

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Angus S. King (KING_A) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-APR-1996 20:10:06.05

SUBJECT: fyi

TO: Gordon Li (LI_G) (WHO)

READ: 2-APR-1996 20:12:24.68

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 4-MAR-1996 07:38:00.00

ATT CREATOR: Roger V. Salazar

ATT SUBJECT: Meet The Press 3/3/96

ATT TO: Jill M. Blickstein (BLICKSTEIN_J)

ATT TO: Lisa M. Caputo (CAPUTO_L)

ATT TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (CERREL_J)

ATT TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA)

ATT TO: Daniel P. Collins (COLLINS_D)

ATT TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A)

ATT TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A)

ATT TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R)

ATT TO: Christa T. Robinson (ROBINSON_C)

ATT TO: Karen E. Finney (FINNEY_K)

ATT TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (GAINES_J)

ATT TO: John Gibbons (GIBBONS_J)

ATT TO: Mary Ellen Glynn (GLYNN_M)

ATT TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J)

ATT TO: Daniel J. Gunia (GUNIA_D)

ATT TO: Brenda I. Hilliard (HILLIARD_B)

ATT TO: Elgie Holstein (HOLSTEIN_E)

ATT TO: Heidi Kukis	(Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Payne, Julia M.	(Julia M. Payne@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Angus S. King	(KING_A)
ATT TO: G. N. Lattimore	(LATTIMORE_G)
ATT TO: Marlene A. MacDonald	(MACDONALD_M)
ATT TO: Thurgood Marshall	(MARSHA_T)
ATT TO: Julie E. Mason	(MASON_J)
ATT TO: Lorraine McHugh	(MCHUGH_L)
ATT TO: Kathy McKiernan	(MCKIERNAN_K)
ATT TO: APRIL K. MELLODY	(MELLODY_A)
ATT TO: Julia Moffett	(MOFFETT_J)
ATT TO: Alison Muscatine	(MUSCATINE_A)
ATT TO: Thomas O'Donnell	(ODONNELL_T)
ATT TO: Jonathan M. Prince	(PRINCE_J)
ATT TO: Victoria L. Radd	(RADD_V)
ATT TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez	(RIVASVAZQU_A)
ATT TO: Rica F. Rodman	(RODMAN_R)
ATT TO: Laura D. Schwartz	(SCHWARTZ_L)
ATT TO: Teresa Wildman	(WILDMAN_T)
ATT TO: Peggy A. Lewis	(LEWIS_P)
ATT TO: Joshua Silverman	(SILVERMAN_J)
ATT TO: Gene B. Sperling	(SPERLING_G)
ATT TO: George Stephanopoulos	(STEPHANOPO_G)
ATT TO: Brenda Anders	(ANDERS_B)
ATT TO: Aman, Sally J.	(Sally J. Aman@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
ATT TO: Virginia M. Terzano	(TERZANO_V)
ATT TO: Barry J. Toiv	(TOIV_B)

ATT TO: Laura D. Tyson (TYSON_L)
ATT TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L)
ATT TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M)
ATT TO: Ann F. Walker (WALKER_A)
ATT TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A)
ATT TO: Daniel Taberski (TABERSKI_D)
ATT TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS)
ATT TO: Russell W. Horwitz (HORWITZ_R)

TEXT:
TRANSCRIPT
MEET THE PRESS
MARCH 3, 1996

SPEAKERS LIST: TIM RUSSERT, NBC NEWS
PAT BUCHANAN, REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE
(EDITORS NOTE: RETRANSMITTED WITH COMPLETE TEXT)
(JOINED IN PROGRESS)

RUSSERT: And let's take a look at the results from South Carolina. You'll see Bob Dole, 45 percent of the vote, 124,000 raw votes. Pat Buchanan second with 29 percent. Steve Forbes with 13 percent. Lamar Alexander with 10 percent.

And it's another week, another front

-runner. Let's look at the delegate count. Bob Dole, 72. Steve Forbes, 57. Pat Buchanan, 30. Lamar Alexander, 5. Phil Gramm, 2. Uncommitted, 13 at this point.

And here to help us talk about these results, the upcoming primaries as well as trade, immigration, and charges of extremism, commentator

-turned

-Republican candidate for president, Patrick J. Buchanan.

Mr. Buchanan, welcome back to MEET THE PRESS.

BUCHANAN: Tim, thanks for inviting me back, and thanks for the plane ride from...

RUSSERT: Good to be here in Atlanta. Bob Dole really clobbered you yesterday.

BUCHANAN: Bob Dole beat us handily. And he did so for several reasons, Tim. He was basically hauled up to the finish line and tossed over by Strom Thurmond, Governor Beasley, and Governor Campbell.

Governor Beasley, in particular, because he's very

strong with social conservatives. And Bob Dole, for two weeks before we got there after our surge, was running attack ads on me saying, ``Pat Buchanan's an extremist." And these attack ads held, probably stopped some of our momentum.

But it has become a Buchanan

-Dole race in the South.

RUSSET: You lost Arizona. You lost South Carolina. Isn't Georgia make or break?

BUCHANAN: Georgia really is a crucial primary, Tim. There's no doubt about it. Georgia could be our North Carolina -- what that was for Ronald Reagan in '76. Where Reagan lost repeatedly, had not done as well as I did, won North Carolina, and he split open the Ford campaign because Ford's campaign, like Dole's campaign, was basically a hollow campaign based on incumbency and expectations and inevitability.

If we can win here, I think Bob Dole will break wide open in the South on Super Tuesday, the states all the way from Florida to Texas and Oklahoma. Then we go into the industrial middle West, where we're going to take him apart, I believe, on the issues of GATT and NAFTA and the sell

-out of American workers.

A week later, it's California. If we can get a breakthrough somewhere, I think his campaign will crack open because it is hollow, bereft of ideas.

RUSSET: But if you lose in Georgia, your run's pretty much over?

BUCHANAN: No, I don't think so, Tim. We're going to go -- we're going to take a Dixie express or a Buchanan express. We're going from Florida, we're going to go up into Tennessee and challenge Lamar on his home base, cross Tennessee down into Mississippi, over into Texas, up into Oklahoma.

And I think this is fertile terrain. Tuesday, for example, we've got a chance to win in the state of Washington. I understand they cancelled the straw poll on us up there. But we got chances to do well, but there's no doubt the place we're going to focus the next two days is the state of Georgia.

RUSSET: Let me tell you a friend of mine in Florida -- a gentlemen was looking at your candidacy, even inclined to vote for you, and then I called him the day before Arizona, he said, ``You know, every time I look at him, he's holding up a rifle, he's got a six- shooter on his hip. He's too hot."

In retrospect, were you too hot in Arizona? Too flamboyant with guns and that kind of impression?

BUCHANAN: I really don't think so, Tim. When we went into Arizona, we were -- started in initially in single digits. We went all the way to 30 percent.

What happened was that Forbes and Dole had absentee ballots out and cast. I went to rally after rally. We had the biggest rallies in Arizona, and people said, ``I'd love to vote for you, but I've already voted for Forbes."

Dole beat me because of absentee ballots and the extremism attacks on attack ads. Forbes won it because he paid \$40 a vote -- \$4 million for 100,000 votes. That is tough to overcome unanswered.

Our surge of momentum was not quite enough to carry us over the top. I think that was the problem in Arizona. We would have loved to have had a win there. We were winning in the exit polls.

I think we won the campaign there, but I think enough work had been done before we got there to militate against victory.

RUSSERT: No regret about waving the guns and all the theatrics?

BUCHANAN: Well, no, I really don't -- really, I mean, look, if you go down to the OK Corral, down in Tombstone after a 150 miles, you want to put on a duster and a six

-gun and walk out there with the OK Corral behind you.

And I thought it was a wonderful photo op, and my sister said, ``Don't do it." I said, ``I'm going to do it. It's my one chance in a lifetime to be in Tombstone."

RUSSERT: Can Bob Dole beat Bill Clinton?

BUCHANAN: Bob Dole's got two problems. He can't debate. He's been beaten in every single debate, and he's trying to duck the one tonight or he's trying to find some way to minimize his damage. And secondly, he can't bring home the Perot voters.

He has no reach for the voters and the workers who have been sold out in NAFTA and GATT. He has little or no reach for those southerners and others who feel that these trade deals not only sell out workers, but they surrender American sovereignty to global institutions like a World Trade Organization, where we get one vote out of 120, and sort of a global UN or Supreme Court of world trade.

I think Bob Dole's problem is he's a -- basically a Washington Beltway Republican who has no reach outside that constituency.

There's no one in America, unlike in our campaign, we'll go through there and people will say, ``We're praying for you, Pat.

We're making novenas for you. Stay well. We love you, Pat."

I don't think there's any fire, energy, or enthusiasm for Senator Dole. I think it is just sort of the expectation he's going to be the nominee.

RUSSERT: Can he beat Bill Clinton?

BUCHANAN: If Bob Dole gets the nomination, my guess is Ross Perot's Reform Party will nominate someone else, and

it will be virtually impossible for us to beat Bill Clinton.

RUSSERT: Will you support Bob Dole as the nominee?

BUCHANAN: Well, I have said I would support the nominee of our party, but I see Senator Dole the other day said he may not support me. And I think what we have here -- should have is reciprocity. So I would say that I would support the nominee of the Republican Party.

BUCHANAN: I anticipate doing so, but I will say this -- unless the -- if the attacks on our people, and on me, and by extension on our people don't cease and the name

-calling doesn't cease, I don't know how those people will come home and support Senator Dole, I'll be honest.

RUSSERT: What conditions will you put on your support? Will the platform plank on abortion stay the same?

BUCHANAN: My problem with Bob Dole -- let me tell you one reason Bob Dole won in South Carolina, and it deals with your question. He was provided cover by the social conservatives. Governor Beasley, who's very strong with pro

-life, and the Christian Coalition leadership moved en masse behind Bob Dole.

But Bob Dole voted -- collaborated with Bill Clinton in putting two pro

-abortion justices on the Supreme Court -- Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Steven Breyer. Bob Dole voted for fetal tissue research on aborted embryos, and Bob Dole repeatedly trolls the name of General Colin Powell out as a potential vice president.

Now, Colin Powell is a pro

-choice Bill Clintonite on abortion, who is a self

-professed Rockefeller Republican.

I think Bob Dole is getting away, really, he's being provided cover by certain social conservatives for a record that is in collaboration with Bill Clinton's effort to lock in Roe v. Wade for a decade.

And I think with the social conservatives, we have got to get them back, there's no question about it.

RUSSERT: Will you insist that the abortion plank banning all abortions -- period -- stay in the Republican platform? Will you insist, Mr. Buchanan, that Bob Dole not choose a pro

-choice running mate?

BUCHANAN: Well, let's talk about the right

-to

-life

plank. We've won that battle, Tim. Bob Dole is not going to stand up and fight Pat Buchanan to take that out of the platform now with our enormous support; otherwise, there would be a walkout of the convention. You would split the party.

You would probably have embryonic right

-to

-life parties

all over America. We're going to have -- the Reaganite plank is going to be in the platform.

With regard to Colin Powell, who has said he cannot support Pat Buchanan, let me say this. As of now, I don't believe Bob Dole's going to get this nomination. I think it's a hollow candidacy. It's a hollow campaign.

They fill up this hollowness with tricks and attack ads and push polls, which I've just discovered, and I think one solid blow, as in Georgia, and I think it comes crashing down. And I will be picking the vice presidential nominee, and my choice will be pro

-life.

RUSSERT: If Bob Dole selects someone who is pro

-choice, would you support him?

BUCHANAN: If Bob Dole puts, which he would be doing at 73 years of age, puts into the line of succession for the Republican Party leadership a pro

-choice, Rockefeller

Republican, he will split his party asunder, and many of my people will walk out no matter what I do.

RUSSERT: During the course of your campaign, you have been criticized by conservative Republicans -- William F. Buckley, Bill Bennett, Jack Kemp, Newt Gingrich, Barry Goldwater, Rush Limbaugh. Has your candidacy destroyed the conservative movement, divided the conservative movement forever?

BUCHANAN: That's a very good -- that's a well

-taken

point. First, Buckley has not spoken, to my knowledge, about this year.

But the others -- Mr. Bennett says I was a liberal, and then he endorsed Lamar Alexander, who I think most people would think is more liberal than I am on every issue.

BUCHANAN: There's not only the Mr. Republican chair that is open -- and not only the presidency, but the chair for leader of the American conservative movement in the post

-Cold War era. That chair was held by two men, Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan.

That chair is vacant. And there's no doubt we have an application for that chair and we are winning the battle for that chair for a new populist conservatism of the heart that tries to bring into the Republican Party working class Democrats and middle class folks who believe us on social issues but want to know why we're selling out their jobs, they want to know why we're cutting these trade deals for the benefit of Wall Street, selling out middle Americans.

So many of them broke with the Republican Party. They loved Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan got 60 percent of the vote, the Bush- Dole party reduced it to 37 percent. Bennett and Kemp were part of that huge reduction

-in

-force
of the Republican Party.

My goal is to get it back up to 60 percent, but you need to bring Democrats back in. And this is a new conservatism, it's a different conservatism, it's a conservatism of the heart, it is outspoken, bold, unabashed, it is what Ronald Reagan was in 1979.

RUSSERT: So even if you don't win the nomination, you are going to lay claim to the chair, the title "Mr. Conservative," and tell Newt Gingrich and Bill Bennett and Jack Kemp, "Hey, fellas, deal with it, I am Mr. Conservative based on my primary performance."

BUCHANAN: They will have to deal with me and deal with my people.

Look, Richard Nixon told me that he had to, because of his defeats, he had to go out and win in what he called the "fires of the primary." We have been tested out here and we really don't need lectures from Beltway conservatives who refused to get into this fray and fight for their convictions and beliefs, to tell us what we ought to believe when the people who are rallying to me are telling them what we believe.

And I think we are going to create a vast movement, but, Tim, honestly, I would tell Haley Barbour, "Haley, tell the boys to cool it a little bit, I can bring them into the Republican Party." We can beat Clinton if you unite this tremendous movement for the Republicans.

Tim, you know who came in second in the Democratic primary in New Hampshire? Pat Buchanan with 3400 write

-in
votes. If I'd been on the ballot with Bill Clinton I would have gotten 15

-20 percent of the vote up there. I

can bring those folks home.

We're asking the Republicans, stop the name calling, open up to these folks, I know they're a little rambunctious in the lobby of the country club, but let us in.

RUSSERT: Some of my friends in Georgia tell me there are a lot of Democrats down here who are going to play mischief and cross over and vote for you just because they want you to be the nominee because they think you're easy pickings for Bill Clinton.

BUCHANAN: Do you think Bill Clinton would rather stand up in a debate with Bob Dole or Pat Buchanan? Do you think those White House aides -- you know what they look at me and they say?

"Buchanan, maybe we could beat him good but maybe he could beat us." With Bob Dole they got a known factor. They got a Beltway career politician Republican who has collaborated on these trade deals, who has no reach in middle American.

Listen, most of the Democrats who come across and vote for Pat Buchanan will be conservatives of the heart. They'll walk out there and vote for Buchanan because they said, "That guy represents me. He's the only guy in America that does."

This talk, you know, when folks going to go out for mischief and do things like that, that's mainly myth, Tim, that stuff doesn't happen. Everybody talks about it, but it doesn't happen.

RUSSERT: Is it because of all this opposition from the conservative movement within the Republican Party that you requested Secret Service protection.

BUCHANAN: No. I could handle myself with any of those fellows. No, no, we got Secret Service protection, I'll tell you when we got it is New Hampshire. Last time we got it right after New Hampshire. We got, I'll tell you when we got it is when you get the huge crowd of press, and I mean when they back up with those cameras they go over children and people in lines are grabbing you and things like that. We decided to get it right after New Hampshire as we did last time, only we decided to have it there that night.

RUSSERT: But you're controversial, you're hot on the stump. Are you concerned about your personal safety?

BUCHANAN: No, you know, if something like that's going to happen, it's going to happen. But I will say this: the people who have engaged in what I would call the rhetoric of hatred against Pat Buchanan, the name calling, fascist, Nazi, all these names, they're creating the same type of environment that has been created in other situations where some nut acts on this impulse.

BUCHANAN: And I would urge them, those names have no place in American politics. I'm controversial, I admit it, I love robust debate on the issues, but we ought to get that kind of viciousness outside of our politics. The

rhetoric of hatred has no place here.

RUSSET: Is there an anti

-Catholic bigotry?

BUCHANAN: Well, let me separate out. The press has treated me very fairly. The national press has by and large treated me fairly. The New York Times has given me tremendous exposure for my views and ideas. So I'm not going to criticize the press this time, I have no reason to criticize them.

But there was a nasty piece of vile anti

-Catholic

bigotry done by Ted Koppel on Nightline which assaulted and slandered and lied about my father and about my family and my faith. I never heard the name Father Coughlin in my house when I was a child. I never knew who he was until I read books about the thirties.

That term ``Christ killer," as you know, Tim, the nuns in the 1940s and '50s who raised me in those Jesuit scholastics would never use a term like that. My mother and father, if someone used a term like that in my house, they would have been slapped down. And the idea that my mother or father would have tolerated that or the nuns would have done that or taught that to us, that is a vicious anti- Catholic slander and slur and Mr. Koppel let the mask of urbanity drop for a moment when he put that piece on and so did ABC News.

And I had, what I decided to do, I don't want to be distracted.

RUSSET: But that was a balanced piece in terms of issues.

BUCHANAN: I didn't mean -- have you read that piece on the Koppel (ph) Nightline piece? Balanced? They went down to The Palm to get people I'd never heard of to give their opinions of Pat Buchanan's character. And, again, it was based on ignorance and malice. And I had my sister respond to that and we're not going to talk about it anymore because we got a campaign here which is devoted to raising issues and ideas and that's a massive distraction.

RUSSET: Let's turn to some issues.

BUCHANAN: Sure.

RUSSET: Tariffs. Pat Buchanan says President Buchanan would slap a ten percent tariff on Japanese goods, a 20 percent on Chinese goods. Many Republican conservatives, again, are calling this the Buchanan sales tax. And to the people here in Georgia, all across the country, they should know, if Patrick J. Buchanan becomes president, they buy a television set for 500 bucks, it's now 550. A VCR, another \$35. If they want to buy a Honda or Toyota, an extra \$2000.

BUCHANAN: A Lexus, an (OFF

-MIKE) \$5000.

RUSSERT: This is a Buchanan sales tax.

BUCHANAN: All right, let's talk. Exactly. Let me talk to that point very well.

Look, what we have proposed is, the Japanese have a \$60 billion trade surplus with us every year. In other words, they sell us 60 billion more than they buy from us. In the last 25 years, Tim, they bought 400,000 American cars and they sold us 40 million. We can't let that continue to happen.

I will tell the Japanese, ``You will act with me to get rid of this trade surplus at our expense or I will act unilaterally." I am thinking in terms of the automobiles. Reagan left them with a 1.6 million quota of cars coming into the country. I am thinking of dropping that quota steadily, steadily, steadily down, if they don't respond, down to the point where the Japanese can sell us about as many cars as we buy from them.

And the purpose of the objective here would be to have the American auto companies take back our own market. If they won't let us into Japan's market, let's take that ten percent consumption tax. Dick Lugar wants a consumption tax on everything. I want it on foreign goods.

And what you do is, let's take the \$5000 tax on a Lexus, it goes from 50 to 55 thousand, all right? The 5000 is used to cut the tax on small American businesses who hire Americans. If Lexus goes up \$5000, Cadillac becomes more competitive, the Lincoln Continental becomes more competitive, Americans start buying from Americans again.

BUCHANAN: We would treat -- these tariffs would only be used on unfair traders like the Communist Chinese who have a 40 percent tariff on us.

RUSSERT: But every camera, every VCR, every TV with an increased sales tax -- 10 percent. Hasn't the competition, in fact, been good for GM and Ford? Taurus is now the number

-one car. American cars are better because the American people opted to buy Japanese cars because the quality was better and forced American automobile manufacturers to make their cars better.

BUCHANAN: Is competition good for our TV industry, our radio industry, our VCR industry, our shoe industry? They're gone, Tim. You're touching on a point where I agree with you.

Ronald Reagan stepped in and said you got 1.6 million cars coming from Japan, thus far, no further. You're not going to do to Detroit what you did to Philco and Dumont (ph) and all of our television industry.

By stopping the Japanese at a certain level, the Japanese then brought their investment in to build the cars here, which aren't under the quota. So, they bring in factories.

Secondly, we gave Detroit time to recoup. That's

exactly what I would do. I would never again let a foreign country come in here and destroy an industry. OK, you take imports up to 20, 30 percent and then you say, ``That's it."

