. Then everyone is invited to the Childrens Discovery House for an open house. Children will be able to draw their own dream to be posted on the "I Have a Dream" wall. There also will be stories about King and parent/children activities throughout the afternoon. It's all free. For more information, call 890-2300.

Camp check: Today is the day to check out the camp scene for the summer. From 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. today at Cumberland Science Museum, you can talk to representatives from dozens of day camps and overnight camps for children. This is one-stop shopping and a great way to gather information. If you can't make the one today, mark your calendar for Feb. 5, which is Summer Opportunities Day, 11 a.m.-3 p.m. at University School of Nashville.

More good news: The Cumberland Museum is free all day Saturday so your family can see and enjoy all the fun exhibits while you are there for the fair.

Toddler day: Hickory Hollow Mall is having a Fun and Games Toddler Day 11 a.m.-2 p.m. today in Center Court. All activities are free. This is

designed for children 18 months to 4 years, with activities like Little Tikes Safety Street, Creative Corner, and Music Center. Gerber Graduates will provide snacks and at 2 p.m, a drawing will be held to give away Little Tikes toys to more than 30 lucky winners.

Fabric sale: Textile Fabric at 4051 Hillsboro Road in the H.G. Hill Center is having a sale through Jan. 23, with all fabric 30% off. There is also a table that is marked down 75%.

Opera preview: At 2 p.m. tomorrow, you can get a free behind-the-scenes look at the Nashville Opera's upcoming production Susannah in a sneak preview discussion led by the Nashville Opera's general artistic director John Hoomes.

It's in the auditorium at the Harpeth Hall School, 3801 Hobbs Road. Hoomes will preview the storyline and music of the opera, which will be performed in the Polk Theater at TPAC on Jan. 21, 23 and 25. The discussion is free, but opera tickets run \$ 12-\$ 48. However, there are a few "pay what you can" (suggested \$ 5 minimum) single tickets remaining. They also have \$ 5 "student rush" tickets (if available) 45 minutes before curtain time.

Art reception: You are invited to a free reception 1-3 p.m. tomorrow at Hendersonville Arts Council (Monthaven) featuring photographs by Robin Conover, photography manager for The Tennessee Magazine. For more information, call 822-0789.

Magician and ventriloquist: Jack Austin, magician and ventriloquist, will perform at 10 a.m. Monday at the Williamson County Library, at 611 West Main St. in Franklin. This library also has regular storytimes at 10 a.m. every Wednesday and Thursday, followed by preschool crafts at 10:30 a.m. They also have other activities after school and at night, so call for the schedule: 595-1244.

\$ 5.99 haircuts: There is a sale at all area Great Clips locations starting Thursday and running through Feb. 4, where both adults and kids can get a haircut and blow dry for \$ 5.99. For the shop nearest you, call 1-800-greatclips (1-800-473-2825). Normally, they charge \$ 10-\$ 11 for an adult haircut,

or \$ 8-\$

9 for children 12 and under and seniors 65 and up. With that kind of price, you should be able to afford a nice tip.

Bag sale: The Shopping Bag thrift store at Bethlehem Center, 1417 Charlotte, is holding a bag sale Friday and Saturday. Fill a grocery bag with all of the clothes, shoes and purses you can fit and pay just \$ 1 for it. Store hours are Friday 10 a.m.-4 p.m. and Saturday 10 a.m.-2 p.m.

Blair concerts: Violist Eva Stern and pianist Joel Schoenhals will perform in a free Blair School of Music concert at 3 p.m. tomorrow in the Steve and Judy Turner Concert Hall, 2400 Blakemore Ave. Schoenhals, a Blair alumnus, and his wife, Stern, are the Artistic Faculty Duo at Longwood College in Virginia and have performed and taught across the country.

Trevecca symphony: The Trevecca Symphony Orchestra will offer a free chamber concert at 7:30 p.m. Thursday at Tarter Student Activity Center on the Trevecca campus, 333 Murfreesboro Road. The program will include works by Handel, Scarlatti, Telemann, Boyce and Manfredini.

Imaginarium special: The Imaginarium, the science museum at 1111 Laurel St., is having a January special. If an adult brings a children's or adult coat to donate to the needy, the adult gets in free. Regular admission is \$ 4.50, so this is a good deal for you and for the people who need coats.

Shoe sale: Months ago I wrote about a discount shoe store called Can-Pull Shoes, in Springfield. Well, it's changed its name to Lasting Impressions and it's having a big sale to celebrate. The store is still at 2023N Memorial, across from the Burger King, and they sell shoes, clothes, jewelry, accessories, gifts and Merle Norman cosmetics. The shoes are the deal right now all shoes that were \$ 49 or more are \$ 10 off and all other shoes are \$ 19.99.