Now, the Americans -- you've got five years. Like we told Harley

-Davidson -- five years of tariff protection to get well. Harley

-Davidson did it, took back the motorcycle market. We've got to defend our manufacturing base. It is being hollowed out.

RUSSERT: You may just start a trade war.

BUCHANAN: There is a trade war being waged against the United States...

RUSSERT: What happens to McDonnell Douglas, Boeing? We export airplanes. Japan, China buy those planes. They stop buying our American airplanes. What happens to those workers?

BUCHANAN: Are you kidding? Are you kidding? Go out and talk to the workers at Boeing. When Boeing cuts a deal with China and sells them planes, China says put the tail assembly in China.

I stand with the workers who are saying, ``Do not export our factories and jobs, export our products."

Tim, look at what happened to Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, and Lockheed. They are being taken down by Airbus, subsidized with \$30 billion by socialist governments in Europe who are bringing down the companies that built the planes that kept Europe free.

You've got to get tough with these people. We will use every -- look, we have more Americans working in -- now in government than in manufacturing. Did you see our merchandise trade surplus? What is it? Over the weekend?

Merchandise trade surplus -- \$175 billion. One billion dollars equals 20,000 jobs. We lost four million manufacturing jobs last year alone, which we would have had if we simply had a trade balance in merchandise.

RUSSERT: Would you be in favor of domestic content legislation that automobiles made in America must be made with -- by a certain percent of American steel and a certain percent of American workers?

BUCHANAN: I will take a look at that. I've been opposed to that in the past. But I will say this, with regard to the Japanese who have an enormous share of our market. The way I would start is either the tariffs on the Japanese consumer goods or simply say, ``Look, you've got 1.6 million cars. Next year, you get 1.4 million unless you shape up. Next year, you get 1.2 million, or you shape up."

Tim, there is -- people are practicing trade wars against America. China has a 40 percent tariff on our goods. It sells us four times as much as it buys from us.

It steals our intellectual property, and we sit there and take it.

Let me say about the phonies in Washington...

RUSSERT: But your mentors, Mr. Buchanan -- President Nixon and President Reagan. Both for most favored nation status -- trading status to China. Both for NAFTA. Reagan and Nixon break with you on this issue, or you break with them.

BUCHANAN: I do, let's see, Ronald Reagan -- I do break with Mr. Nixon. Ronald Reagan had in his heart, he was a free trader intellectually. The heart was that of an economic nationalist.

Look at the quotas he put on steel, on automobiles, on machine tools. Look at the fact that he told the Japanese, "You're going to buy 20 percent of your computer chips from Americans." I think Ronald Reagan would be moving in my direction.

He and I agreed 100 percent in the Reagan White House. Now, I think he would be...

RUSSERT: He endorsed NAFTA two years ago.

BUCHANAN: let me talk about these White House meanies -- Republican Senators who are flunkies on this issue. Bill Clinton said what? If the Japanese don't shape up, put 100 percent tariff on Lexus. Eighty

-eight members of the Senate said we stand with President Clinton.

These fellows are attacking me for advocating policies that they themselves endorse if Clinton moves out in front of them.

BUCHANAN: Listen, what is coming in America is economic nationalism, economic patriotism. We are leading it. The whole Republican Party is moving my way. The country's moving my way.

RUSSERT: We have to take a quick break. I want to come back and talk about the ``bloodless corporate butchers," as you call them, and what impact that may have on our economy.

We'll be right back with more of Pat Buchanan after this message.

(BREAK)

RUSSERT: We're back live from Atlanta, Georgia, talking with Patrick J. Buchanan. He wants to be president. Mr. Buchanan, you called ``bloodless corporate butchers," the leaders of the large corporations. What would you, as President Buchanan, do -- specifically -- if AT&T announced a layoff or IBM announces a layoff? What would you as president do?

BUCHANAN: That's a very tough question, because I don't have the answer to it. And I do recall seeing that AT&T thing in January, and I was just astonished. Not only the 40,000 dropped off at a single blow, but the stock went soaring up.

I don't have the answer to that, Tim, but I will say this --

I think we got to use moral pressure on stockholders to deal with boards of directors who pay \$5 million salaries to people who are responsible for this and call themselves ``Chainsaw Al" and all these big, hairy- chested names when what they're doing is killing jobs.

So, I don't have the answer to how to deal with the big corporations dropping people off like that. I do have trade and tariff policies I think will bring investment into America, and we've talked about those.

And I do have a small business bill of rights where we virtually eliminate federal taxes on small business because they're going to have to pick up these folks that the Fortune 500 has been lopping off by the thousands.

RUSSERT: When you worked for Ronald Reagan, some Democrats in Congress said we should have legislation which says that there should be notification to the workers and to the community before a big layoff, and Ronald Reagan said, ``I will veto that legislation."

BUCHANAN: We were wrong. Sixty

-day notification is right.

RUSSERT: That's right, and Pat Buchanan is for that?

BUCHANAN: Yes.

RUSSERT: I've talked to a lot of people in large corporations on Wall Street over the last week, and they tell me that if your trade policies were put in place and your economic program was put in place, it would be a shock to the stock market.

That the market would collapse perhaps as much as 20 percent. And they reminded me something that I'm not even sure you're aware of. Do you how much -- what percent of the stock market is pension money?

BUCHANAN: It's an enormous amount. It used to be 33 percent. I'm not sure what it is now.

RUSSERT: It's a third, and that's...

BUCHANAN: It's called pension fund socialism.

RUSSERT: Fifty

-four million people have fully funded pensions in this country.

BUCHANAN: I'm sure you and I do, too.

RUSSERT: Well, let me -- 200,000 of AT&T, 200,000 had GE, and Mr. Buchanan, if that market was rattled by your economic policies, pensioners -- pensioners could lose a half billion dollars and they're security is threatened.

BUCHANAN: Look, look -- 20 percent drop. First, I don't believe it. A 20 percent drop in the stock market would be about a 1,000 points, which would take it down to where it was in the bull market of about a year ago. I don't believe that's going to happen.

But, Tim, it seems to me the responsibility of a

president and a leader is to look out for those who have no one else looking out for them. To provide a voice for the voiceless -- for the unborn, for working men and women who are losing their jobs.

You know, you talk -- people talk about a lot jobs. One fellow came up to me and he said, ``I know there are a lot of jobs out there, Pat. I got four of them."

And this is what is happening in America. The middle class and working folks who work with hands, tools, and machines are left out.

BUCHANAN: Their real incomes are going down. Middle class income's going down. And a president has got to represent the interest of the vast majority of Americans. You and I do good.

I bet you've got a 401K. I got a 401K. That's doing fine.

But we're not doing fine if the rest of America's being left behind while some of us are doing very well.

RUSSET: But these large companies, every worker at those companies are supporting two people who are getting a pension. And if you rattle this economy and threaten those pensions, don't those...

BUCHANAN: Well if you're not -- you're talking -- I mean if you had a drop, a small drop in the stock market, it would be where it was a year ago, which was a bull market. But look, that doesn't -- dividends and interest and things like that are not contingent upon that. And here's -- listen, the point is, folks who have 401K's are doing fine. The folks who are not doing well are those who live on -- going to be on social security and are going to have a meager income when they retire, and they're trying to save some money now.

And we are taking away the best jobs they've ever had. Let me tell you...

RUSSET: This is a global market. This is a global economy. And...

BUCHANAN: It is -- you're not responsible for the global economy Tim. You are responsible for the American economy...

RUSSET: But that's where -- If you want Americans to have well paying jobs -- job growth amongst -- in the export business, six times higher...

BUCHANAN: I'm not against exports. I'm for -- listen, if we had 175 billion more in exports Tim, we would have a trade balance. All four presidents on Mount Rushmore agreed with me. One they wanted America to be the greatest manufacturing power in the world, independent of all countries. Secondly, Americans were to have the highest standard of living in the world. And they were not to be thrown into dog

-eat

-dog competition with then
Europeans who made 20 percent of what they made. That was

the heart of their economic policy known as the American Economic System.

You marry that to Ronald Reagan's low tax rates, which make us the enterprise zone of the western world. This country will boom as it never has before.

RUSSERT: But these corporations have an obligation to their employees and to their pensioners to continue to be strong financially, and continue to grow and create jobs. And you want to stop that by pulling up the borders.

BUCHANAN: This is nonsense. I want them to grow and I want them to grow here. I like it that BMW comes into South Carolina. What I don't like is that General Motors moves to Mexico and Ford moves to Mexico. What I don't like is the fact we're shutting down American factories here. Listen, how do they -- how do you justify -- let's take IBP when I was in Iowa.

Real wages on the floor of IBP went down 40 percent in 15 years. That is a depression. The wages of the guy running the show went from 400,000 to 4 and a half million.

If that's what Capitalism means, I can't defend it anymore. And I'm a Conservative. I'm a free enterpriser. I'm a Capitalist. These people with these obscene salaries, which explode and expand with stock options, -- at the very moment they lop off ten thousand workers, -- if we're Republicans defending that, we don't deserve the support of those workers. And I don't think Washington, those fellows in the Beltway, have a clue. Bob Dole was up in New Hampshire, he says, "I didn't know that this was about jobs and the economy, how this thing works." They don't have a clue.

RUSSERT: You've been criticized, however for investing in those very same companies. You own stock in GE and IBM and where else? And AT&T.

BUCHANAN: Well AT&T is Shelley's. Let me tell you this...

RUSSERT: But if they're so bad, why do you invest in them?

BUCHANAN: Let me tell you. I've got a retirement program, Tim, I'm sure like you, it sat in a cash market account. And my broker calls me and says, "Hey Pat, you're getting two percent on your money. Why don't you put it in the stock market?" I said, "I don't care about the stock market. I'm not interested." He said, "Can I invest it all?" I said, "You go ahead and invest it." And so he's invested all my capital in that. But the very fact -- look, I've got two big fat speaking fees from Goldman Sachs. Have they influenced my attitude toward Goldman Sachs, after Mr. Ruben's crowd led us into that Mexican situation?

RUSSERT: But you're not worried about the 54 million Americans who are relying on pension from these big companies?

BUCHANAN: I'm relying on pensions from these big

companies.

BUCHANAN: What I'm saying is we have to have a balance. Somebody's got to look out for the losers. It is coming.

RUSSERT: Let's talk about immigration.

BUCHANAN: Sure.

RUSSERT: Your position against illegal immigration is well known.

BUCHANAN: Right.

RUSSERT: Building a fence. Legal immigration, however, you want to freeze all legal immigration for five years.

BUCHANAN: Yeah.

RUSSERT: If that was the case, your Dad would never have been here. You have a housekeeper from Chile. She wouldn't be here.

BUCHANAN: Sure she would. Look, she came in 1970, whatever it is.

Look, Tim, in our history we've had periods of very high immigration -- our Irish immigrants came over from 1849 to about 1850- something -- and periods of very low immigration. We need a period of time to assimilate and Americanize and absorb all those who have come here legally. I would reduce it from about 900,000 to 200,000, probably still the most generous policy on Earth.

But we need a time, because we got to look at what's happening in Canada. That's coming apart on two issues: language and culture. Formerly a very united, we thought very placid country, and I think this country is threatened down the road with something like that unless we Americanize and absorb all these folks.

Let me tell you one president whom my conservative friends admire, Calvin Coolidge, who did three things, he and Harding. They stopped immigration cold after the 30

-year explosion of it; they cut the top tax rate from 90 percent to 25 percent; and then they imposed the Fortney

-McCumber (ph) Tariff, which took tariffs up to 40 percent so we would have our entire own market.

You had the greatest explosion of growth, development, hope and opportunity in American history, right up to the Depression and the stock market collapse because of what the Fed did, as Milton Friedman has taught us.

RUSSERT: But over the last five years 80,000 Irish have come here, 100,000 Polish, and you're saying no.

BUCHANAN: Five years?

RUSSERT: That's right, over the last five years.

BUCHANAN: (OFF

-MIKE) 15,000 a year?

RUSSERT: You're saying...

BUCHANAN: Fifteen thousand a year from Ireland? You're not going to go completely to zero on this. You do have to stop the illegal immigration. You got to stop chain immigration. By that it means when a fellow comes here, say, from the Philippines, he can bring his wife and he can bring his siblings, but he can't say, "I want to bring my Mom and Dad and brothers and sisters," and many of them going onto welfare and some of them going into crime, especially the illegal immigrants. Ted, I mean, excuse me, but...

RUSSERT: What you're saying is Patrick Ewing, for the Knicks from Jamaica: No. Arnold Schwarzenegger from Austria: No. General Shalikashvili from Poland, no.

BUCHANAN: No, no, General Shalikashvili, I think they probably came over as refugees after World War II. Look, I'm not...

RUSSERT: Are refugees allowed? If there's refugees from Cuba are they allowed in?

BUCHANAN: Well, listen, with Cuba, Cuba's a special case because it's right next to the United States, it's 90 miles away, if they escape Castro they've only got one place to go.

There's a difference between that and Haiti. Look, if Haiti, someone feels politically oppressed, he walks across the border into the Dominican Republic.

RUSSERT: But what about political refugees from Rwanda, Sudan, Somalia?

BUCHANAN: Let me tell you something. We cannot take in everybody who claims he is politically persecuted, otherwise we'd have to take in everybody that ever escaped from China, and we can't do that, Tim. We got to make decisions based on what is in the best interest of the United States of America, and I believe the American people want a time

-out on legal immigration, I will guarantee that time

-out, I will stop illegal immigration cold.

RUSSERT: But this is legal immigration. I was thinking...

BUCHANAN: It's going to be, Ted, how high do you think it should be? How high do you think it should be? How high do you think it should be?

RUSSERT: I was thinking about your position now, and I thought about the Statue of Liberty and that inscription on the bottom: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses..."

BUCHANAN: Emma Lazarus, Emma Lazarus. "Yearning to breathe free."

RUSSERT: "...yearning to breathe free. Send them, the homeless, I lift my lamp beside the golden door." President Buchanan would cover that inscription up for

five years.

BUCHANAN: This is silly. Ted, under Franklin Roosevelt...

RUSSERT: Tim, Tim. Ted's the other guy.

BUCHANAN: Excuse me. They had that problem on that show, too.

Look, under Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman we had virtually no immigration. We had a moratorium on immigration from 1924 to 1965. Were they somehow anti

-immigrant because they had a time

-out in that period?

BUCHANAN: No. They wanted to assimilate and Americanize the people who had come here.

RUSSERT: But the Statue of Liberty -- this is our beacon. This is our inscription. This is our motto, and you're saying, "Stay out."

BUCHANAN: No, Tim. Tim, I'm not saying that. I'm saying we need to adopt the policies we had from '24 to '65 but be slightly more generous than that.

That was Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower. They were good Americans. They realized we were a nation of immigrants, or the descendents of immigrants, but they also realized that you need stability in the country. You need to Americanize folks who have come here.

Seventy

-five or 85 percent of the American people agree with me.

RUSSERT: But your grandparents came from Ireland, Germany, Scotland...

BUCHANAN: That was a period of high immigration.

RUSSERT: And what you're saying, though, in 1996 -- if you're from Ireland, Germany -- Irish need not apply.

BUCHANAN: No, what I'm saying quite simply is this, America is not going to have a policy of open borders, which the Wall Street Journal recommends, if I'm president of the United States.

We will exercise the right to control our borders, to enforce our immigration policy, and adopt immigration policies that we believe -- Congress and the president -- are in the national interest of the United States.

And the timidity and cowardice I see in Congress and the part of the President now in not even enforcing existing immigration laws against what is happening in the Southwest, that comes to an end when I take the oath of office.

RUSSERT: We have to take another quick break. We'll be right back with more of Patrick J. Buchanan, Republican candidate for president.

(BREAK)

RUSSERT: The IRA has committed terrorist acts in

London. Do you support that?

BUCHANAN: I would say with regard to Gerry Adams, let's find out from intelligence and others did he support or in any way know about that atrocity that occurred in Great Britain when that act of terrorism occurred.

And if he did, I don't think you could go with him. But if he did not, and he simply is representing that wing and the negotiation's already going, I think that, yes, he ought to let him in.

I think on this issue, where I have -- I think that the President has done a good job, basically. I would not have invited Gerry Adams to the White House. I think that was an affront to the British, but the idea of negotiating with these people -- look, he had to negotiate with Yasser Arafat.

RUSSERT: If Cuba shoots down any more civilian aircraft with American citizens, what would President Buchanan do?

BUCHANAN: If it's in international waters, I would shoot down the Cuban planes.

RUSSERT: Would you go get them if you couldn't get to them? Would you shoot them on...

BUCHANAN: Well, if they shoot down -- if they use anti

-aircraft guns and shoot down a Piper Cub (ph) over their own island, I think that's an act of murder and terrorism, really, against people who are basically doing a humanitarian service, spotting people in the Florida Straits for boats to pick up.

But they would not be violating international law if they did that. So, I would maintain very tough sanctions on Castro. I think President Clinton has appeased Fidel Castro for a period of time, and now, he's reversing his policy, partly for political reasons.

RUSSERT: If Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait this afternoon, what would President Buchanan do this time?

BUCHANAN: Well, we got a commitment there we've already made. And we would have to stop it, and I think I would maintain that commitment. But I opposed initially because I don't believe, in the long run, that monarchy is the long haul, is the future in the Persian Gulf, Tim.

We have got ourselves commitments there of dual containment, of maintaining these monarchies, of defending Saudi Arabia, which we have to do, which is vital. And the Shi'ites and the Kurds, which you cannot maintain if you continue to draw down the military forces the way we're doing right now.

RUSSERT: But you would throw Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait?

BUCHANAN: Yes, I would tell him that he would -- that his nation would be under attack if he enters Kuwait.

RUSSERT: The last time in 1990, you took that issue, you opposed President Bush. You said thousands of

Americans would die, the area would blow up. You were dead wrong.

BUCHANAN: No, let me see, I don't think I said the area would blow up. I said this -- early in August when some people were clamoring for American air strikes, we had about 20,000 guys in the 82nd Airborne. They had 100,000. I said this will be a bloodbath. They were screaming for an initial attack.

But let me say this. I said this -- if we smash Saddam Hussein and destroy him, we will create commitments for ourselves that we're going to have a tough time validating, and you will also increase Islamic Fundamentalism throughout the area.

BUCHANAN: That was proven right. We have commitments far beyond what we had before. Islamic fundamentalism on the rise in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey -- all through that region. And I think one day we're going to find out we could have real trouble because of it.

RUSSET: When you turn to the issue of extremism, I want to show you a tape and get your reaction.

BUCHANAN: Sure.

RUSSET: This was Barry Goldwater in 1964.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE CLIP)

GOLDWATER: I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. And let me remind you also that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.

(END VIDEOTAPE CLIP)

RUSSET: Was he right?

BUCHANAN: No, he was not. You know, I sat in a room with my father up at Stone Harbor and he got up and walked out of the room and said the guy's lost the election. And he proved to be right.

What Senator Goldwater should have done in realizing extremism was an issue, he should not have done that provocative a thing. He should have reached out and brought that party together. I know he'd been called terrible names. Let me say about Senator Dole. Senator Dole is running a shabby campaign.

He tells reporters everywhere, ``I've pulled that extremism ad." In the South Carolina debate, ``I never called Pat an extremist." Meanwhile, he's running this ad everywhere, he's doing these push calls to tell people ``Pat Buchanan's extremist, he's going to give nuclear weapons to all these countries." He knows it is false, shabby campaign calling an old friend an extremist.

Tim, that is what Al Gore and Bill Clinton have been doing to Republicans, Newt Gingrich's Congress, the new young freshman for months. And now Mr. Dole's emulating that tactic and it is a sign of the vapidness and the hollowness of the Dole campaign.

RUSSET: But you also choose to equate the Civil Rights movement and the Civil War. The Civil Rights movement was to unify this country, the Civil War, which

was to destroy the Republic. You compared ``We Shall Overcome" to ``Dixie." A lot of people take great offense to that.

BUCHANAN: Oh, they take great offense, I know they do. But look, what I say is we conservatives, and some of the folks in the South who oppose the Civil Rights movement, we got to accept the fact that we shall overcome is part of the anthology of American songs and American history.

But other folks have to accept the fact that the Confederate battle flag, that this is a badge of honor, bravery, courage, defiance against overwhelming odds. It's the flag under which those 15,000 men walked into those guns at Gettysburg. Both sides are honored up there at Gettysburg. And all we're saying is, you got to respect the valor and honor and buoyance of the Confederate commanders and their valor.

Joshua Chamberlain, the greatest soldier this country ever produced, said whenever I see that Dixie, that flag, that Confederate flag it reminds me of incredible valor under impossible odds. That's what it means to me. What we're saying is, Tim, respect our traditions. We will respect yours. We're diverse. We come from different places.

We've had a lot of arguments and battles. Respect all our traditions.

RUSSET: But Blacks take great offense at that...

BUCHANAN: Look, some take offense at that. And some, there's some Americans who vote against Martin Luther King's holiday. But this, the Blacks consider Martin Luther King, and many Whites consider him a great Martin of Civil Rights, and a great hero.

RUSSET: Do you?

BUCHANAN: I consider Martin Luther King a brave man, a courageous Civil Rights leader. I was at the march in Washington, eloquent, eloquent more than any American of his generation. But I do believe he was a flawed character.

RUSSET: And you told Mr. Nixon in a memo that he was a fraud and a demagogue?

BUCHANAN: Well, no I don't know that I said that. I said he's been considered by many. I don't believe I ever said.

RUSSET: Many consider, you said. Correct?

BUCHANAN: Many consider, OK. Some people do. This was when the whole issue was very volatile as to whether or not they should have a holiday for Dr. King. Ronald Reagan initially opposed that holiday. I initially opposed that holiday. Now that it's there we've got to say listen, friends, that battle is over.

BUCHANAN: And let's move forward together. That's what we're trying to do. But don't make us renounce my ancestors or my heritage or my history. We shouldn't make others renounce theirs. We're a diverse nation.

RUSSET: You've also been hit with charges of

anti

-Semitism.

BUCHANAN: Right.

RUSSERT: Last week I had William Safire, a friend of 30 years, a co

-worker in the Nixon White House. I asked him about those charges about you. And this is what he said.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SAFIRE: Well, certainly in personal relationships he get along well with just about everybody. But on a scale of one to ten. If you take the great majority of Americans and say -- on anti- Semitism, they don't have any, one. And you take Hitler as ten. And you say Farrakhan is seven. I'd put Buchanan four or five.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

BUCHANAN: Well, I think that is a -- that's really a slander, really. Adolph Hitler, a mass murderer of Jewish people, the greatest anti

-Semite in history, in the agent of mass murder. Mr. Farrakhan rants and raves against Catholics and Jews, in particular, and others to a degree that all of us find appalling. And yet Ms. Safire compares me with those figures. I think the comparison is not only invalid, it's outrageous.

RUSSERT: Well, he refers to -- calling Congress, ``the Israeli Occupied territory'', has supported the war -- Israeli Defense Ministry, and the (OFF

-MIKE)...

BUCHANAN: Who the -- Can I talk about that?

RUSSERT: ...the reference to the Holocaust survival syndrome which creates group fantasies, that's what he's concerned about.

BUCHANAN: All right. Let me tell you. Let's talk about it.

At times, Congress has behaved exactly that way. It has not stood up, in many cases, to the Israeli lobby when they demand foreign aid, far beyond what I think is proper and ought to be done. And Congressmen will tell you off the record Tim, that they are terrified at what happened to Chuck Percy or Bill Fulbright. The amen corner of the Israeli Defense Ministry, Mr. Safire is a member in good standing of that. During a number of these conflicts there were people who came out entirely for the war against Iraq.

And they based it on the grounds that Iraq was a threat to the nation's state of Israel. But that's not my interest. I...

RUSSERT: Mr. Nixon in 1968 said, ``Bring us together." Do you think Blacks and Jews could vote for

Pat Buchanan?

BUCHANAN: I think -- I'll tell you, I think, given the hostility that's coming out of some members of the Jewish community -- you ask me, it's difficult. I do think I can bring a lot of Black Americans home because they stand with me on these unfair trade deals that are sending their jobs overseas. These are working class folks who are coming our way.

RUSSERT: Mr. Buchanan, we have to leave it there. Thank you for joining us. Be safe on the campaign trail.

BUCHANAN: Thank you.

RUSSERT: Coming next, Cuba's back in the news. We'll hear what Fidel Castro had to say about America in 1959. More of "Meet the Press" live from Atlanta after this brief news and weather update.

(BREAK)

RUSSERT: A quick station break and we'll find out what Fidel Castro looked and sounded like in 1959.

(BREAK)

RUSSERT: ...1959 and appeared on "Meet the Press."

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

(UNKNOWN): Dr. Castro, an American magazine published a story this week which says that Dr. Castro really hates America.

Will you tell the American people how you feel about the United States?

CASTRO: I'm not going to hate to the people of the United States. I don't hate anybody, including my enemies, those who have been my strong enemy in Cuba, I don't hate them. Mark the Apostle, ocho, taught us not to hate. (OFF

-MIKE)

(UNKNOWN): Well are you saying that you don't hate your enemies and you don't hate us either?

CASTRO: It's not to the public, to the people of the United States sincere are they thinking about the citizens of the United States are very nice and noble people.

CASTRO: I see in Cuba, I see here you're young boys, girls, newspaper reports, doctors, everybody really, really nice people. This is my impression. If I would think another way, you can be sure, I would say here.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

RUSSERT: And here it is 37 years later, Cuba shoots down four American civilians. The U.S. imposes tougher economic sanctions and relations deteriorate. We'll be right back.

(BREAK)

Tune in tonight for the NBC NIGHTLY NEWS with Jack Ford. Tomorrow, Katie Couric back from maternity leave. Welcome back, Katie. You'll see her tomorrow on the today show. Tune in tomorrow night for the NBC NIGHTLY NEWS with Tom Brokaw.

And a special thank you to our great Havana affiliate,
WXIHN 11, Channel 11 you are the best.

That's all for today, we'll be back next week. If it's
Sunday, it's MEET THE PRESS.

END

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: owner-usda-agam@reeusda.gov@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-APR-1996 13:21:00.00

SUBJECT: USDA-AGAM> AgNews 4/9 Midday

TO: Multiple recipients of the list (usda-agam@reeusda.gov@INET@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

IND_TO: Gordon Li (LI_G) (WHO)
READ: 9-APR-1996 13:23:42.46

IND_TO: Doris O. Matsui (MATSUI_D) (WHO)
READ: 9-APR-1996 13:25:07.93

IND_TO: Evan M. Ryan (RYAN_E) (WHO)
READ: 9-APR-1996 13:26:11.66

IND_TO: Patricia A. Clark (CLARK_P) (OA)
READ: 9-APR-1996 13:28:04.17

IND_TO: Bruce K. Sasser (SASSER_B) (OMB)
READ: 9-APR-1996 13:41:51.88

IND_TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
READ: 9-APR-1996 14:24:04.50

IND_TO: LeeAnn Inadomi (INADOMI_L) (WHO)
READ: 9-APR-1996 16:58:26.07

TEXT:
Tuesday, April 9, 1996 MidDay Edition

***** COPYRIGHT NOTIFICATION *****

AGNews is intended for use by USDA policymakers only. Redistributing AGNews outside USDA by any means violates copyright on the source material.

FARM & FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

CHINA'S BAN ON CORN EXPORTS IN QUESTION (201 Reuter, Knight-Ridder 4/9) -- South Korea corn importers said on Tuesday they had received no word on Chinese sales, but would be interested if Chinese grain went on the market. On Tuesday, a Chinese trader said Beijing had approved the sale of 1.5 million tons of corn to South Korea and Japan at \$175-\$180 per ton. But an official at China's state grain reserve denied any decision had yet been made to lift the export ban, imposed on corn and rice in December 1994 after grain reserves were found to be much lower than officials had thought.

U.S. CORN BOOMS IN SOUTH KOREA (202 Reuter 4/8) -- U.S. corn exports were likely to dominate South Korea's feed-grain sector in the 1996 marketing year while wheat imports held steady, according to a report from

the U.S. attache in Seoul.

PHILIPPINES LIKELY TO BE OUT OF THE CORN MARKET (203 Knight-Ridder 4/8) -- The U.S. attache in Manila said the Philippines government is not likely to buy corn again before the end of this marketing year, except for 50,000 tons of white corn needed by the country's starch makers. Although livestock producers want more corn, the government is expected to look for wheat in India and Australia.

VOLUME OF TOKYO CORN FUTURES SURGES (204 Reuter 4/8) -- The trading volume of corn futures on the Tokyo Grain exchange has surged early this year amid the grain contract's price rallies in line with the Chicago market. The first quarter volume in 1996 totaled 2,989,808, up from 789,544 last year.

PORK OFFER-PRICES TO JAPAN UP, BUYING RUSH (205 Knight-Ridder 4/8) -- Offer prices for U.S. and Taiwan chilled/frozen pork to Japan have increased by about 10-20% from late March, with price gains likely to continue through July, traders said. The price rise is being driven by strong demand from Japanese traders who expect to see another import tariff hike in late July.

FRANCE, CHINA SEEN NEAR FRAMEWORK WHEAT AGREEMENT (206 Reuter 4/9) -- France and China are preparing a framework agreement for the purchase of unspecified volumes of French wheat over the next three years, to be signed on Wednesday, French industry officials said on Tuesday. A multi-annual agreement is under consideration, one official said. This involved the purchase by China of unspecified amounts of French wheat during the 1996/97 (July/June) agricultural season and the following two seasons. Tonnages will be set at the start of each campaign, he said.

PLANTING SHOULD INCREASE RAPIDLY THIS WEEK IN EUROPE (207 Knight-Ridder 4/8) -- Mostly dry weather and mild temperatures will make for very good planting conditions across Europe this week.

CHINA GOVT TO AID FAILING SUGAR MILLS (208 Reuter 4/8) -- China will prop up the ailing sugar factories in the far south of the country by buying their output for its central reserve stocks, a senior sugar official said.

MARKETING & REGULATORY PROGRAMS

CANADA DESTROYS SIX SHEEP THOUGHT TO HAVE SCRAPIE (209 CP 4/8) -- Agriculture Canada has destroyed six Ontario sheep which showed signs of developing scrapie, the ailment believed to have sparked the mad cow outbreak in Britain.

BOLL WEEVIL DISPUTE SPREADS (210 Houston Chronicle 4/9) -- A dispute over boll weevils has spread to South Texas and the Winter Garden area, as farmers intent on eradicating the pest, square off against farmers balking at paying for an intensive spraying program.

BARLEY DISEASE LOOMS (211 AP 4/9) -- Weather conditions in the Pacific Northwest are ripe for a potentially devastating barley stripe rust epidemic. But plant pathologists say there's no reason to panic yet. Washington and Idaho officials are warning growers to take precautions.

NATURAL RESOURCES & ENVIRONMENT

LOGGING AND THE UNABOMBER (212 Los Angeles Times 4/8) -- The article reports that the issue of the Unabomber's potential involvement in environmental opposition to logging emerged last week with unconfirmed reports that he had been seen at an Earth First! timber protest in Montana in November.

NEW FOREST POLICIES UPSET SOME CAMPERS (213 Los Angeles Times 4/9) -- The new system for dispensing permits to enter some wilderness areas in California has been criticized by some of the locals who say the new method virtually locks them out of the area during prime times as distant city dwellers can reserve places in the forests well in advance.

OFFICIALS MONITOR SEEPING LAGOON IN NORTH CAROLINA (214 AP 4/9) -- North Carolina regulators are unable to stop a Columbus County hog farm from opening, even though groundwater is seeping into a lagoon being built to hold animal waste. Environmentalists are concerned. Unless there is a violation of water quality laws, however, there is little that officials can do to force the farm to address their concerns, the local media reported.

RESEARCH, EDUCATION & ECONOMICS

DROUGHT CONDITIONS CAST DOUBTS (215 Des Moines Register 4/7, 4/9, AP 4/8) -- Dry weather for the past 10 months has parched the southeastern two-thirds of Iowa, creating drought conditions almost as bad as in 1988, according to the state climatologist. An Iowa State University agronomist said that a dry April and May wouldn't be that bad and maybe they could get planting done on time for once. Last year, wet weather kept Iowa farmers from planting; now, cold ground conditions are keeping farmers from planting corn. Field work was ahead of last year and the five-year average.

(216 Reuter 4/8) -- Kansas wheat condition slipped another five percentage points with the crop rated 48% good to fair as dry conditions and below freezing temperatures take their toll.

(217 UPI 4/8) -- Cool and dry conditions also are holding back farmers from planting in Illinois. Wheat is greening up, but it looks thin.

PIONEER TO LICENSE SEED CORN HYBRIDS (218 Reuter 4/8, Des Moines Register 4/9) -- Pioneer Hi-Bred International Inc., said it will implement a program of licensing its proprietary, commercialized seed corn hybrids in connection with ongoing efforts to obtain patent protection for its proprietary germplasm. Under U.S. patent law, Pioneer corn would not be available for breeding by other corn breeding companies unless licensed by Pioneer.

BIOTECH GOAT CREATED TO PRODUCE DRUG (219 Wall Street Journal 4/9) -- The article reports on transgenic drug production using special bred farm animals. The potential cost savings of the methodology aren't known, but one manufacturer predicts it can produce drugs for about half the cost of traditional methods.

SCIENTISTS SAY RAPESEED OIL LINKED TO ASTHMA (220 Reuter 4/6) -- British scientists said they had established a link between oilseed rape crops' and asthma, hay fever and other illnesses. Government ministers have in the past denied that the crop is a threat to health, saying that the crop is no more detrimental than other grasses.

RURAL ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CO-OP FEVER (221 Farm Journal 4/96) -- The article reports on the rise of valued-added farmer cooperatives in the Renville, Minn., area. With co-ops for a 8,750-sow hog farm, 2-million-hen layer operation and a tilapia aquaculture venture, Renville is a hotbed for cooperatives. Minnesota and the Dakotas now have 50 new value-added co-ops, the article says.

USDA -- MULTI-MISSION

MARION BERRY FEATURED (222 Farm Journal 4/96) -- The article features President Clinton's farmer-adviser Marion Berry. Berry, housed at USDA, is the president's eyes and ears on agricultural policy matters. Now, he is running for a congressional seat. Berry is known as the father of the Wetlands Reserve Program, and as the "Mayor of Agriculture."

EDITORIAL AND OPINION

FREEDOM TO FARM--THANKS TO THE TAXPAYER (223 Los Angeles Times 4/9) -- The columnist suggests that the new farm bill is a form of socialism which victimizes consumers, taxpayers and the remaining independent farmers whose livelihoods are threatened by subsidized industrial-scale competition. He suggests that Congress should pass legislation that would abolish the whole of the existing farm system and subject it to the same competition and price dictates that free industries face.

IMPACT OF CORN PRICES (224 Atlanta Journal and Constitution 4/9) -- A columnist outlines the reasons corn prices are so high: weather-related production problems world-wide, and increased demand for feeding livestock. He predicts corn prices will continue rising until livestock feeding becomes unprofitable and slaughtering is increased. He says grocery prices will eventually rise although meat prices are likely to drop first.

DISCLAIMER -- AGNews content is derived from major wires, news magazines and mass distribution press. Inclusion of an item in AGNews does not imply USDA agreement; nor does USDA attest to the accuracy or completeness of the item. AGNews editors will not read, mail or fax source material to any user.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 9-APR-1996 13:23:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I3C7XWAMTS006HKD@PMDf.EOP.GOV>; Tue, 09 Apr 1996 13:21:07 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from maat.reeusda.gov (maat.esusda.gov)

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.0-6 #6879) id <01I3C7YPQSC400007K@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Tue, 09 Apr 1996 13:21:46 -0700 (MST)

Received: (from daemon@localhost) by maat.reeusda.gov (8.6.12/8.6.12)

id RAA13704 for usda-agam-outgoing; Tue, 09 Apr 1996 17:09:25 +0000 (GMT)

Precedence: bulk

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: uucp@Whitehouse.GOV@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-APR-1996 19:33:00.00

SUBJECT: scanner results

TO: adams_c (adams_c@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TO: horn_s (horn_s@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:25-APR-1996 09:34:55.12

TO: shinn_m (shinn_m@A1@CD) (OA)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
SCANNER RESULTS

set and put it up somewhere else. One where they can keep the battle going.
One where they can retain their positions of leadership. And what do you do
when someone is throwing bombs and killing your people? You don't think of
public relations- your fire back. Exactly what was being counted on. Got
them good. Pulled them in before they had a chance to think. What if Peres

MESSAGE BODY

From 73773.440@CompuServe.COM Wed Apr 24 19:33:01 1996
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by WhiteHouse.gov (8.7.1/uucp-relay) id TAA10398 for
<President@WhiteHouse.GOV>; Wed, 24 Apr 1996 19:33:01 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from storm.eop.gov/198.137.241.51 via smap
Received: from DIRECTORY-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-6 #6879)
id <01I3XJ845N0W002AF4@STORM.EOP.GOV> for President@WhiteHouse.GOV; Wed,
24 Apr 1996 19:30:34 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SCAN-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-6 #6879)
id <01I3XJ83HSME002O8V@STORM.EOP.GOV> for President@Whitehouse.GOV; Wed,
24 Apr 1996 19:30:32 -0700 (MST)
Received: from arl-img-7.compuserve.com by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-6 #6879)
id <01I3XJ6L2IAE001OIW@STORM.EOP.GOV> for President@Whitehouse.GOV; Wed,
24 Apr 1996 19:29:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: by arl-img-7.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id TAA14324; Wed,
24 Apr 1996 19:30:55 -0400
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 1996 19:30:08 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Steve G. Robinson" <73773.440@CompuServe.COM>
Subject: Miscel.
To: president <President@WhiteHouse.GOV>
Message-id: <960424233007_73773.440_FHC37-1@CompuServe.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Comments: This message scanned by SCAN version 0.1 jms/960226

Readers,
O.k.

Some thoughts already put down to share. There are lots more but some will have to wait until the next letter.

Just a few almost for sures concerning Republican strategy for the '96 Presidential election.

Now that Bob Dole is the candidate all those Republicans intent on smudging his image are gonna put everything into creating a candidate that talks, answers question, relates, looks, and communicates in a way that can win. That sounds so obvious reading it back over. But this is magic and it works really well and it is hard to say who it will work for and who it won't. They haven't done it with Dole before. So don't be surprised if he comes up with an appealing personality in the next months or so. Calculate it into the equation now so there will be fewer surprises. If it doesn't happen? Even better.

While giving Dole complete monetary, networking, administrative, etc. support conservative Republicans might distance themselves discreetly in the media. It will be Democrats job (without overdoing it) to continually link Gingrich and Dole, D'amato and Dole, whoever best represents extreme Republicanism etc. in the minds of the public. No consultations with Newt. No publicized meetings with prominent but controversial Republican leaders. Democrats may have to work to keep the other majors players role with Dole in the news. This is completely fair because Dole has worked hand in hand with other Republicans through the years. Best of all for Clinton Dole has shown him self to be almost a complete pushover. It would not be too hard to portray him as a puppet of the conservative elite (nice sound to that). The conservative coalition guy has agreed to back off and be less pushy in agreement with Dole for which conservative coalitions agenda will be pushed after Doles election. Not too hard to draw that line even as they step back to let the tide of time wash it away.

Talk about sweet treatment. Dole calls for an investigation into his own organization? I am use to hearing about the accusation first and then most candidates are asked about it afterwards by journalists! What a switch! How nice! And in the paper (yesterday?) he has a nice front page article explaining why he will be taking an unpopular stand before the actual action is taken. That at least could be attributed to preparation by his staff (although isn't necessarily). The other required journalistic collusion.

Listening to NPR and the hands off approach of Democrats concerning the S and L's because of Democrats involvement in it. This is really dumb. There seems to be some ethic here concerning not throwing stones if you live in glass houses. Or is it just fear. If it is the first it is not good enough.

Republicans have been trying to stick the S and L scandals to Democrats but most see it as nonpartisan . Republicans share equal suspicions in the publics mind concerning it, maybe even a little more when the facts are understood. Democrats are seen sometimes as foolish and a little greedy but there is no sticking of a corruption label. In fact Whitewater seems to be reversing and sticking more to Republicans because of their willingness to use it for partisan purposes. Just the hint of that starting so don't take it for granted. Besides maybe I don't have this right but I have a sneaking suspicion the S and L scams would have never happen without deregulation pushed by Republicans. I am just guessing I admit. I know nothing about banking or the history of it. But didn't S and L's start getting to do things only banks could before sometime in the eighties and wasn't there a lot of resistance by knowledgeable persons who predicted trouble? If that is true Democrats have

the biggest weapon against any accusations concerning S and L's. It does not erase corruption but it points out it would never have had a chance to take root without the assistance of the opposing party. It points to a major weakness in philosophy. A very valuable weapon with the public. If this is not just guessing on my part (which it might be-but I remember thinking at the time that there must be money in those S and L's the way they were pushed at the beginning- and I remember noting the Oregon one was Benjamin Franklin- like it was a conservative front)

If there is a major point sinker by Dole or trailing in the polls in the last three months before the election then his life could be in danger. (Hey, it wouldn't be a good letter without a little conspiracy) Imagine this: some other more popular personality -not so old- signs on the ticket with Dole. Someone who does not have the name recognition but has more charisma or a better message with the public. The vice candidate gains the necessary media exposure to win in the course of campaigning with Dole. But it becomes apparent Dole can't beat Clinton. But the vice presidential candidate could.....