Winter breakaway: There is a retreat for women next Saturday at Trevecca Nazarene University. For \$ 17, you get a continental breakfast, a box lunch and a choice of four workshops that focus on being enriched emotionally, physically

and spiritually. For more information, call 248-1355.

USN classes: University School of Nashville this week kicks off its reasonably priced Evening Classes Series. The schedule has something for everyone. A few examples: French for Travelers, Good Skin Sense for All Ages, Uninhibited Art, Just Sew It, Etched in Glass, How to Take Photos You'll Love, How to Get Started in Acting, Behind the Scenes at TPAC, Poetry, self-publishing, Buddhism, investing, golf, bicycling, rock climbing, pool, ballroom dancing, yoga, divorce, understanding memory loss, gardening, cooking and more.

The schedule is unbelievable, with some classes just one session and others as many as three or four. Most classes cost \$ 20 to \$ 50. To register or to find out more, call 321-8019 between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. The classes run Jan. 18-Feb. 12.

Help: Reader Lydie Pruett of Nashville asked if anybody knew a way to get a slick spot off of a pair of pants. She said a pair of her pants has a slick spot about three or four inches in diameter caused from ironing with a iron that was too hot. If you know of a remedy to bring the pants back to life, please let me know.

Stay cheap!

LOAD-DATE: January 27, 2000

6 of 6 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2000 The Tennessean

The Tennessean

January 10, 2000, Monday CITY EDITION

SECTION: LOCAL, Pg. 3B

LENGTH: 743 words

HEADLINE: FOLLOWING IN KING'S FOOTSTEPS;
ON MONDAY, UNITED STATES WILL OBSERVE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY TO HONOR THE
MEMORY OF
CIVIL RIGHTS CHAMPION MARTIN LUTHER KING JR., WHO WAS BORN JAN. 15, 1929.

BYLINE: DIANE LONG STAFF WRITER

BODY:

Kindness and justice are two words with new significance for Nicole Deane and Elyse Landry at the University School of Nashville.

Last year, in teacher Scott Merrick's third-grade class, the girls participated in the Kindness and Justice Challenge, a national program to honor the dream of Martin Luther King Jr.

"I learned that it's really important to help people," said Nicole, 10.

"I learned that justice is to stand up for yourself and do what's right," said Elyse, 9.

Those two basic lessons for life are the foundation of the third annual KJ Challenge. The program is sponsored by Do Something, a national youth leadership organization founded by Martin Luther King III and actor Andrew Shue.

Last year, 2 million students and 17,000 educators from all 50 states participated.

"It is an incredibly simple yet very powerful way to teach young people about giving back to their community," said Lara Galinsky, who helps coordinate the national campaign.

"It's contagious. It grows."

This year's program starts Monday with the national celebration of King's birthday. For two weeks, students are asked to perform acts of kindness and justice, recording each action for a personal and class tally.

"The whole procedure is that children become intentional about doing acts of kindness or justice, which are clearly defined as doing nice things for other people or standing up for what's right," said Merrick, who participated for the first time last year at University School.

"The classroom discussions that this thing drives are just heartwarming and enlightening for everybody, including the teachers."

Now the technology coordinator for the lower grades at the school, he's helping coordinate the program as it spreads to other classrooms.

"We're taking it in stages, but my goal is to move it out through the entire lower school," he said. "My hope is that it gets into the conscious direction of every child's life."

Last year, Nicole and Elyse worked with a few other friends to organize a Kindness and Justice Fair, staged in Elyse's backyard.

For the donation of a toothbrush or other personal care item, participants could compete in sack races or other games and contests.

"The challenge itself inspired me to do that," Nicole said. "Most people unfortunately are not focused on helping people. I probably wouldn't have thought of it before."

All the donated items, which filled a whole car trunk, were donated to Room in the Inn, which provides shelter for homeless people.

"So many people showed up and we got a lot to give to the homeless," Elyse said. "The people who came were so generous. I learned that you shouldn't always just think about yourself. You should think about others too."

At Cameron Middle School in Nashville, teacher Janet Turner is participating for the first time this year.

"Every year it seems like we do the same little one-day blurb on Martin Luther King," said Turner, who teaches English as a new language for immigrant children.

"I thought it would be better for the children to do things in the community, and also to learn more about what justice is. I think they're pretty clear about what kindness, is but not about standing up for justice."

Although a handful of students and schools that record the most acts will get national recognition, the personal intent of the program appeals to Turner.

"It's not focused on some kind of prize," she said. "It's more focused on the intrinsic award of community service."