Pretty tempting. I bet a heart attack or stroke is pretty easy to induce in someone older (I assume there are methods). It would seem only natural in someone his age. Sad but not unusual.

If I were Dole I would bring my own food unexpectedly, regularly and randomly. An ounce of prevention.....

But let's assume instead the Republican vice presidential candidate will be a she. Pretty safe assumption. Someone young but experienced. No scandals or potential for. A current or former governor. Either that or Quayle.

Of the two that are known for sure to be connected with the Oklahoma city bombing- Nichols and McViegh: Nichols is the one most capable of planning and carrying out of a bombing. McViegh is intelligent but he is a foot soldier.

Nichols has the persistence and personality type. Interesting how McViegh was at the scene and Nichols has the alibi. A good planner doesn't put himself at risk. His planning skills are needed for future jobs. Best to have a water carrier for the heavy stuff. A male was calling local businesses on that day?

That just makes it look more suspicious. Even I know phone records are used in court to substantiate presence. Pretty fishy to me that the FBI accepts this without any further research. And if there were others don't bother to wait for contact to be made again. It won't happen. If they are acting as a military unit they will follow military rules. After all they are patriots!

Just like Paul Revere! With that kind of pride and comradeship there won't be a slipup. They are playing soldier. Even easier if there are those who are already showing them that strings will be pulled for them from above if they keep their mouths shut.

Also compared to the Unabomber I am surprised with how little there is on the Oklahoma two and how little of their personal life has been released or even delved into by the media. We know of his sister but nothing about his or the other guys family. His parents, his close friends? It has been a year. In contrast there are pictures of the hermit when he was a young boy. People he went to school with comment on him. A woman he dated gave a press conference. Where are the chums of Mr. Nichols? Didn't he go to high school? What was he like then? Who were his friends on the army? The Press can't get that information, huh? Or is there something there someone would rather the public did not know? Granted the Unabomber has been doing it longer and more times. Still head count wise (as in people dead) he is small potatoes compared to McViegh and Nichols. But not if you look at the media play done for each. That disparity would not be possible without the media or someone deciding to take a

hands off approach.

But then there weren't any lobbyists or timber executives in that federal building were there? Just little black children and expendable average citizens. (I think the connection with the black separatist sounds very likely). And there is no political benefit to Republicans of leaks about right wing extremists, only left wing extremists. Now that is good press! Whatever is going on there is a lid on the Oklahoma city bombing case by the media as compared to the Unabomber. Official or just due to the political leanings of the investigative agencies or for some other reason. The Oklahoma perpetrators lives are being played unusually low. Even given the eccentricity of the Unabomber the disparity of news coverage is unequal.

And the guy in Oregon whose shed blew up. Reading the press one would have thought he had been arrested with a prostitute from the attention it received. What if he had been black? Or anti logging? Would have been a lot more attention. There is either clear favoritism here or protection. Whether intended or not 'to the right' leaning men are going to get the notion (at least in Oregon) that the law will look the other way if they stockpile explosives and play with them. Does the Republican party really want a bunch of crazies blowing buildings in the name of reform? They've got to decide because if they don't speak out against it then these folks are going to assume their leaders agree. No political maneuvering here. However I may dislike the Republican Party I don't believe its top leaders want to see little babies bodies on TV. Yet they will see lots more of it if nothing is said. If Republican leaders will not speak out against Militias and the violence they espouse then sometime in the next two months Clinton has to make this a national focus as important as any he has ever taken on. He has to let the average American know that it is time to let their neighbors know that the rest of us do not consider Militia's or such military actions as American or patriotic. It is up to the average citizen to stop encouraging these people through passiveness. Time for the rest of us to speak up. If Americans do not want terrorism of this kind it is up to each of us to stop it. And the best way is to create a massive movement against it. This might be more important then getting reelected. If little guys have gone underground while being encouraged by more powerful interests then the potential for violence is incredible. The sixties people were children in comparison. I don't know there are lots of these kinds of people. There may only be a few. But the potential for destruction of our society not just physically is to large to ignore. These people must be taken seriously.

I don't understand the Lebanon connection but if bombs were coming into Israel then Israel had the right to throw some back. On the other had it does not make for good press, a spiritual position you can operate comfortably from, or just a very good feeling about yourself when those not involved get caught in the cross fire. Israel needs to have strong connections between what it is doing and those who have done violence toward them. Looks to me like it's been getting muddy. Maybe it just looks that way. Also somehow their enemy was able to shift the battle from inside Israel and a battle with an organization called Hamas to a battle outside with a completely differently organization-Hesballoh (?). Israel was winning the public relations battle inside Israel (the important battle) so the opponents had to create another front to fight on where the advantage would go the other way. Take down the set and put it up somewhere else. One where they can keep the battle going. One where they can retain their positions of leadership. And what do you do when someone is throwing bombs and killing your people? You don't think of public relations- your fire back. Exactly what was being counted on. Got

them good. Pulled them in before they had a chance to think. What if Peres had gone to Assad? Then the world pressure right now would be on Assad. Instead it is on Israel. How to get out of this mess? Three weeks of clothes is a good start. Hesbollah firing from near the UN camp does work for Israel. Good decision by the commander who decided Christopher should not take a tour just now. Assad does not sound trustworthy.

Clinton should research the land mine issue completely. Even get a few independent unofficial opinions on it. I hate these things but what a wonderful trap for a Democrat president to fall into. (This may not be the case but what a perfect example of what a good Republican trap can look like!) Elimination of a strategy which may be the only effective weapon under certain very narrow circumstances in one percent of the conflicts anywhere. But all they need is a bunch of soldiers wiped out because the military was prevented from using them in one instance (just before an election, maybe?) with loud criticism by a few generals afterward. Then the land mine companies are rolling in the dough again. No other country would jump on the band wagon of elimination then. And the US is only one consumer. Abortion should be allowed. Yet there are circumstances under which we do not allow it. Land mines may have a very important role under very unusual circumstances. Taking that option from the military (under strict guidelines in very few instances) could make Clinton enemies he needs as friend right now. Dole on the other hand has lots of friends in the military. That one issue isn't going to lose him necessary votes or necessary assistance to the commander in general in the next few months. But it could to Clinton. Get some veterans groups riled up. Clinton should not jump in right away whenever Dole supports an issue no matter how wonderful and right it seems. If it is any kind of a liberal issue then Democrats should assume 'trap!' And try to look at it from that angle. Is it necessary to even take a stand on this right now? What else will happen as a result of taking a stand? Republicans love to pull Democrats into making stands then watching as the negative long term political consequences surface slowly. One of their favorite tricks. Not that the stand is wrong just be careful when they attempt to have any control over timing. Would this issue have come up with out Republican help. Would Clinton feel pressured to support or reject it without a previous Republican action? Essential questions. What are the benefits to Democrats of putting it through now? Are their large potential negatives? Would it be just as easily passed after the election. If so what has made it so important to the Republicans right now? Do they see a potential we don't? Political disadvantages? A couple weeks is enough time to let all the 'Oh my God, this would happen if we did that!' realizations come to the surface for most decisions. What seems obvious to others can take that take that long. This has been a major weakness in the Clinton camp. First the tendency not to consult other top Democrats (not important to get their support but because they will see angles the administration does not.) (Actually to his credit he has not done this since the budget talks) Second the tendency to jump in within two days of an issue being raised. Often when no one expects or needs a decision. Third the tendency to do this on issue on which a President cannot reverse himself without discrediting the office. Have to say right now that President Clinton and all the Democrats have been doing everything just fine. No mess ups at all. I only write this as a warning because Republicans will try to play this or that weakness again. If it worked before maybe they can get it to work again. Unfortunately have to look to the future and for warned is fore armed. But you guys are doing great!

Especially, I am really happy seeing the ad's defending Clinton between popular shows. A lot of what Republicans have accomplished was because there was no

resistance. No one bothered to just say to the public 'No, what they are saying is not true.' In many cases that is all that it takes. And doing this at the time the accusations begin is best of all. No time to clean up later when so many other things have to be done too (just before the election). In the same area just saw a Jim Bunn ? (local) ad accusing Clinton of voting against the family tax cut. This ad did a good counter and should be countered itself. The best angle I see is when the woman says that everything she makes just goes to their taxes. Looks to me like she is complaining about not making as much money as her husband. Well, and whose fault is that, honey? Surely not Democrats. Women like that make one understand how men get the idea women are stupid. (Ok, so she is just a commercial construct.....). Anyhow this is the best part of their ad because it gets all those voters thinking about what they would do with that extra money. (Right! Their churches and communities would be getting those checks the next week! But you can't point that out.). Still the Democrat ad pretty much answered this kind of insinuation and all that's needed is repetition.

Watching a put down of the FAA on TV. Air crashes. Pretty nasty. Read recently there is a fund being held that could be used to improve the Air traffic control situation and why isn't Clinton using it? Do I detect an attempt here to play with the ledger in order to shift the way the balance sheet looks? Don't touch that fund.

Along the same lines. See where the Medicare trust is 'bleeding more red ink than expected'. A little assistance here? Republicans need these systems to collapse or look like they are on the way out. They are socialism pure and simple and the US needs to eliminate all socialism to be pure (according to conservative doctrine). No place for this stuff in American society. The tainted Canadians or Europeans maybe but we in the US have to hold the hard line against evil. And if the public hears the demise of a program long enough then the plug will be pulled eventually. Whether originally inevitable or not.

That's all for now folks,

Always supporting,

Patti Bruce,

Portland, Or.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:24-APR-1996 19:35:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I3XJB2OMG000HQG8@PMD.F.EOP.GOV>; Wed, 24 Apr 1996 19:32:57 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from whitehouse.gov (whitehouse.gov)

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-6 #6879) id <01I3XJBK8N56001OIW@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Wed, 24 Apr 1996 19:33:20 -0700 (MST)

Received: (from uucp@localhost) by WhiteHouse.gov (8.7.1/uucp-relay)

id TAA10478; Wed, 24 Apr 1996 19:34:31 -0400 (EDT)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy (ABERNATHY_P) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-APR-1996 14:08:59.59

SUBJECT: DOLE: SHUT DOWN PUBLIC HOUSING, 'BIG BROTHER' HUD

TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Daniel Taberski (TABERSKI_D)
(WHO)
READ:29-APR-1996 14:10:39.36

TO: Jonathan Orszag (ORSZAG_J) (OPD)
READ:29-APR-1996 14:22:51.41

CC: Paul R. Dimond (DIMOND_P) (OPD)
READ:29-APR-1996 14:19:24.80

TEXT:

Date: 04/29/96 Time: 10:50

DDole: Shut Down Public Housing, 'Big Brother' HUD

WASHINGTON (AP) America's public housing developments are "the last bastions of socialism" and should be shut down in favor of a voucher system that lets the poor choose where to live, Sen. Bob Dole said today.

In an election-year speech meant to sharpen contrasts between the GOP presidential challenger and President Clinton, Dole also railed against the Clinton administration's Department of Housing and Urban Development, calling it an intrusive Big Brother that should be closed.

He singled out three fair-housing investigations launched by then-Assistant Housing Secretary Roberta Achtenberg, including a 1994 action against a Berkeley, Calif., neighborhood group protesting the opening of a nearby home for recovering drug addicts.

"Fair housing laws will be enforced in a Dole administration," Dole told the annual National Association of Realtors conference.

"There is no room for discrimination ... but there's also no room for a Big Brother Housing and Urban Development Department threatening and intimidating those doing nothing more than expressing their First Amendment rights," he said to applause.

Dole noted the investigations and threatened fines were ultimately dropped by HUD, but added dryly, "I hope my remarks won't lead to an investigation."

Achtenberg, whose nomination in 1993 was fiercely opposed by Senate conservatives, resigned her post last year to make an unsuccessful bid for San Francisco mayor and has since returned to the department as a senior adviser to Secretary Henry Cisneros. It is an appointment that does not require confirmation by the Senate.

Dole's morning remarks were the latest in a series of speeches designed to paint Clinton and his appointees as reckless liberals. The Kansas senator has previously taken aim at Clinton's judicial appointments; today was the first time he turned on HUD.

He said the department's public housing program, begun long before Clinton took office, had failed to improve the lives of the poor. Calling the federal bureaucracy ``landlords of misery," Dole said housing vouchers for the poor were a better alternative. He also called for privatization of the Fair Housing Authority, and said safety-net programs for the homeless would be better administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

HUD is one of four cabinet-level agencies which Dole has said he would eliminate, in addition to Commerce, Education and Energy.

Resurrecting a hot primary issue that has since fizzled out, Dole also reiterated his commitment to retaining, under any flat-tax reform, the popular deduction for home mortgage interest. And, he said he wants to ``eliminate, and if not eliminate, at least reduce" the tax rate on capital gains.

APNP-04-29-96 1052EST

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Diana M. Fortuna (FORTUNA_D) (OPD)

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-APR-1996 12:47:15.57

SUBJECT: FYI see first bullet from wh bulletin yesterday

TO: Molly Brostrom (BROSTROM_M) (WHO)

READ:30-APR-1996 12:54:24.45

TEXT:

IN THE WHITE HOUSE AND AROUND TOWN:

- o Dole proposes public housing be replaced with vouchers. During a speech this morning to the National Association of Realtors, Senator Bob Dole proposed the Federal Housing Authority be partly privatized, with the poor receiving vouchers to choose their own dwellings rather than living in decrepid government housing. Referring to HUD, Dole said: "They want to reduce the number of homeless; they want to expand housing opportunities and open housing markets to minorities. Their goals may be commendable; I wonder about their methods. Many of HUD's main programs don't even pretend to help the poor. Others just plain hurt the poor." Added Dole: "Let's take public housing, for instance. Public housing is one of the last bastions of socialism in the world. Imagine, the United States government owns the housing where an entire class of citizens permanently live. We're the landlords of misery." Said Dole: "Let me be clear: I believe the government has an obligation to maintain a safety net. But these programs have failed in that mission. They have not alleviated poverty. In fact, they've deepened it, rather than to alleviate it. Housing vouchers, in my view, would enable poor Americans to choose where they like to live, just like we do. If they've got a voucher, they can take it to you or somebody else, and you can help them, and America's free markets can help. The Federal Housing Authority should be privatized. Homelessness assistance should be given to the Department of HHS and not HUD. And enforcement of the fair housing laws should be monitored by the Department of Justice." Dole also criticized the actions of one of the Clinton Administration's more liberal members, Roberta Achtenberg, a former HUD Assistant Secretary who ran unsuccessfully for mayor of San Francisco and recently returned to be a senior adviser to Secretary Cisneros. "Make no mistake about it, fair housing laws will be enforced in a Dole administration. There is no room for discrimination, but there will also be no room for intimidating and intrusive actions like those taken by a former assistant HUD secretary, and let me tell you about some of those," said Dole, explaining: "When Ms. Achtenberg was here, when a small newspaper in Washington state ran an ad about housing for seniors only, she threatened to fine the paper \$10,000, and also wanted the paper to print six articles that HUD would provide. After Washington Senator Slade Gorton intervened, HUD relented and the fine was lowered to \$1,000. In the summer of 1994, a number of individuals in Berkeley,

California, in a neighborhood, expressed their opposition to development in their neighborhood that would house recovering drug addicts, probably something you wouldn't want in your neighborhood. Their opposition included a petition campaign, distributing handbills, speaking out at meetings, and the filing of lawsuits, all activities which are legal the last time I checked. However, Ms. Achtenberg ordered a seven-month Federal investigation of the individuals, threatening them with fines up to \$10,000 each. ... HUD is not the 'thought police.' They're not 'thought police.' We had another organization, in New York, that had the gall to oppose the location of a facility for the homeless and mentally ill. HUD filed a complaint demanding their membership lists, names of contributors, meeting notes and other records. Again, after an uproar, the complaint was dropped." Concluded Dole: "There's no room for discrimination in our society -- and let me make that very clear -- but there's also no room for a big brother Housing and Urban Development Department threatening and intimidating those doing nothing more than expressing their First Amendment rights. And that's what America's all about."

Dole also told the realtors that home ownership is "a piece of America," and "one way to keep it is to keep the mortgage-interest deduction, forever. Don't worry about. It's going to stay there in a Dole Administration. ... I also think we ought to keep the charitable deductions in any flat-tax proposal." Added Dole: "So, the tax code can be flatter, it can be fairer, and it can be simpler. But it can also encourage home ownership, encourage contributions to charities, whatever. And we're going to set about to get that done."

Staying on the tax subject, Dole said: "Later this week, the Heritage Foundation is going to release a study about the impact of the \$265 billion tax increase, and they're going to conclude that it cost about 1.2 million additional jobs, about \$208 billion in economic output, about 40,000 new business starts, about \$112 billion in wages and salaries, \$264 billion in non-disposable income, about 1.3 million new cars and trucks sales that aren't being made -- and the list goes on and on."

- o Clinton announces drug strategy. Appearing in Miami with his Drug Czar, President Clinton today outlined a strategy for fighting America's drug problems. According to Clinton, the strategy is "meant to be a 10-year plan" that "focuses on rising drug use among children," and would come with an increased funding request of 9.3 percent.

Clinton laid out the five pillars of the strategy, saying, "Number one, to get young people to reject drugs. That's what you're doing here. Number two, to use effective treatment and prevention to break the vicious cycle that link drugs to violent crime. Third, to stop drugs at the border, the way we are doing at the Miami Customs Office where technology and street smarts are catching more drugs with less inconvenience to arriving visitors. Fourth, to break up the sources of supply, whether they are cocaine farms in Colombia or methamphetamine labs in California. And finally, to reduce the terrible social and economic costs imposed by drugs on our society, \$69 billion in the last year."

Meanwhile, a group of Republican legislators and California

Governor Pete Wilson is going to hold a press conference today criticizing the Administration's prosecution of the drug war heretofore. The legislators include Senators Abraham, Coverdell, Grassley, and Hatch, plus Congressmen Zeff, Souder, and Mica. An aide to one of the participants said the group would focus on "the increased use of drugs by America's youth during the last years of the Clinton Administration." Some of the members just returned from South America on a fact-finding mission. The aide added that Republicans would also hit Clinton again on drug-related decisions made by Clinton judicial appointees.

- o Arafat to meet with Clinton this week. Palestinian President Yasser Arafat will fly to Washington tomorrow and will meet this week with President Clinton, spokesmen for the Administration and for Arafat said today. The AP reports an Administration official said Clinton will meet Arafat either Wednesday or Thursday. Arafat spokesman Marwan Kanafani said Arafat wants to discuss talks on the final status of Palestinian rule in the West Bank and Gaza, which are to take place next month. Arafat will also seek greater financial help for the Palestinian Authority, Kanafani said. Arafat is to speak on Tuesday evening at a conference on Middle Eastern affairs to promote intellectual exchanges and support the peace process.
- o Republican members trying to force minimum wage issue on House GOP leaders. Despite a pledge from House Republican leaders not to bring a bill to the floor that increases the minimum wage, an apparently substantial number of House Republicans is intent on forcing the issue -- and sooner rather than later. Representative Chris Shays, appearing on CNBC's "Capitol Gains," said this morning that "at least 60" Republican members of the House support raising the minimum wage. Shays contended delaying an inevitable vote is "absurd" politics that is retarding advancement of the broader Republican agenda, saying, "We're being dragged to the altar kicking and screaming. We're ultimately going to say the vow, so let's get the wedding over with and let's get back on to what we believe is ultimately our issues." Shays also said supporters will use a discharge petition "if ultimately we don't have a vote on [raising the minimum wage], but we want to give our leadership time to come in with an alternative package," adding a prediction that, "Ultimately what I think it will be is their package plus the minimum wage." Shays said the issue should be resolved within "the next four to eight weeks." However, the House Republican leadership does not seem to share Shays' conviction that the vote is inevitable. A House GOP leadership source called Shays' comments, "his opinion," adding that the "at least 60" Republican votes Shays is claiming are overstated. Acknowledging that Democrats will attempt to get a vote, either through a substitute or a germane amendment, a House GOP leadership source predicted the vote would fail because, "We're going to make it very clear to our conference as we go through this summer that this is our chance to define what Democrats stand for versus what we stand for." The leadership source also said "we disagree" with Shays' contention that dragging the issue out is poor politics for the GOP, adding, "It's one way we can pin the President down where he's committed to old Democrat ideas."
- o Product liability conference report going to Clinton tomorrow. A

House Republican leadership source reports this morning that the conference report on product liability legislation -- passed in Congress by large but not veto-proof majorities -- will be sent to President Clinton tomorrow. Clinton has promised to veto the measure. Proponents of the legislation have waged an ad campaign to try and change the President's mind. Asked if the House will vote to override the expected veto, the leadership source said, "Since we don't have the override strength, we'll try to make the most out of it that we can."

- o Dole and Gramm lead separate gas tax repeal efforts; Daschle says Democrats will consider it, "but that doesn't mean we're going to do it." Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole and Sen. Phil Gramm are apparently heading up separate efforts to repeal the 4.3-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax before Memorial Day weekend kicks off the summer travel season. At a press conference today, Gramm is expected to outline his plans for trying to attach an amendment -- which would finance a gas tax repeal with a specific, but undisclosed, funding mechanism -- to legislation on the Senate floor. "Anything that comes down obviously has some potential," a Gramm aide said today, adding: "We'll find out in the next couple of days what the real support is. Our bet is that it's going to be very high. And there will be bipartisan support."

However, a Senate GOP leadership source said: "Senator Gramm is the last person who is going to be making the call on legislative strategy. After all, he attempted to run his presidential campaign from the Senate floor and ended up with nine delegates before he had to drop out. So he's not going to be responsible for making the calls. Senator Dole will make the calls and that's that." After Dole sent a letter to President Clinton late last week, seeking cooperation in repealing the gas tax, the source indicated that Republicans are likely to highlight the gas tax as a campaign issue. According to the leadership source, Dole "is demonstrating his ability to get to the front of the train. He's going to be leading an energetic charge to repeal the gas tax. The nominee has struck a very popular issue."

Referring to a statement from House Speaker Newt Gingrich that the House is likely to move a gas tax repeal by Memorial Day, the Senate leadership source said: "We assume there will be a live, unreconciled tax vehicle out there by that time with offsets...taken from some of the Tier II issues that we worked out with the White House in budget talks early this year." The source added that waiting for the House to send gas tax legislation to the Senate "is certainly an option" for Dole, and a freestanding bill may be preferable to Gramm's proposed amendment because the issue "deserves its own signal moment in order to demonstrate where we as a party stand."

A House GOP leadership source said it is "a possibility" that the House will pass a gas tax repeal by Memorial Day -- as predicted by Gingrich -- and send it to the Senate for consideration. The House leadership source said the tax rollback "amounts to \$5 billion a year," and "Dole is talking about [discretionary] spending cuts" to make up the shortfall.

Added the Senate leadership source: "We are hopeful the Administration will work this out with us. They're the folks who

claim that 'good policy is good politics,' and it's clear...that they're concerned about the political impact, the increasing gas prices, and appearing to be against a tax rollback. So there is some political inducement for them to play ball with us."

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle commented this morning that "it's easy for the Republicans to come up with ways of which to now dismantle this extremely successful package [of taxes passed by Democrats]. But I want to see how they're going to do it and if they can come up with a way that will generate the same deficit reduction in the next four years as we've done in the last four."

Added Daschle: "Well, it seems to me the Republicans' only issue -- it's remarkable to me. I'm sure if you talked about the weather, they'd come up with a tax cut; if you talked about heart problems, they'd come up with a tax cut. Any problem that you can think of in this country can be fixed with a tax cut if you listen to the Republicans." Said Daschle: "If there's a way to offset the revenue, if there's a way to relieve some of the price pressure, we're prepared to look at [repealing the gas tax increase]. But that doesn't mean we're going to do it."

- o Supreme Court upholds ruling against South Dakota abortion law. The Supreme Court announced today it will uphold lower courts' invalidation of a South Dakota law that required most young girls seeking abortions to first notify one of their parents. The lower courts' rulings said the law is unconstitutional because it does not allow girls to avoid telling their parents by getting a judge's permission instead. In other cases, the AP reports:
 - The Court ruled 7-2 in a Michigan case that Federal trial judges cannot grant acquittal to convicted criminals who miss the deadline for requesting such an order by even one day beyond the 7-day period provided in the law. "These rules are plain and unambiguous," Scalia wrote for the majority.
 - The justices refused in a Massachusetts case to curtail judges' power to close juvenile delinquency proceedings to the public. Without comment, they turned away the Boston Globe's argument that such proceedings should be open unless a trial judge can explain why publicity most likely would hurt a youngster's rehabilitation.
 - The Court agreed to resolve a dispute over estate taxes that government lawyers said arises "in countless cases." The Court said it would study the Internal Revenue Service's contention that the estate of a Georgia man who died 10 years ago owes an additional \$14 million in estate taxes on the \$30 million he left. The IRS said the estate overstated the marital and charitable deductions to which it is entitled, but the US Tax Court and the 11th US Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against the IRS. Other Federal appeals courts have reached conflicting rulings in such cases.
 - The justices refused to revive a lawsuit against CBS over a 60 Minutes report on Alar, a chemical used to spray apples. Without comment, they let stand rulings saying the Washington state apple growers who filed the lawsuit accusing CBS of product disparagement failed to prove the 1989 report contained any false statements. Lawyers for the growers asked the justices to use the case "to determine the extent to which the First Amendment protects literally true statements with defamatory implications."
 - The Court agreed to decide whether prison inmates may sue over

the loss of good-conduct time that would have hastened their release. The Court granted an appeal in which Washington state prosecutors argue that such lawsuits should be prohibited. At issue is a lower court ruling that revived civil rights lawsuits instituted by a prisoner who lost 30 days of good-conduct time in a disciplinary action and who says he was denied a fair hearing.

- o Concord Coalition releases Congressional scorecard on deficit reduction votes. The Concord Coalition Citizen's Council released its annual "Tough Choices" deficit reduction scorecard at a press conference today. The scorecard tracks the votes of members of the House and Senate on key deficit reduction issues. Martha Phillips, the Concord Coalition's executive director, said that promises from both parties to balance the budget fell by the wayside in 1995 as party bickering took center stage. The "bipartisan spirit was not exhibited by most members of the House and Senate," Phillips said. Phillips officially released the scorecard today with Tim Penny, a former Democratic Congressman from Minnesota. The Concord Coalition based its scorecard on 16 votes in the House and 21 in the Senate. The votes selected met the following criteria: proposed increases or reductions in the deficit through spending or tax decisions; involved means testing of entitlements or other benefits; offered a way to pay for new spending rather than adding to the deficit; eliminated or reduced pork barrel projects, unaffordable big ticket items or promised to make government more efficient; or involved important procedural issues affecting how budgeting decisions would be made in the future. Those receiving the highest marks in the House (with a score of 100%) are Reps. Scott Klug, John Duncan, Jr. and Fred Upton. In the Senate (with a score of 96%): Senators Hank Brown, Bob Kerrey, Sam Nunn and Charles Robb.

- o Political notes: NY poll shows the older the voters, the less they like Dole. In a new Marist Institute poll of New York voters, Bob Dole fared worse the older the respondents were. Voters under 30 preferred Bill Clinton over Dole 54 percent to 41 percent; voters between 31 and 44 years old favored Clinton 58 percent to 34 percent; voters between 45 and 60 years old favored Clinton 60 percent to 33 percent; and those over 60 favored Clinton 61 percent to 31 percent. #### Clinton travels to Florida today. President Clinton travels to Florida today for fund-raising and to announce a new anti-drug strategy at a Coral Gables middle school. Florida Republicans purchased newspaper ads to coincide with Clinton's visit; the ads attack Clinton's judicial appointments. #### Rep. Cooley accused of having secret wedding to collect veterans' benefits. Rep. Wes Cooley (R-OR) may have married his wife, Rosemary, outside the country so that she could continue to collect veterans benefits as the widow of a marine, according to The Bulletin of Bend, Oregon. The paper quotes one source as saying: "Wes and Rosemary were married in Mexico. The reason they were married out of the country is because Rosemary was collecting survivor's benefits from the death of her first husband. That's why she retained the name Herron." #### Gov. Whitman defends Clinton anti-abortion veto. Gov. Christine Todd Whitman, appearing on CNN's "Inside Politics Weekend," (R-NJ) defended President Clinton's veto of a bill banning partial-birth abortions, saying: "I would have

supported that, not because I think the technique is anything that we want to see, but because it's only used in cases that are extreme medical emergencies." ### Rep. Jackson, Jr. speaks to NAACP fund-raiser. Jesse Jackson, Jr., a freshman Congressman, defended affirmative action at the NAACP's largest annual fund-raiser last night, saying: "We should not back away from race-based and gender-based solutions for race-based and gender-based problems." The dinner, held in Detroit, was expected to draw 10,000 people, according to The Detroit News.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: jamest@usia.gov@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-MAY-1996 07:57:00.00

SUBJECT: 5_6_MEP: _Already_A_Victory

TO: matsui_d (matsui_d@A1@CD) (WHO)

READ: 6-MAY-1996 08:24:57.33

TEXT:

FOREIGN MEDIA REACTION

EARLY REPORT USIA

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND MEDIA REACTION

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, WASHINGTON, DC 20547

Patricia McArdle, Branch Chief Media Reaction, (R/MR), Tele. No. (202)619-6511 Ann Pincus, Director

Monday, May 6, 1996

MIDDLE EAST PEACE: 'ALREADY A VICTORY'

Assessments of the Middle East peace process in the foreign press today and over the weekend were relatively optimistic despite the resentment over the recent conflict in southern Lebanon. Writers analyzed the outcome of the visits of Israeli Prime Minister Peres and Palestinian Chairman Yasser Arafat to Washington last week. Israeli commentators focused on the effects of the meetings on the Israeli and U.S. elections, while Cairo's pro-government Al Ahram complained that "President Clinton has given Israel what Israel had not dreamt of obtaining." More positive conclusions appeared in papers in Amman and in Tunis, where independent, French-language Le Temps declared that, "Peace between Arabs and Israelis is inescapable." European and Asian editors also voiced their hopes that, in the words of Paris's economic Les Echos, "Faced with defiance, provocation and violence on the part of those, on both sides, who would like to derail the talks, the peace makers have held firm and that is already a victory." Syria's role was again noted as a key factor in bringing peace to the region. Moscow's reformist, weekly New Times concluded that, "Sooner or later, under U.S. pressure and on realizing that the losses in Lebanon exceed the political advantages of the current situation, Assad will have to put Hezbollah on a short leash, if only for a while."

EAST ASIA: SECURITY AND TRADE

East Asian and Russian commentators viewed the fluid

security situation in the region and discussed the need for the U.S. presence in East Asia and the difficulties of divining what Pyongyang's objectives are. Analysts, however, approached U.S.-China relations principally from the trade angle. Major Chinese dailies reiterated China's willingness to retaliate against potential U.S. sanctions under Super 301, stating that "all consequences would be the responsibility of the U.S. side." The Business Weekly supplement to Beijings' official, English-language China Daily insisted that the "extension of Most Favored Nation (MFN) trading status is a must for normal Sino-U.S. economic links," and warned that Europe and Japan would be happy to pick up the slack if the U.S. failed to renew MFN.

BRIEF

-- Bosnia

NOTE: Reports from London and Tokyo were not available today owing to the celebration of national holidays.

EDITORS: Mildred Sola Neely and Pat McArdle
MIDDLE EAST PEACE: 'ALREADY A VICTORY'

ISRAEL: "Too Much of It"

Top-circulation, pluralist Yediot (5/6) editorialized, "Important as it certainly is, Prime Minister Peres's visit to Washington was exceedingly affected by the upcoming Israeli elections. President Clinton's over-mobilization on Peres's side smacked of pure propaganda. But this is the privilege of the president of the world's only superpower. If great America believes that the way the Israeli elections go is its business, it has the right to intervene."

"Bill and Shimon"

Washington freelancer Ori Nir commented in liberal Haaretz (5/6): "Bill Clinton made it amply clear to the thousands of American Jews at the AIPAC Conference who chanted 'four more years' that four more years of harmonious relations between Israel and the United States depended not only on the outcome of the American elections, but also on the results of the Israeli elections. He could not be more explicit as to whom he wanted to win the Israeli elections. Two days later at the White House signing ceremony he said, 'The Israeli voters have shown pretty good judgment for quite a long while now.'"

EGYPT: "Signs Of Revenge"

According to pro-government Al Ahram (5/6), "One could sense signs of revenge from the most recent statement made

by U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher in which he says that he doubts if the Syrian President Hafez Al Assad wants to continue the peace process with Israel. Christopher is taking his revenge on Hafez Al Assad because Hafez refused to see (Christopher) during one of his visits to Damascus.... But these Syrian suspicions are not new to Christopher and all American officials. Everybody who is interested in the Middle East shares in the suspicions of President Hafez Al Assad and they have their reasons. The strange thing is that Warren Christopher ignores the Grapes of Wrath operation.... Why does he want Syria to make peace with Israel on the basis of trust when experiences in the recent past emphasized that there is no reason for such trust?"

"Giving Israel What Israel Had Not Dreamed Of Obtaining"

A commentator wrote in opposition weekly Al Arabi (5/6) : "According to Zionist documents, testimonies and papers President Clinton has given Israel what Israel had not dreamt of obtaining. The U.S. administration under Clinton, according to the words of the head of AIPAC, is the most biased in favor of Israel in the whole history of the United States. For the sake of Israel, he stood against the whole world and challenged international conscience which had condemned the most recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon.... He was even described by an Israeli newspaper...as the obedient boy who refuses nothing to Israel."

JORDAN: "Palestinian-Israeli Peace"

Pro-government, influential Al-Ra'y (5/6) held, "We are optimistic at the fact that the final-status negotiations have started after five years of continuous efforts.... We are also hopeful that the peace agreement that will be reached between the Palestinians and the Israeli will lead to a Palestinian sovereign state with Arab Jerusalem as its capital."

TUNISIA: "Beneficial Impetus"

Foreign news editor Faouzi Snoussi wrote in independent, French-language Le Temps (5/3): "The visit of Chairman Arafat (to Washington, DC) has important implications for the autonomous territories.... The most important thing is for the two leaders (Arafat and Clinton) to

tackle the economic situation in the territories. By inviting Arafat, the United States seems to have felt the need to remedy that situation in order to avoid the risk of new upheavals.... Peace between Arabs and Israelis is inescapable. The best way to prevent attacks (on the peace process) from any source would be to give the Palestinians

the possibility of sustained economic development. Good will alone is not enough."

FRANCE: "Already A Victory"

Economic Les Echos (5/6) published this unattributed editorial on its back page: "It is obvious that nothing will be done before the May 29 elections.... Yesterday, the essential point was to show, with a symbolic gesture, that the Israelis and Palestinians respect their commitments. Faced with defiance, provocation and violence on the part of those, on both sides, who would like to derail the talks, the peace makers have held firm and that is already a victory."

GERMANY: "Negotiations In Taba"

Centrist General Anzeiger (5/6) observed, "The Taba negotiations could sound the bell for the end of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, if not even for the last phase of the Middle East conflict. Since yesterday the negotiations are concentrating on the question of autonomy. Not without reason both sides agreed on a time frame until May 4, 1999. The conflict of a century should be settled only shortly before the end of the century. Now they will also talk about the future of Jerusalem--the most sensitive of all items. Aware of their weakness, the Palestinians have submitted to the fact that Al-Quds, as they call Jerusalem, will remain the capital of Israel. Without accommodating steps by Israel on this question, the negotiations might rapidly end in an impasse. Who knows?--maybe Jerusalem will become the seat of Israeli as well as Palestinian ministries. By no means should a wall again separate the Arab Eastern part from the Jewish West in this unique town. This world does not need walls--not in Berlin and not in Jerusalem."

RUSSIA: "Assad Will Have To Put Hezbollah On A Short Leash"

The reformist, weekly New Times (5/6) said, "This war is terrible for Lebanon. A once flourishing country has been turned into a veritable hell, a hostage of alien interests, and is compelled to pay in full measure for the bills of others. To pay with the lives and sorrow of its citizens, with economic dislocation. But in conditions of a de facto Syrian occupation, the government is incapable of doing anything. And, finally, Israel--its aim is to ensure the security of its citizens. To achieve this, it must first inflict such a military defeat on Hezbollah that the terrorists would take a long time to recover from and, secondly, lay the groundwork for a political settlement in that region without which military flare-ups will constantly recur, as it has happened so far. Israel is

prepared to conclude an agreement with Lebanon and Syria in which Syria would undertake in writing to stop Hezbollah from carrying out any whatsoever actions against Israel. But it appears totally improbable that Syria (and, correspondingly, Lebanon) will give such a consent. Yet, sooner or later, under U.S. pressure and on realizing that the losses in Lebanon exceed the political advantages of the obtaining situation, Assad will have to put Hezbollah on a short leash, if only for a while."

BANGLADESH: "Arafat In Washington"

Independent Banglabazar Patrikar (5/6) observed, "The meeting between Clinton and Arafat has made people hopeful about Palestine. Reconstruction is urgently needed for the Palestinian people at this stage after a long struggle.... It can be said that Arafat's visit was successful. Side by side, it is also true that the U.S. president and his State Department have adopted a commendable policy toward the Palestinians. This will not only help the reconstruction of Palestine, but also facilitate the peace process."

INDIA: "Advantage Assad"

An editorial in the nationalist Hindustan Times (5/6) remarked, "In the end it is President Hafez Assad...who seems to have emerged the winner. The United States and Israel had been trying to fence him off the rest of his neighborhood. Today President Assad has become the kingpin of the comprehensive peace process in West Asia. Syria has the muscle to tame the Hezbollah. Assad is aiming at a better deal with Israel than what Egypt and the PLO have managed to get so far. Israel knows his clout and has viewed him in a different light."

INDONESIA: "Arafat's Visit Strengthens Palestine's Position"

Independent Suara Pembaruan (5/3) opined, "On May 1, President Clinton received Arafat in the White House with full state protocol for the first time....The question is whether the United States will meet its pledge to Palestine of \$500 million of the total \$2.5-3 billion required to rebuild Palestine.... Arafat did not request a large amount. Should he so choose, he could receive a large donation from oil-rich Arab countries. Palestine's political cards, however, no longer lie with the Arabs, as some...are skeptical of Arafat's maneuvers. Iraq, Arafat's ally, suffers from the economic embargo and is distancing itself from Arafat. The Gulf States, particularly Kuwait, have reservations about embracing Arafat. Thus Arafat's strong position in the eyes of the United States and the West should be immediately supported with concrete action."

EAST ASIA: SECURITY AND TRADE

CHINA: "Unreasonable Listing Of China Under Super 301"

Many Chinese dailies ran this Xinhua piece, including the official, Communist Party People's Daily (5/4), "A spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC) said today that the U.S. Trade Representative has again unreasonably listed China as a priority 301 nation.... We express our resolute opposition to this.... The spokesman said that since the Sino-U.S. IPR Accord was signed, China has comprehensively and earnestly implemented its obligations under the accord and constantly enhanced protection of IPR.... 'China's tremendous successes... are universally acknowledged and obvious to all.... But the United States...again has listed China as a priority 301 nation and threatens trade retaliation. This is utterly unreasonable.... Should the United States act willfully and implement trade retaliation...China can only adopt corresponding countermeasures... in order to safeguard state sovereignty and national dignity."

"MFN Accord Vital to Normal Ties"

Sun Hong and Hong Yong wrote for the front page of the Business Weekly of the official, English- language China Daily (5/5), "Extension of Most Favored Nation (MFN) trading status is a must for normal Sino-U.S. economic links, which are in the interest of all parties, a senior Chinese expert said last week in Beijing. Zhou Shijian, vice president of the International Trade Research Institute, said proper handling of the issue is crucial to both the United States and China since the two countries are becoming key economic partners. Suspension of MFN treatment... will damage promising prospects (for the two economies). 'You can bet that European and Japanese businesses will be gleeful about the huge market given up so generously by the United States,' Zhou said....

"What's worse, the base of Sino-U.S. relations would be shaken, which does not accord with the global strategy of the United States... China has veto power in the United Nations and has wide influence over developing countries, which should not be neglected by any U.S. politician with long-term insight."