The program also fits into other activities on the agenda for Turner's students, who will attend a performance on Anne Frank at Nashville's Children's Theatre.

"They really go together beautifully because Anne Frank and Martin Luther King both give the children a lot of ideas about what justice is and what injustice is," she said.

ON THE NET

Learn about Martin Luther King Jr. with a site from Stanford University. It has the complete texts of many King works, including the "Dream" speech, plus original audio recordings to hear the famous King delivery style. Address: www.stanford.edu/group/king/ Cut across two different candy bars and look at the middles -- the cross sections. Can you tell which is which? Test your candy bar IQ at the Science Museum of Minnesota -- then click on Thinking Fountain for creative activities in dozens more categories. Address: www.sci.mus.mn.us/sln/tf/c/crosssection/namethatbar.html

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: MARTIN LUGHER KING JR. WAVES TO THE CROWD AT THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL IN 1963 WHERE HE IS DELIVERED HIS FAMOUS "I HAVE A DREAM" SPEECH. AT A 1992 KING RALLY IN NASHVILLE.... FILE PHOTOS

LOAD-DATE: January 27, 2000

***** Email Completed *****

Time of Delivery: January 27, 2000 11:30 am EST

Email Number: 40:0:5887130

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Alison Crisman to James Kvaal Re: FYI Only - Personal Education Commentary [personal] [partial] (1 page)	12/01/2000	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Liberation Theology])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/30/1999 - 12/01/2000]

2019-0147-F
jn451

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alison Crisman <Acrisman@aficio.org> (Alison Crisman <Acrisman@aficio.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-DEC-2000 17:00:33.00

SUBJECT: Fwd: FYI only - personal education commentary

TO: James R. Kvaal (CN=James R. Kvaal/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

(b)(6)

[001]

Date: Fri, 01 Dec 2000 16:03:00 -0500
From: "Stacey Heath" <Sheath@aficio.org>
Subject: FYI only - personal education commentary
To: "Alison Crisman" <Acrisman@aficio.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-7
Content-disposition: inline
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
The Summer of their Disconnects:
How Conservatives Spent their Vacation Getting Education Wrong
Steve Fleischman
September 6, 2000

With the passing of Labor Day, and the inevitable start of a new school year, it's not just students who need to put their thinking caps back on. Many political conservatives should be learning a few new lessons about education as well. This summer, conservatives have made a lot of news on education. And while there's much to praise about their new-found interest in educating poor and minority children, it has led them to a number of positions that seem contradictory at best, and disingenuous at worst. These are a few examples.

It's Education, Stupid

Given George W. Bush's constant focus on the theme, one must assume that over his bathroom mirror he has taped a note that reads, "It's education, stupid." Bush has advanced an ambitious agenda that stresses improved reading instruction, more accountability, and vouchers for kids who attend failing schools. He claims to be well qualified to improve education, and has his record of accomplishment in Texas to prove it. Watching him speak with genuine emotion and knowledge about education convinces me that, least on one issue, he isn't bush league.

So far, the sales pitch sounds reasonable. Schools need improvement. Bush has been governor of a state that by most fair estimations has done a very good job of raising student achievement, particularly for minority children. Bush looks good. Until you dig deeper, and discover the disconnects.

First, the reforms that Bush is taking credit for are in large part due to the hard work of his two predecessors as governor, both Democrats. So, give him credit for sticking to a good plan. However, George W. Bush no more introduced education reform in Texas, than Al Gore invented the Internet! Both of them exaggerated a bit. At least Gore has taken his claim back.

Moreover, some of the most effective education reforms adopted during the Bush years come from the fevered work of that peculiarly Texan version of the Devil: teachers' unions. Raising standards, improving discipline in the schools, ending social promotion, adopting research-based reading practices, these are all ideas that have their origin in policies first advocated by the Texas Federation of Teachers. It would be nice if instead of bashing unions, Bush would once in a while recognize the great debt he owes them.

Even if you dismiss the argument that improvements in the state are mainly due to the Democrats, and The Teacher Unions, you are still left with the fact that the Texas Miracle is based on the set of common-sense reforms listed above, plus a very good information tracking system that allows educators to know exactly how well they are doing. Interestingly, when a recent RAND report identified Texas as one of the states showing the greatest improvement in the education of poor children, Bush was quick to take credit. Many other conservatives and editorialists, in their rush to praise Bush, failed to note that the reforms and results reported by the study took place before he became governor! And, in another disconnect, while Bush bragged about the accomplishments, he said nothing about the report's conclusion about their cause: lower class size, more resources for teachers and preschool programs. Maybe, it's because this is Gore's education agenda, not the Governor's.