AUSTRALIA: "Increased U.S. Presence Would Not Have Stabilizing Effect"

An editorial in the liberal Canberra Times held (5/6), "Increasingly there is a sense of déjà vu about the Howard

government; and this is no better illustrated than in the move by Foreign Minister Alexander Down to 'reinvigorate' the American alliance, including the possibility of new U.S. military bases on Australian soil.... This is not to suggest that an American presence in the East Asian hemisphere is unwelcome. U.S. forces in Japan and South Korea probably discourage adventurism...and the U.S. Pacific Fleet might well have helped to contain those among the Beijing leadership who see value in escalating the recent war of words with Taiwan.... An increased American military presence would not have a stabilizing effect.... But the real damage would be to the perception our neighbors would have of an Australia that acted as an armed camp for the Caucasian superpower.... The United States has not expressed any desire to expand its military commitment to this part of the world and is unlikely to do so in a presidential election year when budgetary restraint is a major issue."

HONG KONG: "Allies Glare Covetously; Sino-U.S. Trade Is As Usual"

Under the headline above, the independent Hong Kong Economic Journal's editorial said (5/6), "We think that the U.S.'s tough attitude toward China is only words. In reality, it will not do anything that will lead China to take retaliatory action. Of course, the presidential election will be settled by the end of the year. If Clinton is re-elected, he will be restricted from being elected a third time, and if Sino-U.S. relations have not yet improved by then, the U.S. government may adopt absolute actions."

MALAYSIA: "U.S. Cannot Be Excessively Suspicious"

An editorial in government-influenced, Malay-language Berita Harian (5/4) concluded, "With the developments in Asia, America knows that it cannot continue to be suspicious of the changes that are occurring among countries in the region. Excessive suspicion will destroy its role as a world power.... Without a change of attitude toward the Asian countries, the United States can destroy its leadership and importance....

"We (Malaysia) hope that the praise that we receive (from the United States) will become a catalyst for a closer relationship with America and also help support Malaysia's attempt to develop the region, including through the EAEC.... Nevertheless, Malaysia has already spent nearly four years explaining the goals, objectives and range of work of the EAEC. Clinton still has suspicions about the institution. Some statements that have come out about the EAEC do not reflect a positive attitude; on the contrary, they attempt to create greater confusion."

SOUTH KOREA: "U.S.-N. Korea Relations Decisive Factor For Changing Asia"

A column in pro-business Joong-Ang Ilbo stated (5/6) under the above headline, "For the United States, China and Japan carry the greatest importance in terms of Asian security. The Taiwan issue and the return of Hong Kong to China, along with human rights and the trade deficit, will continue to strain Sino-U.S. relations. China's strategic relationship with Russia, too, will be a headache for the United States, but for now America will support China as it moves toward capitalism. At the same time, 'strategic ambiguity' will remain Washington's policy toward China and Taiwan for a long time. Given the rise of China and uncertainty about North Korea, Japan's role in Asian security will inevitably expand a great deal. South Korea is still very uncomfortable with the prospect of a militarily strong Japan, but it will soon have to learn to live with it. China's goal with regard to this peninsula is to maintain the status quo, while Russia remains an onlooker. At this point, uncertainty about North Korea defines the core of U.S. policy toward Korea. Washington desires gradual change in the North, so its Northern policy makes the South angry at times. However, U.S.-ROK relations are not going to change much. Finally, China is keeping an eye on how fast U.S.-North Korea relations move."

RUSSIA: "Why Is North Korea Developing Trade Ties With Capitalists?"

Diplomatic correspondent Ivan Shomov observed in reformist Segodnya (5/5), "North Korea will strive to develop its trade ties with countries of the 'capitalist market.'... Pyongyang will soon adopt the necessary laws, including on the attraction of foreign capital and the creation of a free economic zone. In this connection, some observers suggest two versions: Perhaps, after the unprecedented floods that hit the 'fortress of socialism' last year and the hunger that began in many provinces the new 'great leader' of the DPRK, Kim Jong Il, has finally realized that the ideas of 'chu-chkhe' (reliance on one's own resources) will not fill one's stomach and decided to change the old course, or, perhaps, this is a propaganda maneuver to get at least some material assistance from the West."

BRIEF

BOSNIA

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA: "Bosnia Will Remain Ethnically Divided"

Independent Oslobodjenje front-paged this commentary by Gojko Beric (5/6), "After the unsuccessful UN mission, we are now witnessing IFOR's lack of understanding of the situation in Bosnia. The best illustration of this is the latest statement of the British General Cumming, given after Serb extremists stoned and wounded a number of Bosniak and Croatian refugees. The British general described these events as orchestrated demonstrations of civilians, thus leading to the conclusion that the authorities in Sarajevo were also involved.

"Further, General Cumming claims that, compared with the war period, freedom of movement in Bosnia is improved and that the conditions to allow for September elections exist. It does not take much wisdom to figure out that freedom of movement is better now than during the war. Truly, traveling to certain places in Bosnia is possible, but we can hardly regard that as freedom of movement.... The so-called freedom of movement is, in fact, strictly controlled movement, with the possibility of any idiot in an uniform creating as many problems as he likes.... The lack of freedom of movement--which creates tensions--is one of the reasons why free and fair elections are impossible.... Robert Frowick, from the OSCE, stated that Bosnian elections would be the most complicated ones in the history of mankind. Who is to blame for the fact that they are complicated? The international community to the largest extent, because its indecisiveness shaped this complicated situation in Bosnia.

"Again the Western countries are anxious to achieve quick results in Bosnia. This time they want the elections to take place. Their insisting on the elections in September is, in fact, the desire to get Bosnia off the agenda at any price. In practice, this would mean that Bosnia remains ethnically divided, with hard inter-entity boundaries and almost no international boundaries."

GERMANY: "Unthinkable To Send Serbs To Serb-Held Areas"

The controversy over whether the former Yugoslavia refugees in Germany should be forced to return home by the date originally specified sparked this editorial in right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (5/6), "War refugees should have shelter during the time of the war, then they have to return home.... However, they cannot be sent back into areas where they have to fear for their lives, where the war in reality still continues or where they are not admitted. So long as the Serbs do not even allow displaced persons or refugees to visit the cemetery, the return to that part of Bosnia under Serb rule is unthinkable.... The international force, IFOR, still has a long way to go."

BELGIUM: "Where Can You Find Trust Among Bosnians?"

Edouard Van Velthem said in independent Le Soir (5/6), "The Serbs' massive exodus from Sarajevo eventually served as a warning: the triumph of the principle of 'everyone in his own house,' the paranoid rejection of co-habitation; all fanned by the alarming speeches of those wanting to go to the absolute end.... The infernal spiral of feelings of hatred, fear, revenge and guilt: The Dayton text has put an end to hostilities, but it also reflects its powerlessness at restoring an unfindable trust among wounded peoples. This is so much so that the most skeptical observers denounce the ambiguity of a global agreement which, supreme contradiction, simultaneously advocates reconciliation and...division to achieve it."

##

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 6-MAY-1996 07:59:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I4DMIDJBGG00Q5NQ@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for
matsui_d@a1.eop.gov; Mon, 06 May 1996 07:57:01 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from usia.gov (XGATE.USIA.GOV) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-6 #6879)
id <01I4DMIII0PU004WG1@STORM.EOP.GOV> for matsui_d@a1.eop.gov; Mon,
06 May 1996 07:57:08 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Connect2 Message Router by usia.gov via Connect2-SMTP 4.00; Mon,
06 May 1996 07:59:07 -0500
Organization: USIA
X-Mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.00 MHS to SMTP Gateway

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Brian J. Johnson (JOHNSON_BJ) (CEQ)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAY-1996 20:26:10.04

SUBJECT: the red squirrel

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)

READ: 8-MAY-1996 20:39:50.90

TEXT:

Barry,

Katie and I have been answering that question by saying, "Last summer the GOP leadership in Congress set out to fundamentally change environmental policy through the budget process. They had more than 50 different anti-environment measures ... closing national parks, opening the Arctic Refuge, cutting EPA enforcement 25%, toxic dumps 25%, etc. The President made the environment a top priority and, with Dems in Congress, succeeded in blocking almost them (49 to be exact). But we couldn't win everything ... no one's ever won everything in the history of the Republic, it's not the way it works. But, on balance, the President clearly blunted this effort to roll back health and environmental laws." Every reporter I've talked to bought that on the surface. In fact, the day the news broke the NYT and Post environmental reporters each called me to express their wonder at how thoroughly we won (and check the facts of the final agreement). Incidentally, most of the activists agree and most put out statements of support. They never expected the President to be so tough. Attached is the list of the 49 budget wins. I've never distributed it systematically (since we weren't gloating), but it's been fact-checked by OMB and we're thinking of including it in a mailing to constituents. I'll run it by Larry before I do. In any case, it's a good reference to demonstrate either how good we are or how far out of the mainstream they tried to go. Let me know if you've got something you want me or Katie to do. Who's asking?

Brian

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 8-MAY-1996 20:08:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Brian J. Johnson

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 24_POINT_ROMAN

49 BUDGET WINS

FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

April 30, 1996

Throughout the budget process, the Republican leadership in Congress sought to use the budget to weaken environmental safeguards and create special interest environmental loopholes and natural resource giveaways. The proposals -- which had little or nothing to do with balancing the budget -- would have stalled or even eliminated many basic health and environmental protections that the American people have come to expect.

Republicans in Congress promoted more than 50 separate anti

-environment actions through the budget. President Clinton and Democrats in Congress defeated almost all of them. Following is a summary of the most important environmental victories:

Cut the Environmental Protection Agency Budget by 22 Percent.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"I love the environment, but I'm cheap at loving the environment."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (R

-GA) (Gannett News Service, 2/16/95).

Proposal: Republicans in the House and Senate sent President Clinton a budget that slashed funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by 22 percent from the President's request (HR 2099). It included a 25 percent cut in enforcement, a 25 percent cut in Superfund toxic waste dump cleanups, a 45 percent cut in drinking water funding, and a 29 percent cut in clean water funding.

Clinton Administration Response: President Clinton vetoed the EPA budget bill, saying, "The ultimate test of any budget is what kind of world it leaves for future generations. . . . We want to pass on to our children the good Earth God gave us. We want to give them the opportunity we enjoy. We want to safeguard their health." (12/18/96) In months of negotiations, President Clinton stood firm in demanding that the budget adequately fund EPA, requesting an add

-back of \$966 million.

Months later, on April 25, 1996, Republican leaders in Congress conceded 85 percent of President Clinton's add

-back

request, \$817 million.

Adopt Policy "Riders" to Roll Back Protection for Parks, Forests

and Wildlife.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"This rider [to expand logging in the Tongass National Forest] is a classic example of pork

-barrel politics, not markets, driving environmental outcomes. . . . Congress is perpetuating and deepening a decades

-long program of silvicultural socialism that has sacrificed America's forests to special interest politics."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Karl Hess, senior fellow with the conservative Cato Institute (12/7/96).

Proposal: Republicans in the House and Senate sought to use the budget as a vehicle for a series of environmental "riders" -- policy changes unrelated to balancing the budget. Most of these riders -- such as one to expand clearcutting in the Tongass (AK) rainforest -- were designed to promote narrowly

-defined interests and could never have become law by themselves. Therefore, their champions tacked them onto the Department of the Interior/U.S. Forest Service and EPA appropriations bills (HR 1977 and 2099), hoping that President Clinton would not be willing to veto the entire bill in order to keep these measures from being enacted. Other proposals included one to prevent EPA from protecting clean water by vetoing harmful wetlands permits, one to take the newest national park -- the Mojave Preserve -- away from the Park Service, and one to block all new actions to protect endangered species.

Clinton Administration Response: President Clinton vetoed the appropriations bills, saying, "Environmental protection is not, or at least it never has been until now, a partisan issue. . . . But Republicans in this Congress have attempted to roll back decades of bipartisan environmental protection. It's wrong, and I cannot permit it to happen." (12/18/95) In months of negotiations, President Clinton refused to allow these riders -- even after almost every other disagreement had been resolved.

Seven months after the fiscal year began, the GOP leadership in Congress finally relented. On April 25th, 1996, they passed a bill that dropped some of the riders and authorized President Clinton to waive almost all of the others.

Special Interest EPA Loophole "Riders."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"EPA, the Gestapo of government."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Rep. Tom DeLay (R

-TX), the third

-ranking Republican

in the House, on the need for 17 "riders" to the EPA funding bill (Washington Times 7/31/95).

Proposal: Earlier in the budget process, Republicans in the House of Representatives attached 17 specific "riders" to EPA's appropriations bill (HR 2099). These riders would have opened major loopholes for polluters such as oil refineries and hazardous waste incinerators; blocked future actions to improve public health and environmental protections such as efforts to expand community right

-to

-know about local toxic releases; and blocked EPA's ability to enforce existing environmental protections, for example by prohibiting enforcement to keep raw sewage off beaches and out of waterways.

Clinton Administration Response: President Clinton denounced these riders, saying "[the bill] would be bad for our children, our health and our environment. This is Washington special interest politics at its most effective and at its worst" (8/1/95). After Democrats and moderate Republicans won a vote on the floor of the House to strip the riders, the GOP leadership held a second vote, and re

-inserted the riders.

Several weeks later, opponents of the riders forced a third vote, and won -- but only after GOP leaders twice delaying the vote in an unsuccessful bid to whip their membership into keeping the riders.

Open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to Oil and Gas Drilling. "Arctic oil reserve."

- Sen. Frank Murkowski (R

-AK), Chairman of the Senate

Energy and Natural Resources Committee, giving his opinion of the "real" name of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. "It never was ANWR," he said (Christian Science Monitor, 6/29/95).

Proposal: Republicans in the House and Senate supported a measure to open the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in Alaska to oil and gas drilling. The provision passed both the House and the Senate on close votes, and was included in the Budget Reconciliation bill

(HR 2491).

Clinton Administration Response: President Clinton, who has consistently opposed opening the Arctic Refuge, said, "I will veto any reconciliation bill that opens ANWR to drilling. ...this is one of the most significant environmental votes facing Congress, posing a clear choice

between protecting a unique, biologically

-rich wilderness

and pursuing a misguided energy policy" (Letter to Senator Lieberman, 10/26/95).

On December 6, President Clinton vetoed the GOP budget, specifically citing the measure to open the Refuge as a reason. Throughout the budget negotiations, President Clinton refused to reconsider his position, and for that reason, the measure to open the Arctic Refuge has not become law.

Close National Parks.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"If you've been there once [Great Basin National Park], you don't need to go again."

"The question is not whether to close some of the parks, but how."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Rep. James Hansen (R

-UT), 11/06/94 and 12/08/94, respectively.

Proposal: Republicans in Congress supported a proposal (HR 260), to create a National Parks Closure Commission and attempted to pass it by attaching it to the budget (HR 1977 and 2491).

Clinton Administration Response: President Clinton attacked proposals to close national parks in his radio address from Jackson Hole, WY (8/26/95). He argued instead for reforms to park concessions and fees to improve the national parks.

Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt toured the country, saying "As long as I am alive and breathing and Secretary of the Interior, they're not going to do this" (e.g., 3/31/95).

On September 19, 1995, this proposal was rejected on the House floor. The GOP sponsors immediately reattached it -- this time on the Budget Reconciliation bill (HR 2491).

Following protests from the Clinton Administration and the public, the proposal was finally dropped from the budget bill.

Lift the Moratorium on Offshore Oil Drilling.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"There certainly is an emotional outpouring of sentiment

against drilling on behalf of those who believe it is a pollutant."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Bob Livingston, House Appropriations Committee Chairman (R

-LA) (Houston Chronicle, 6/28/95).

Proposal: Republicans in Congress supported a proposal to lift the moratorium on oil and gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf, off the sensitive coastlines of

California, Florida, North Carolina, and other states, and in subcommittee defeated a proposed amendment to reinstate it in the Interior Appropriations bill (HR 1977).

Clinton Administration Response: When the House subcommittee on Interior Appropriations voted against extending the offshore oil drilling moratorium on June 20, President Clinton vehemently opposed the measure, saying "I will not allow oil and gas drilling off our nation's most sensitive coastlines on my watch. America's coastlines are simply too important to our economy and our way of life." The moratorium was reinstated by the full Appropriations Committee because of widespread public support.

Regulatory "Reform."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"Not harmful"

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- House Republican Tom Delay (R

-TX) of the chemical
DDT.

(Washington Post 7/1/1995)

Proposal: The Republican Contract with America included so

-called "regulatory reform" as one of its core principles. But rather than reform the regulatory system, the Republican proposal would roll back a generation of public health and environmental safeguards and create a regulatory system that is more bureaucratic and costly to taxpayers. After passing the House, President Clinton and Democrats in Congress defeated the bill three times on the floor of the Senate in procedural votes. Seeking to revive it, the Republican leadership attached a similar measure to the Debt Ceiling legislation (HR 2586).

Clinton Administration Response: President Clinton vetoed the Debt Ceiling legislation, saying this measure would "reverse a 30

-year bipartisan commitment to environmental protection and public health. It would increase pollution and decrease the purity and safety of our air, water and food" (11/13/95).

Halt New Food Safety Standards For Meat and Poultry.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"Not that I can think of."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Rep. Tom DeLay (R

-TX), when asked if there are any federal regulations he would keep (Greenwire, 3/6/1995).

Proposal: The House Republicans included a provision in the

Agriculture Appropriations bill (HR 1976) which would have delayed a new Clinton Administration reform of the meat and poultry inspection program designed to protect people from E. coli and other harmful bacteria. Each year, it is estimated that thousands of people die and hundreds of thousands of people get sick from E. coli and other meat and poultry contamination. The new inspection reform, called the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) system, is a science

-based system of food safety control to improve the safety of meat and poultry products and to better protect Americans from food

-born pathogens.

Clinton Administration Response: President Clinton strongly supported the new food safety reforms, saying, "the federal government has been inspecting meat the same old way since the turn of the century. ...they touch it and smell it to see if it's safe, instead of using microscopes and high technology. That's crazy, and for the last two years we have been working hard to change that, to reform the meat inspection rules so that Americans can be confident they're protected" (7/15/95). The Clinton Administration strongly objected to the measure to delay these important food safety reforms (7/18/95).

The measure was dropped on the House floor.

Promote the Mining Giveaway.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"You might reasonably ask, how can a public official give away a billion dollars without going to jail?"

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt (Washington Post 9/7/95).

Proposals: There were two significant mining proposals:

(a) Republicans in the Senate voted to lift the moratorium on new mining patents -- the process under the Mining Law of 1872 by which corporations can lay claim to billions of dollars worth of public minerals for as little as a few hundred dollars. The House/Senate conference committee in

the Interior Appropriations bill (HR 1977) accepted the measure. (b) At the same time, both the House and the Senate voted for sham mining reform as part of the Budget Reconciliation bill (HR 2491).

Clinton Administration Response: The Administration repeatedly objected to both measures, with President Clinton saying, for example, "Just think of it: The Republican budget proposes to raise taxes on working families with incomes of less than \$27,000, to increase the cost of college loans and cut the number of college scholarships, but they're determined to keep giving away \$1 billion worth of minerals on government land for \$275" (11/4/95).

For the mining patent moratorium (a): Democrats and moderate

Republicans in the House rejected the conference report mainly over this provision (9/29/95). The GOP leadership brought it back a second time, but, despite their best efforts, the bill was rejected a second time (11/15/95). The moratorium was finally reinstated. For the sham mining reform (b): President Clinton vetoed the GOP Budget Reconciliation bill December 6, 1995, specifically citing this measure in his objections. Override Environmental Laws for Salmon Recovery in the Pacific Northwest.

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN_ITALIC

"I am trying to say "timeout" so that silly things will not happen, so that bait fish and... salmon that are running the wrong way in a stream will not take precedence over the rights of farmers and ranchers. . . ."

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN

- Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison (R

-TX), explaining an amendment to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations/ Defense Bill (H.R. 889) earlier this year. The amendment rescinded FY95 funding for the listing of species as threatened or endangered and for designation of critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Congressional Record 3/16/95). Proposal: Republicans in the Senate proposed a measure to improve the financial situation of the Bonneville Power Administration, which faces increasing competitive pressures, by overriding environmental laws and by capping the amount of money BPA would spend on salmon recovery. The measure was contained in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill (HR 1905).

Administration Response: The Administration threatened to

veto the entire bill if this provision was not removed. In response, the Administration and Senators Hatfield, Baucus, Murray and others reached an agreement which, in the Vice President's words, "proves that Bonneville's financial problems can be addressed without abandoning or overriding environmental laws" (10/23/95). The Portland Oregonian said, "Northwesterners ought to be ecstatic with the deal" (10/25/95). According to Senator Hatfield's staff, it was the veto threat that caused him to abandon the strategy of waiving environmental laws (Oregonian 10/20/95).