All of these solid accomplishments in Texas are based on solid reforms. The disconnect is that Bush is running on his (supposed) accomplishments, but not on the reforms that got him there!

So, what does he offer instead as the centerpiece of his education platform? Vouchers. Vouchers are to education what Laetrile was to cancer treatment: a quack solution to a very real problem. I've yet to hear a reporter ask Bush this simple question: "How many Texas schools have been improved because of state-issued vouchers?" The answer he would be forced to give is: "None. Didn't use them here. Got better without them." The follow-up question would then be: "Governor, if you have?as you claim?the best educational improvement record in America, and you didn't use vouchers to achieve it, why are you so confident that they would help even one school in the country get better. Why not follow the reforms you undertook in Texas?"

A Texan I know offers the best answer to this question. He says, "If you like what happened in Texas, vote for Gore." Because, ironically, Vice President's education plan is much closer to the package of reforms that Texas used to raise student achievement than the Governor's.

Vouchers and Privatization: Compared to What?
Although many voucher advocates are very nice and well-meaning folks, some

are not. Take Paul Peterson. Please. Peterson, a Harvard professor, claims to conduct "educational research" on the effectiveness of vouchers, and for years has been at the center of many of the controversies involving the so-called "proof" of their effectiveness. In the highly politicized atmosphere in which the voucher debate is conducted, he is a master player.

Peterson knows when to release his studies. The latest one, purporting to be a groundbreaking "experiment" that offers strong evidence of the significant benefit of vouchers for poor children, was released at the last moment, just in time to make the Friday papers, as the entire world was head off to the beach for Labor Day. A whole long weekend (in news, an eternity) passed before anyone could see the report, let alone conduct an analysis, or challenge the findings. By then, conservative writers and editorialists were hailing the study, and vouchers.

This is Peterson's typical pattern: release to the press and make headlines; only later, if ever, subject the study to academic peer review. Given the academic fights researchers engage in, they have practically relegated themselves to irrelevancy in the policy arena. Therefore, it is smart politics?but bad science?for someone who wants to influence policy to follow "Peterson's principle;" i.e., release first, answer the hard questions later, when no one is listening.

But, this time some one was listening. A reporter from the Gannett News Service, apparently familiar with other school improvement efforts around the country, wrote a story on the voucher report that compared its reputed results with those in Memphis for a research-based reading program called Success for All (SFA). Since 1987, the SFA program has been used in more than 1,500 schools nationwide to improve the reading of "at-risk" elementary students, with consistent and impressive results. The program's developer, Robert E. Slavin, proudly boasts that it is the most thoroughly studied program in the history of American education. The Gannett story noted that SFA's success in Memphis compared favorably with those that Peterson reported.

His response was to dismiss SFA's research base! To use a very crude analogy, that is the equivalent of saying that the Monkees were a better band than the Beatles because "Day Dream Believer" outsold "Day in the Life." C'mon! It takes a lot of nerve to dismiss a program that is bringing success to hundreds of thousands of poor students because it makes his program look weak by comparison.

But, back to Bush. It doesn't really matter whether Texas school improvement is a Republican Miracle or a Democratic Miracle. It matters first whether it is a miracle or not. In my view, it probably is. Thousands of students are getting a better education, and a better chance in life because of what George W. Bush, among others in Texas, has done. But, since the improvement didn't happen because of prayers or faith, but as a result of smart policies and hard work, figuring out why and how it happened is what matters. I believe it is the result of the common-sense policy approach I outlined above. And, this is the only "is" that matters. Not, who is going to take the credit. (I believe that Governor Bush would have been a better candidate had he campaigned on his solid education record, than on his flaky education plan.)

The biggest disconnect in the Peterson research, tipped off by his hostile reaction to being presented by evidence of something better, is that he cares more about his ideas than about educating kids. And, that is a real, dangerous, and unacceptable disconnect.

A related disconnect: It is an article of faith among those who support vouchers that free markets do a better job of delivering educational services than does the government. Therefore, in addition to vouchers, they often support the private management of schools. And, the most respected of these private firms? certainly the one often held up at the most effective? is the Edison Project. And, what reading program does Edison use in all of its schools? Success for All! So, we are left with the strange equation that "free marketeers" would dismiss the evidence that public schools can make significant, often dramatic, progress using SFA, in the name of privatizing schools so that they can adopt . . . SFA! Somebody please explain this to me.

The Enemy of My Enemy is My Friend

I am convinced that the world of education makes even stranger bedfellows than politics, as the following case in point illustrates. Diane Ravitch, a well respected education scholar, who is often labeled a conservative, but who has had long lasting ties to the AFT, one of the two major teacher unions, recently released her latest book, *Left Back*. According to press reports (sorry, at 555 pages it was too heavy to drag to the beach this summer), she makes the argument against the entire "progressive" education reform movement. I believe that Ravitch has a sincere and deep-rooted commitment to making education better for all of America's children, and her contributions on behalf of school improvement have been notable. Disagreements with her analysis notwithstanding, she is a person to be taken seriously. And, she will be, but for the wrong reasons.

In the same way, E.D. Hirsch, Jr. has vigorously criticized the same progressive tradition, and for many of the same reasons. He believes it denies the children who most needed it access to rigorous, content rich, thought provoking curriculum that accelerates their learning. And, conservatives, for the wrong reasons, also laud him.

I suspect that both are the darlings of conservatives because they seem to be arguing for "tradition." In fact, they are arguing for egalitarianism and presenting their own versions of education "liberation theology," i.e., provide poor children with the excellent education they will need to compete with their peers who are born to privilege. This is a democratic vision, not a "conservative" or "liberal" one.

My guess, also, is that Ravitch and Hirsch are popular with conservatives because they seem to offer at the very least an implicit indictment of the "education monopoly;" a.k.a., our public school system. Many conservatives refuse to call them public schools, referring to them derisively as "government" schools. Their mistaken notion of "public" is that you attain that status not by the way the enterprise is governed, but by who attends the school. So, if children, i.e., "the public" go to it, it must be a . . . public school! By that same logic, the supermarket I shop in must be a "public store" since everyone goes there to buy their

groceries. However, I can't remember the last time the manager asked me for input on the store's policies. The public runs public schools, not just attends them.

In any event, I think many conservatives assume that it is they?the education monopoly?that have foisted these rotten progressive ideas on kids. It is they?elected school boards, departments of education, unions, etc.?that have fostered generations of mediocrity in American education. Surely, the public education monopoly is guilty of replacing the basics with whole language, constructivism, and invented spelling. Surely, it is they that allow calculators and "rainforest math" to replace the multiplication tables. Conservatives follow simple formulas: All would be better if we went back to tradition. Or, if we were given vouchers to leave public schools and attend others of our choice.

And, here is where the disconnect occurs. For, as education writer Richard Rothstein reports in an article on the behavior of public and private schools, a recent study by the conservative Fordham Foundation, finds that independent private and Catholic schools are as likely as public schools to be hotbeds of progressivism! In fact, the greatest variation on the use of "traditional" or "progressive" practices occurred within schools, not across them. And, Catholics schools were the most likely to use progressive methods.

One might therefore conclude that, if conservatives want to avoid "progressive" education, they should promote public education. Sending children to Catholic schools, would allow "progressivism" and "constructivism" to spread like a virus. If conservatives believe that these approaches offer inferior education they should steer poor, indeed all parents, away from them. They should oppose vouchers, that will only wind up sending children out of public schools that follow approaches (traditional) that they believe work, to schools that follow ineffective methods. If conservatives believe private schools are better, they are under an obligation to explain why this is so, considering the fact that they apparently adopt mistaken teaching methods.

Take this one last and relevant issue: class size. The research in this area seems to lead to one conclusion: reducing class size in the early elementary grades, particularly for poor and minority children, has positive?and long lasting?effect on their academic achievement. If this is so, then why do conservative politicians so vehemently oppose investments to reduce class size? Why do conservative policy analyst go through tortuous contortions to find ways to deny this overwhelming evidence, yet eagerly accepted the thin, and contested, evidence about the benefits of vouchers?

I assume that if you asked a parent of children attending private schools why they chose them, that high on the list of reasons would be that they offer smaller class sizes than public schools. And, parents would say that the individualized attention their children received as key to their success. So, why would those who believe in the benefits of reduced class size for their own children attending private schools deny them to others attending public schools?

Disconnects R Us What are we to make of these disconnects? We have a candidate with a solid education record, who abandons it in support of an unproven approach to school improvement. We see a researcher who claims that his number one concern is improving the education of poor children dismissing the program with the strongest long-term evidence of accomplishing just that. And we have conservatives railing again "progressive" education at the same time that they advocate having kids leave public schools to attend private ones that use these methods. I think what you have are folks that are driven more by ideology and self-interest than by what's right for kids.

We now have the resources, and the knowledge, to invest wisely in programs that offer poor and minority children real opportunities for academic success. Does anyone have the right to throw that away because of his or her notion of what is right, as opposed to what research evidence tells us is right for kids. I believe we don't. I call on compassionate conservatives to abandon ideology and do what works. Children's lives depend on it.