LIST OF 49 DEFEATED ANTI

-ENVIRONMENT MEASURES

VA/HUD APPROPRIATIONS (EPA, CEQ) (HR 2099):

? Cut Superfund toxic dump cleanup funding by 25 percent. President Clinton vetoed a GOP budget bill that included a 25 percent cut from his request. Earlier, the House and Senate had each voted to cut Superfund 36 percent. In the

end, Congress restored all of the President's \$150 million add

-back proposal. (H, C) PRINTER FONT 10 POINT ROMAN

Denotes location of the measure (H=House, S=Senate, C=Conference report).

)
PRINTER FONT 12 POINT ROMAN

? Cut EPA's environmental enforcement by 25 percent. President Clinton vetoed a GOP budget bill that cut enforcement 25 percent from his request. Congress restored \$40 million of the President's \$45 million add

-back
proposal. (C)

? Cut safe drinking water state loan funds 45 percent -- if they can't be eliminated entirely. President Clinton vetoed a GOP budget bill that cut safe drinking water funding by 45 percent from his request. Earlier, the House had voted to eliminate safe drinking water funding entirely. In the end, Congress restored all of the President's add

-back proposal,
\$225 million. (C)

? Cut clean water funding 29 percent. President Clinton vetoed a GOP budget bill that included a 29 percent cut to clean water funding from his request. Earlier, the Senate had voted for a 37 percent cut. In the end, Congress restored \$224 of the President's \$240 million add

-back
proposal. (C)

? Cut EPA health and environmental safeguard

-setting and
implementation by 17 percent. President Clinton vetoed a GOP budget that cut EPA's operating budget, which funds standard

-setting, by 17 percent. Congress restored \$177 million of the President's \$276 million add

-back proposal.
(C)

? Eliminate EPA's ability to protect clean water by blocking harmful wetlands permits. President Clinton vetoed the bill that contained this measure. After the President insisted that it be dropped, it was -- on the last day of negotiations. (C)

? Halt action or enforcement of Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative. The Great Lakes contain 95 percent of the nation's fresh water and supply drinking water for 23 million Americans. (H)

? Curtail protection of toxic air pollutants from all oil refineries, creating a loophole for a single industry by blocking public health protection for the 4.5 million Americans who live near these facilities in states like CA, NJ, PA, TX, and LA. (H)

? Block upgraded pollution controls at individual hazardous waste facilities. (H)

? Prevent federal ability to ensure that states will meet minimum clean air standards, penalizing states, citizens and industries who work together to create viable clean air plans and letting others off the hook. (H)

? Prohibit funding for Superfund on beyond December 31, 1995 if Superfund reauthorization is not passed and signed into law. (H)

? Prohibit EPA enforcement to keep raw sewage off beaches and out of waterways, by limiting enforcement of pollution controls for combined sewers and sanitary sewers, creating the potential for raw sewage to overflow onto beaches, into rivers, or even onto city streets. (H)

? Eliminate EPA's ability to set standards to prevent industrial water pollution (effluents), an action that would lead to 15 million pounds of toxic pollutants entering our nation's waterways in 1996, benefitting the pulp and paper industry, pharmaceutical manufacturers, and the metal products and machinery industry. (H)

? Halt EPA action or enforcement to keep stormwater pollution out of the nation's waterways. (H)

? Block use of state loan funds to help construct wastewater treatment plants that keep raw sewage out of our waterways, until Clean Water Act is reauthorized. (H subcommittee)

? Undercut EPA standards limiting air pollution from small gasoline engines, which produce 10 percent of the air pollution in U.S. cities. (S)

? Eliminate EPA research on the health effects of electromagnetic fields. (S)

? Impede EPA's STAR program -- Science to Achieve Results. (S)

? Allow states to adopt unworkable plans for limiting auto emissions, defying Clean Air Act requirements. (H)

? Require EPA to abide by state audit privilege and voluntary disclosure immunity laws. (H)

? Eliminate Council on Environmental Quality. CEQ advises the President on environmental matters, coordinates environmental agencies and otherwise oversees the National Environmental Policy Act. (H)

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS (DOI, USDA/Forest Service, DOE/energy conservation)

(HR 1977):

? Waive environmental laws to expand harmful clearcutting in the Tongass (AK) rainforest. President Clinton vetoed the bill that contained this measure, and it was one of the last disputes to be resolved. The President waived the rider as part of the final budget agreement. (S, C)

? Undermine the new California Desert National Park by taking the Mojave National Preserve away from the National Park Service and giving it to the Bureau of Land Management or, later, requiring that the Park Service manage the land according to BLM guidelines. President Clinton vetoed the bill that contained this measure, and it was one of the last disputes to be resolved. The President waived the rider as part of the final budget agreement. (H, C)

? Prohibit efforts to protect newly endangered species with a moratorium on endangered species listings or critical habitat designations. President Clinton vetoed the bill that contained this measure. President Clinton vetoed the bill that contained this measure, and it was one of the last disputes to be resolved. The President waived the rider as part of the final budget agreement. (S, C)

? Hamper efforts to protect Northwest salmon by terminating the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management project. President Clinton vetoed the bill that contained this measure; the offending language was dropped. (H, C)

? Extend the override of environmental laws contained in the timber rider to the 1995 Rescissions Act for an additional three years for replacement timber. President Clinton supports repealing the timber rider and replacing it with a

common

-sense timber salvage program. The rider to extend the override of environmental laws was inserted by the House and Senate after President Clinton vetoed the original appropriations bills in December, 1995 and dropped during the final round of negotiations.

? Lift the moratorium on offshore oil drilling. (H subcommittee.)

? Lift the mining patent moratorium, which temporarily blocks new claims on public minerals under the 1872 mining act, where a billion dollars of minerals can be had for as little as \$275. (S)

? Eliminate U.S. Geological Survey. The Contract with America included as an attachment a plan to eliminate the USGS. Following protests from the Clinton Administration, Democrats in Congress and the public, this measure was dropped.

? Eliminate National Biological Service. The GOP budget resolution called for the elimination of the NBS. The NBS was eventually merged with the USGS. (H, S)

? Delay Implementation of Rangeland Reform. (S)

? Prohibit biological surveys on private lands, even with permission of the owner, and prohibit the use of volunteers.

(H committee)

ENERGY & WATER APPROPRIATIONS (DOE, DOI/Bureau of Reclamation, Army Corps of Engineers) (HR 1905):

? Override environmental laws pertaining to Pacific Northwest salmon recovery efforts. After President Clinton threatened to veto the bill if it contained this measure, the

Administration and Senators Hatfield, Baucus, and Murray negotiated a workable administrative solution that addresses the Bonneville Power Administration's financial concerns without undermining planned salmon recovery efforts. (S)

? Waive environmental laws for Animas La Plata dam (CO). Following a veto threat by President Clinton, Republicans in Congress dropped their attempt to jump

-start construction of

this water project by waiving environmental laws. (S)

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS (HR 1976):

? Halt new standard for meat inspections, designed to protect people from E. coli and other meat and poultry contamination. (H)

COMMERCE, STATE, JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS (HR 2076):

? Prohibit efforts to protect newly endangered species with a moratorium on endangered species listings or critical habitat designations. This measure was contained in both the Interior and Commerce Appropriations bills, both of which President Clinton vetoed. The final bill includes the measure (modified, but still objectionable), but allowed the President to waive it -- which he did. (S, C)

? Transfer 200 tax and environmental attorney positions to U.S. attorneys' offices. (H)

BUDGET RECONCILIATION (HR 2491):

? Open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to Oil Drilling. (H, S, C)

? Close National Parks. (H)

? Mandate transfer of Ward Valley (CA) site for low

-level

radioactive waste dump without public health safeguards.

The Administration supports transfer of the site, but only with the proper public health safeguards. President Clinton vetoed this measure with the budget reconciliation bill.

(H, S committee, C)

? Eliminate tax credit for renewable energy sources such as wind and biomass. (H)

? Eliminate tax incentive for utility

-funded energy

conservation measures. (H)

? Repeal certain environmental safeguards for grazing, which

DOI issued after two years of extensive public hearings.

(H)

? Sell national forest land to ski resorts. (H)

? Continue monopoly power for incumbent current national park vendors by failing to increase competition for concessions contracts. President Clinton vetoed this measure with the budget reconciliation bill. (H, C)

? Allow owners of large blocks of land to receive substantial amounts of low

-priced water from federal projects.

President Clinton vetoed this measure with the budget reconciliation bill. (S, C)

? Require transfer of certain federal water projects while

waiving environmental laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act and Endangered Species Act.

President Clinton vetoed these measures with the budget reconciliation bill. (H, S, C)

? Allow states to unilaterally take over oil and gas royalty collections and charge the federal taxpayer the full administrative costs of doing so. President Clinton vetoed this measure with the budget reconciliation bill. (C)

? Exempt certain federal actions from ESA requirements. (H)

DEBT CEILING (HR 2586):

? Regulatory "Reform." President Clinton vetoed the GOP debt ceiling, to which the Republican leadership in Congress had attached their regulatory "reform" legislation, saying, "It would increase pollution and decrease the purity and safety of our air, water and food" (11/13/95). (H, S, C)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-MAY-1996 14:16:34.72

SUBJECT: INTERNAL TRANSCRIPT: USA Today Interview of President

TO: Gabrielle M. Bushman (BUSHMAN_G) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:16:40.23

TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:17:31.38

TO: Mary Ellen Glynn (GLYNN_M) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 15:53:08.15

TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:40:57.47

TO: Peggy A. Lewis (LEWIS_P) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:34:07.04

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 15:30:00.51

TO: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:16:49.12

TO: Julie E. Mason (MASON_J) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:48:30.31

TO: Lorraine McHugh (MCHUGH_L) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:19:56.35

TO: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 19:06:11.46

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:48:02.78

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Rica F. Rodman (RODMAN_R) (WHO)

READ:16-MAY-1996 12:19:07.52

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)

READ:15-MAY-1996 14:50:37.96

TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Darby Stott (STOTT_D) (WHO)
READ:15-MAY-1996 18:49:59.62

TO: Margaret M. Suntum (SUNTUM_M) (WHO)
READ:15-MAY-1996 14:17:43.08

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (TERZANO_V) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:15-MAY-1996 17:09:11.63

TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A) (WHO)
READ:15-MAY-1996 14:25:36.26

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK_N) (NSC)
READ:15-MAY-1996 15:12:36.88

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 10_POINT_COURIER
BOTTOM ODD
MORE
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Internal Transcript May 15, 1996

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT
BY U.S.A. TODAY

The Oval Office

11:05 A.M. EDT

Q We appreciate you taking the time to see us about two topics you care a lot about, corporate citizenship and education. But, you know, I have to ask you what you think of this incredible news from the Dole camp that he's going to resign this afternoon.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. You know, you probably ought to call me back after he makes the announcement. I don't really know if it's true.

Q Well, AP and CNN and other places are reporting that it's true, but everyone is hedging their bet because what if he doesn't say what he's drafted himself to say?

THE PRESIDENT: I just have to wait and see what he

says. The main thing to me is that we just keep working on the agenda. Whatever happens, I'm going to keep trying to delay the campaign and keep working on the issues that are important to the country.

I still believe this Congress and I ought to agree on a balanced budget, on welfare reform, on the Kassebaum

-Kennedy bill, increasing access to health care, and on raising the minimum wage. And I'm going to keep hammering away at it and try to get it done. Whatever decision is announced, I hope it will facilitate getting an agreement instead of going back to the politics and the gridlock.

Q Well, it could, couldn't it, because --

THE PRESIDENT: It could.

Q -- it might remove some of the politics from the --

THE PRESIDENT: It could. But it just depends on -- I don't know what the announcement will be. When I just heard the press reports, I brought all of our people in and I said, look, whatever happens, that's his decision. What we have to worry about is what we're going to do, and we just have to stay on track.

Q As a newspaper we've been very interested in the issue of corporate citizenship and excited about covering the conference tomorrow. And Ellen has done a lot of interviewing with corporate executives in advance of the conference. And we wanted to ask you, beyond kind of the bully pulpit aspects of this conference, what specifically do you hope -- what concrete and specific do you hope comes out of the conference tomorrow?

BOTTOM EVEN
MORE

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I hope that two things will happen. I hope that, first of all, that we will get some ideas out of this conference about what policies the government could adopt that would make it more likely that more corporations would do the kind of things that we're going to highlight as positive things; that

TOP EVEN
- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN
MORE

more corporations would invest in the education and training of their work force; that more corporations would adopt family

-friendly policies; that more corporations would help their workers with health

and pension benefits; that more corporations would involve their workers in sharing not only decisions, but in getting a fair share of the benefits of their prosperity, as well as bearing a fair share of the burdens, that the relationship would be better. And if there are public policies that would facilitate that, I want to know what these business leaders think those policies are.

The second thing I hope will come out of it is that we will begin to create an environment in which this will become a legitimate pursuit of every company, that more companies will see that they can do the right thing by their employees and their families and their communities and do well; and that if you look at a company's life over the long period, that having a highly motivated, highly productive, highly successful work force that's also -- that feels that it matters to the company and that feels that -- full of workers that feel that they can succeed in their family life and in their work life is ultimately a good thing for America's bottom line. And so I hope that it will basically accelerate the number of companies who are doing this.

In a broader sense, I suppose what I hope will happen is some version of what came out of the long efforts we made with the entertainment industry -- where we kind of worked around this over a two or three year period, but we wound up with a law, which was the V chip law, but a completely voluntary effort to set up a rating system, which is necessary to make the V chip law work.

Q Do you see legislation then as being part of this goal?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. But I'll give you an example of one. The president of United Technologies, UT, is coming tomorrow. He gave a speech at the Press Club a few weeks ago -- maybe it's been a couple months ago now -- in which he argued, he explained what their policy was for providing educational benefits for the employees and how much broader it was than the traditional tax deduction.

This is a fairly narrow point, but it's a big issue, so I'll give it. The traditional tax law -- which I think is expired now, which we'll have to extend in this budget negotiation -- allowed a company to deduct, I think, up to \$5,000, or maybe \$5,200 a year, the cost of educating or training an employee if the employee was being educated either to keep the same job the employee had or to take a better job within the company; you could deduct that.

UT provides for investments of up to \$11,000 a year for employees involved in any degree program and feels that anything they do to increase their knowledge makes them more valuable to the company. And if they ever have to leave the company they want them to be able to go on and do well. And he argued that they could afford to do it, but that -- and I said, UT, United Technologies, UT -- but that other companies couldn't, and we should consider broadening that incentive; that that's something that the government

could do that would generate more corporate responsibility. That's the kind of idea that I want explored at this conference.

Q You talked about the voluntary agreement you've gotten with the entertainment industry. Would you see, maybe, the evolution of maybe a corporate code of conduct that corporations might actually sign up to voluntarily that outline their obligations and responsibilities?

THE PRESIDENT: I hadn't thought of it in exactly those terms, but it could be that corporations would want to be identified TOP ODD
- \p -

BOTTOM ODD
MORE

in some formal and public way with having met four or five standards of responsibility that -- in the same way that we identify corporations every year that win exporting awards, or win productivity awards, or win other kinds of things. Maybe something like that could come out.

Q Several of the chief executives I've talked to over the last week are concerned that government involvement at all in their policies is dangerous to them and makes them a little nervous. And I'm wondering what you see as your role as a chief executive among these people who are in the private sector? What's your role there?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, there are two things that I have not sought to do. I have not sought some big regulatory approach to this. I don't think government can micromanage the private sector. Nor have I just sought to ever -- going all the way back to '91, when I started running for president the first time -- just to bash people I thought were doing the wrong thing. What I've tried to do is to identify positive approaches that have been taken that I think are good for America and good for the corporations. And so that's basically what I'm trying to do. I'm not trying to get in and develop some sort of public approach to micromanaging.

On the other hand, government does take actions that affect corporate policy. There are -- and I just gave you an example; that's just one example and there are lots of others. You know, the way we have tried to change the way we deal with occupational safety and health and do more partnerships with companies that involve their workers in a worker partnership in creating a safe work place, in return for which they get to get rid of a lot of the rules and regulations of OSHA if they're working together for a safer work place. We've had examples there which have been very successful for companies, which have raised worker safety and worker morale and worker participation.

So there are things the government does anyway that have an impact on corporate policies. And that's what I'm talking about looking at, not micromanaging their business or telling them how to

do every last little thing. I think that's wrong.

Q Do you think the reality is that there are some things the government can do and the government can enact things like pension portability that's helpful to workers in this economy, but when it comes right down to it, workers have to depend on themselves? You talk about individual responsibility when it comes to welfare and crime and other things. Is this a case where in this new economy workers essentially have to take individual responsibility to get job skills and be employable, continually employable in this new economy?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the answer to that is, yes, but there's more to say. Yes, workers do have to take personal responsibility and the vast majority of workers are prepared to do that and do it every day. But when workers are working for a particular company, companies tend to do better when the workers feel like they're on a team, that everybody on the team cares about everybody else and they're all working for the same goal, and then if they succeed in their goal -- in this case, producing a good product or producing a good service and earning a genuine profit -- that they will be appropriately rewarded.

And I think that workers know that there may be more mobility of work, even within the same workplace. That is, let's suppose you work at a bank, suppose you worked at a bank for 25 years -- being a bank teller today is not what being a bank teller was 10 years ago. The whole -- just the technology has changed it. So what I think we need to emphasize is that -- what I'm trying to do that I think the government does have a direct responsibility for is to create a set of rules and opportunities that will give workers who have to change workplaces the capacity to always be employable, to define the security for the American economy of the 21st century as being always employable and always able to support your family.

That's why I want portable health -- access to affordable health insurance, and I want it to be portable. That's why I want this comprehensive pension package to pass, so we will have portable pension security. That's why I want our version of the G.I. Bill for America's workers to pass, so you will always be able to have access to education if you lose your job. So I think lifetime access to education, to health care, to retirement is important, because that makes you employable and able to provide family security.

But while you are in a specific job, with a specific company, small, medium, or large, I'd also like to know that we have created an environment in America, and kind of a business culture in America which put a high premium on very high productivity from the worker and, in return for that, a high level of loyalty, cohesion, and support in the relationship between employers and employees.

Q Now, the CEOs will say that their responsibility is to their shareholders. And if they're not responsible to their shareholders, they are likely to wind up in court. They see themselves as not having that flexibility to make that change.

THE PRESIDENT: They may say that, but I mean, historically, if you read every book on corporations written in this country for the last 60 years, and you read these leadership books written by most of the great experts and business leaders, they all say they feel a responsibility to their customers and to their employees and to the community at large, as well as to their shareholders.

And there is a feeling out there that because -- particularly because the financial markets have become global and instantaneous, that the relative influence of the shareholders has increased and the relative obligation, therefore, to the customers, to the community at large, and to the employees, has decreased, and that a company basically lives on life supports from quarter to quarter, as opposed to being able to look at the long run.

But if you look at the -- if you look underneath that, there are huge numbers of companies in America that aren't even publicly traded, where Americans work. If you walk down the street in Washington, D.C., and you go shop in a place, most places you go are not publicly traded. So we're not just talking about the people that are -- that have their companies publicly traded. And even the companies that are publicly traded, their value over -- tends, in the end, to depend on their ability to produce a high quality product or service at an acceptable price. And that depends, in the end, on something that goes beyond quarter to quarter.

So I think all these companies do have an obligation to shareholders. I'm not suggesting that anybody should be able to -- should be asked to do anything that will either bankrupt them or keep them from making a profit. I mean, the whole idea of the free enterprise system is to make a profit. That's why the focus will be on how to do good and to do well, not either

-or.

Q Secretary Reich has outlined some proposals for public policies that would encourage corporations to invest in workers and so on -- proposal which have excited quite a bit of opposition among some in the business community. What is your view of these proposals? Do you think they go to far in the government role?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, what I want to -- let me just say I'm going to defer comment -- if I want to give these guys, the men and women that are coming tomorrow, and give them a chance to comment on that. And I want to give -- I'm going to ask them outright what they think about any kind of things we can or should do on this.

And to be fair to Secretary Reich, he has recognized that primary responsibility is to help people when they're between jobs, that primary responsibility is to create the -- what we call the G.I. Bill, to give people a voucher when they lose their jobs so they can always get education, to give people a deduction for the cost of education after high school, to create health security and retirement security.

And in terms of anything else, I'm going to defer my

judgments until I have a chance to really listen to them. This has been -- this has really been the first opportunity I have had to focus on what some of these folks will say they think ought to be or ought not to be public policy. And so I want to have the conference first and withhold judgment on that.

Q What brings you to the topic now?

THE PRESIDENT: What?

Q What brings you to the topic now? You say this is the first time you --

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, no. I don't mean -- it's not the first time I have thought about it. I have talked to -- you know, I had wide contact with business leaders, and I have for -- for one thing, during the whole time I was -- this has been an interest of mine for nearly 20 years now, because before I became President I was a governor and I was a governor in a state with a tough economy. So I spent all my time basically on the two things you came to see me about: on education and economic development. So I have had extensive conversations with business leaders over the years about these issues.

And I have also spent an enormous amount of time in businesses establishments of all kinds and especially in manufacturing plants, studying in great detail the sort of relationships between workers and managers and compensation schemes and benefit schemes and all that. I mean, I know a lot about this. But I'm answering this very narrow question Susan asked me is, what about specific proposals designed to encourage certain kinds of conduct. I want to have a chance to get some feedback on that. I just haven't had a chance to ask anybody about that.

Q Were you surprised this year when Pat Buchanan obviously hit some kind of chord in the Republican primaries when he talked about -- when he bashed corporations and --

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q Did you think that sentiment was out there to be tapped?

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. Because I -- there is a general feeling in America -- it's not so much -- it's not just corporations, there is a general feeling in America among a lot of people that they have worked hard, played by the rules, and they haven't benefited in the country's general growth. There is a general feeling among, I think, a lot of working people that they're very glad we have 8.5 million more jobs, but what that -- those 8.5 million more jobs makes it possible for them to negotiate their own way through life better, but not that it means that they're necessarily going to get a raise or they're necessarily going to have greater security.

And so the question is -- and I think people are generally aware that there has been, at least the top -- again, it's very important, our most highly publicized examples of lavish pay, let's say, by CEOs, or most highly published examples of downsizing

are not necessarily reflective of what real life is like for most working people in most workplaces. But I think there is a general feeling that there has been -- well, for example, 30 years ago the average CEO made about 35 or 40 times what the average worker did, and today it's up to about 200 times, and it was only 120 times when I took office. I mean --

Q You're the CEO of the government. You make, what, about 10 times what the average government makes, maybe?

THE PRESIDENT: Less.

Q Less.

THE PRESIDENT: I think.

Q And when you look at the study that shows that the executives of big corporations are making more than 200 times the salary of their average worker, does that seem like a fair deal to you?

THE PRESIDENT: No. I mean, I don't know that there is a -- I don't know that there is a fair ratio, but what I think is -

-I don't know that there is a fair ratio and I don't propose to tell any of these companies or boards of directors what they should pay their CEOs. But what I think is -- let me just put it -- let me flip it on you and say I think the best system are those where the welfare of the people running the company and the welfare of the people who are working for the company, who presumably create the company's wealth -- I mean, presumably, again -- you talked about the financial markets and what a company is worth and the shareholders -- but presumably, ultimately, a company's worth is determined by the fact that it produces something. There is either a good or a service that somebody buys. And in theory, the people who trade the stocks every day are making judgments about what the worth of the company is, based on the work that the people who show up every day are doing.

So I believe -- what we're trying to do, instead of getting into this business about whether the government or the President has the judgment about what the proper ratio is, what we have tried to do tomorrow is to show some companies which have made an honest effort to tie the compensation of the people running the company and the compensation of the people who are working for the company and producing the good or the service that the company produces together, so that they go up or down together.

I do not believe -- and if this is the implication of your other question, I want to make it clear what I don't believe -

-I don't think that working people in this country resent people who run companies making a lot of money. I don't think most Americans resent other people being successful in any way. I don't think people -- most Americans resent people making -- getting rich.

Q Is it possible that they resent people getting rich at the same time they're downsizing their company, though?

THE PRESIDENT: I think what they resent is any feeling that they're being treated unfairly. I think that most Americans enjoy other people's success. That's one of the great glories of this country. We're not a country -- we're not a country that goes around -- one of the reasons we're successful, I think, economically, is that we're not a country that is rooted in resentment. We don't go around resenting other people's success. We don't go around -- for example, in the last three years, each of the first three years of my administration, we have had record numbers of new small businesses form and record numbers of new self

-made millionaires --

people who did not inherit it, they made it. I think most Americans would be proud of that. They would be glad to know that this is still a country where people can make it by dint of effort and enterprise.

But when you're working for a company what you want to feel is that you matter. We all want to believe that we matter. We all want to believe we're going to be treated fairly. And so I think what most Americans want to know is that if the company is doing well, if I work for a place and it's doing well, I want the boss to do well. And I don't care if the board rewards him, but I would like to do well also. And then if we hit a rough spot and I have to take a little hit, I think the people running the show ought to take a little hit, too, so we will all be together. I think that's what most Americans think. And what I'm trying to show tomorrow is that there are companies that have followed that policy and they have done very, very well. I do not believe the government should dictate in any way --

Q Is there any government policy that can help bring that about, or is it --

THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, the only thing -- what I tried to do is, in '93, I tried to persuade the Congress to limit the tax deductibility of executive compensation. And they did a little bit. They adopted a weaker provision than I wanted, but I got passed all I could, just because I think that there is a limit to which the American taxpayers ought to subsidize decisions of boards, particularly if they are out of whack with the general direction of salaries and growth in the country.

But beyond that, I don't think there is anything we can or should do. I think, again, this is more a matter of corporate culture. And remember, a lot of this is driven by just what you said -- a lot of this is driven by, in the highly visible cases, a lot of this is driven by what moves the stock price and the idea that it is legitimate and maybe even necessary to pay the top executives by the movement of the stock price, but you have to pay the workers, particularly if there are tens of thousands of them, based on more long

-term trends related to income.

Now, all I'm saying is, there are a lot of companies where they try to keep them together. And what I think is -- what I want to do is to highlight that. I don't think there is a government

fix to this. The President -- I'm in no position to make a judgment, and the Congress is certainly in no position to make a judgment, and no federal regulator is in a position to make a judgment what any particular executive should be paid. That's crazy. The federal government shouldn't be involved in that. But I think it is a legitimate thing to highlight these companies which have made a lot of money by creating a sense of partnership and shared destiny. And the ones that have done it, I would say, are quite proud of it.

Q We want to turn to education.

THE PRESIDENT: You were going to ask one more question?

Q We have one more -- do you want to ask about Al Dunlap?

Q Exactly. The only thing I wanted to bring up is certainly there are executives who would say that they made a lot of money going the other way. Al Dunlap, former CEO of Scott Paper, says he saved the company by basically firing 35 percent of the work force. He is concerned that this looks like socialism to him. People are getting into his business telling him how he ought to run it.

THE PRESIDENT: We're not getting -- no, no. I'm not getting into his business and telling him how he ought to run it. There are a lot of these companies -- you didn't get to the -- downsizing is an entirely different thing. But wait a minute -- the downsizing is a different issue. A lot of these companies do have to downsize. They do have to downsize. But I think, again, there are a number of studies which have shown that not all companies have benefited from their downsizing. So those are judgment calls, right?

I think what workers feel is, if I give 10, 20 years of my life to a company and I'm going to be downsized, I would at least -- I would like to have the best chance I can to make a transition into another life. And I would like to get the best deal that they can afford to give me.

Again, I say this is a question of fairness. I'm not -- you have not heard me unilaterally condemning all downsizing. This is a very -- some of these big companies have got to downsize. The federal government has downsized. We have been a big downsizer. We have got 240,000 fewer people than we did the day I became President. But we tried to be extremely careful about the way we did it. We tried not to just put anybody in the street. We tried to recognize the dignity of people involved and also the value of their contributions to the federal government in way we did it.

So I don't think we should confuse the two things. Let's take the downsizing issue out of -- let's not tie that to the compensation issue. I'm talking about normal companies in the absence of downsizing or in the absence of major downsizing, what happens year in and year out. How should the compensation go? And all I'm saying is, there is a higher level of morale, a higher level of a sense of fairness, a sense that the country is better off, or at least people in these companies are better off if the workers believe that their fate is more or less tied to the same end destiny that the

people running the show are. That's the only --

Q But tomorrow's conference isn't about that downsizing.

THE PRESIDENT: No, but we'll talk about downsizing. But all I'm saying is that downsizing is a tiny part of this, and when you get a company that is in trouble, where you have to do downsizing, you can argue whether or not you think the board paid the executive in charge too much during the downsizing period -- I mean, that's a different issue. What I'm talking about is the general trend, that there is a 25

-year trend now which has taken the ratio of pay from 35 to 1 to 200 to 1. Is that a good thing? I think it's, on balance, not a good thing. It's gone too far.

But it is part of a general trend of benefits to people who have certain levels of education and certain levels of skill, which have let most of the income gains fall to the upper 40 percent of the wage scale. And that -- all I'm saying is, if I were running a company instead of a country, and we were doing well in the company and there was complete -- apart from the downsizing, I would want a compensation system in which the people who worked with me got some benefit if I got benefits, and if they had to take a cut, that I would want to be taking a little cut, too, because I would want to have the kind of -- I would want them to believe that we were in the boat together.

That is quite different from companies that are in trouble because of changes in the global economy and have to downsize. And I don't think -- the downsizing you have to look at company by company to see if it turned out to be a good decision, a bad decision, right or wrong. I just think that that's a very different issue.

Q Mr. President, we wanted to spend the last few minutes talking about education for our special education supplement in the Friday paper in a week

-long emphasis on education in USA
Today. One of the things we found in doing reporting about education is the public concern among both parents and students about safety in schools and violence in schools. Is there something you're prepared to do to try to make schools safer?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, we have done a number of things. We have had the zero tolerance policy, which we have required of all schools. We have had the safe and drug

-free schools
money. A lot of our police officers have been used to try to help in and around school areas -- of the 100,000 police we're putting on the street. We have got this antigang legislation that is going up to Congress, which I talked about just a couple of days ago.

We're also -- I think we need to make it earlier for schools and teachers to take appropriate disciplinary actions. Now,

Indiana, New York, Maryland, have given teachers and schools more authority to do that, and to remove disruptive students. And I think we should do that nationwide. And Secretary Riley is working on some things that we can do in that regard. And I think we also need stronger enforcement of the truancy laws. I think that would help a lot. And there have been a number of cities -- Oklahoma City, Charleston, and others who have worked on that.

Q So this would be federal legislation to make it earlier to remove disruptive students --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the Secretary of Education is going to recommend to me whether we need to do anything legislatively, or whether we can just do some things that would make it clear that what the schools can do now, without running afoul of federal law.

Q Right. Like as you did with school prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, and the school uniforms, which I think also have really helped a lot in disciplinary areas where we have used them.

But those are the two things that occurred to me. We've just been talking about it, and I've asked him to come back to us with that because I think the -- for a long time, the idea was that it was really a bad thing to remove any student, no matter how disruptive, on the theory that they just get in more trouble out on the streets. But I think that now we're kind of coming back to perhaps a more balanced view, that the states that have done it are getting some good results. And we need to look at that.

Q The last thing we wanted to ask you, the real last question, is one of the things we're doing in our Friday paper is talking to a lot of people -- CEO's and students and people in all sorts of walks of life -- about teachers, the importance of teachers, the qualities that make a good teacher, and about teachers that have made a big difference in their own lives. And we were wondering if there was a teacher or teachers that stands out in your mind as having really made a difference in your life?

THE PRESIDENT: That's interesting. You know, I remember virtually all of my teachers. That's really interesting. But just the other day, for a totally different reason -- I'll just mention one, because I could mention a number of them. I had one of my teachers up here. Did you know that?

Q No.

THE PRESIDENT: We had a professional women's day here last year. And they arranged for my junior English teacher to come up here -- the woman who taught me English in my junior year in high school to come up here. And it was a remarkable thing, and we even had the text book that I used. So I kind of keep in touch with a lot

of my teachers. But she did a remarkable job.

I was thinking the other day, for a different reason, about my sixth

-grade teacher, Kathleen Schaer who, when I graduated from grade school -- I still remember the day I graduated from grade school -- she came to see me and she was almost crying and she said, "You know, you had the best grades in the class. You and another girl, you tied for first. But we put you down to third because you talk too much." (Laughter.) And she said, "You have this gift. You have to decide whether to abuse or use this. I can't decide whether you're going to wind up being governor or wind up in jail." (Laughter.)

I was thinking about it the other day -- at 11 years old. And she was wonderful at encouraging children. And she trusted us so much that if she left the room and you violated the department -- like she said, we're going to have silent study hall, and you talked -- she had a box up on her desk and you were supposed to turn yourself in. And she trusted us. I know this is very old

-fashioned, but she trusted people to turn themselves in and we did it. People did it. It was an amazing thing.

But the reason I was thinking about it is that woman wrote me letters and I wrote back to her until the week she died at the age of 90, when I was governor just a few years ago, I was still governor. About a week before she died, she wrote me for the last time, at 90 years old. She had her own beautiful ending.

Once a year, I would have an event in my home town in Hot Springs and she would come out to see me, once a year. And in the later years, she had to wear kind of a body brace and walked with a walker, but she'd do it once a year to come and see me. And all those years, we would laugh about how she told me on the day I left grade school that they had to put me down two rungs in the graduating class because my conduct grades were a little too low.

Q And what did you take from your year with her and even that last comment?

THE PRESIDENT: That, first of all, she made us -- she believed that all these kids -- and a lot of my classmates were really from very poor families -- and she believed that we could all be something. And she believed that we had, in order to be something, we not only had to develop our minds, we had to be good people, which is why she left that little box on the desk. She never saw any -- the thing that I remember about her was that she treated us all, everyone of us, like we could be something. But she held us all to a standard. She expected us all to meet certain standards.

And that's basically what I think that what I'm trying to get back to today. It's just like these business leaders -- I

don't believe that -- we can't micromanage the school systems. But there ought to be national standards for schools, for teachers, for students. And then there ought to be a grassroots set of reforms that encourage people to meet those standards.

And I guess it's kind of old

-fashioned, but I always
think she was one of those old

-fashioned people. She dedicated her whole life to teaching. She never had a family. She lived with her cousin all her life. Both of them lived to be nearly 90. Both of them were school teachers. But they gave their entire lives to people like me. And most of us turned out pretty good. And they had this -- and I really believe that that kind of almost an uncritical belief in the student, but holding the student to a high standard

-

-that sort of mixture of love and discipline and learning and that kind of blind faith. That's what we really need more of in this country today.

And I saw somebody from home three or four days ago, before I even knew they were going to do this interview, and we all got to talking about her. So I've got her on my mind and I thought I would mention her today -- Kathleen Schaer, that's how you spell the name.

Q Kathleen with a K?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I've still got -- actually, about two years ago, someone gave me a copy of her grade book.

Q Yes? With your name in it?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, for her sixth

-grade year. I've got
it.

Q And you've kept that?

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely, I have. I've got upstairs in the residence, in my personal files in my office.

Q And what was the name of the school?

THE PRESIDENT: Ranville School (ph).

Q We've overstayed our welcome.

THE PRESIDENT: It's okay.

Q We appreciate your time.

THE PRESIDENT: The main thing I want to tell you about this thing tomorrow, though, is that I believe -- and let me just say this -- I believe that this is a case where the President can do more by being positive, by elevating the positive practices that are going on and trying to help, and trying to ask in an honest way what I can do, both as President and in terms of policies, to create work places that are pro

-family and good for training and education and good for health and retirement and good for shared decision making and shared welfare.

I think we can do more in a positive way, just like in the V chip thing, than I can by sort of railing about things that I don't like. I just think that there's just -- the private sector in this country is basically a very powerful thing. We have produced
8

-and

-a

-half million jobs in an economy -- a global economy -- where most other wealthy countries have not been able to produce jobs. That is nothing to sneeze at. And most of the problems that working people have today grow out of a lot of the conditions of the global economy that we've not fully adjusted to.

So I think it's very important not to put the focus on the few things that we think are wrong, instead of -- to obscure the possibility that we can create a whole different sort of frame of reference for what good corporate citizenship is as we move into this new economy. I mean, I really believe you've got a chance to show that you can do the right thing and make a lot of money. And if people thought you could, then I think more people would do it. That's what I believe. I think most people want to do the right thing.

TOP EVEN

- \p -

BOTTOM ALL

And I just think that -- to go back to your very first comment, I think that the change in the nature of the financial markets -- where they're more global, where the stock market and the bond market in America are most affected by global financial movements, which are instantaneous -- has inevitably led to a shift in the focus, which I think may have led to some practices that may not be so good over the long run. But ultimately businesses survive because they produce a product or a service that people want to

purchase. And the workers do that.

So I think that we just need to kind of make sure that we've done everything we can, at least, to create a country in which people want to do the right thing by their workers, people that are running these companies. And I think most of them do and I think that -- once a lot of these companies demonstrate you really can do very well by doing it, and I think that taking that positive approach is far better than just going out and saying here are the things I don't like and complaining about them.

Q You don't see yourself as being -- on this?

THE PRESIDENT: No, and the government cannot micromanage the private economy, we can't do it. And if we tried to do it, we would wind up causing a lot more harm than we would -- than good. But you can influence in ways that are quite positive if you do it right.

Q Mr. President, thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT: Glad to see you. Thanks.

END 11:45 A.M. EDT

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Roger V. Salazar (SALAZAR_R) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1996 06:52:32.04

SUBJECT: CNN's Late Edition 5/26

TO: Jill M. Blickstein (BLICKSTEIN_J) (OMB)
READ:28-MAY-1996 09:45:03.20

TO: Lisa M. Caputo (CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph W. Cerrell (CERREL_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Joseph W.
Cerrell@LNGATE@EOPMRX) (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Daniel P. Collins (COLLINS_D) (WHO)
READ:17-JUN-1996 09:24:40.72

TO: Amanda Crumley (CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rahm Emanuel (EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Christa T. Robinson (ROBINSON_C) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 10:39:47.23

TO: Karen E. Finney (FINNEY_K) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines (GAINES_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John Gibbons (GIBBONS_J) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (
jgibbons@ostp.eop.gov@inet) (STP)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary Ellen Glynn (GLYNN_M) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julia R. Green (GREEN_J) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 07:25:24.60

TO: Daniel J. Gunia (GUNIA_D) (OA)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Brenda I. Hilliard (HILLIARD_B) (NSC)
READ:28-MAY-1996 09:54:58.42

TO: Elgie Holstein (HOLSTEIN_E) (OPD)
READ:28-MAY-1996 14:33:20.14

TO: Heidi Kukis (Heidi Kukis@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Payne, Julia M. (Julia M. Payne@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Angus S. King (KING_A) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 09:13:09.70

TO: G. N. Lattimore (LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Marlene A. MacDonald (MACDONALD_M) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thurgood Marshall (MARSHA_T) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Thurgood
Marshall Jr.@LNGATE@EOPMRX) (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Julie E. Mason (MASON_J) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 07:28:13.54

TO: Lorraine McHugh (MCHUGH_L) (WHO)
READ:29-MAY-1996 08:01:05.25

TO: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: APRIL K. MELLODY (MELLODY_A) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 11:48:03.79

TO: Julia Moffett (MOFFETT_J) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 11:18:51.86

TO: Alison Muscatine (MUSCATINE_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Thomas O'Donnell (ODONNELL_T) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (PRINCE_J) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 18:41:26.01

TO: Victoria L. Radd (RADD_V) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 08:59:28.45

TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez (RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rica F. Rodman (RODMAN_R) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 09:57:28.50

TO: Laura D. Schwartz (SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Teresa Wildman (WILDMAN_T) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 08:26:57.20

TO: Peggy A. Lewis (LEWIS_P) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joshua Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Gene B. Sperling (SPERLING_G) Autoforward to: Daniel Taberski (TABERSKI_D)
(WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: George Stephanopoulos (STEPHANOPO_G) Autoforward to: Laura Capps (CAPPS_L)
(WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 12:36:04.60

TO: Brenda Anders (ANDERS_B) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 10:03:37.24

TO: Aman, Sally J. (Sally J. Aman@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Virginia M. Terzano (TERZANO_V) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 11:30:33.22

TO: Laura D. Tyson (TYSON_L) Autoforward to: Thomas O'Donnell (O'DONNELL_T)
(WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lorraine A. Voles (VOLES_L) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee (Lorraine A.
Voles@LNGATE@EOPMRX) (VPO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 10:34:04.12

TO: Ann F. Walker (WALKER_A) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Allison Wilkie (WILKIE_A) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 08:31:57.85

TO: Daniel Taberski (TABERSKI_D) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jason S. Goldberg (GOLDBERG_JS) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Russell W. Horwitz (HORWITZ_R) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 09:09:39.23

TO: Darby Stott (STOTT_D) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michelle Crisci (CRISCI_M) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 08:26:07.58

TO: Stuart Schear (SCHEAR_S) (WHO)
READ:30-MAY-1996 08:52:31.41

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (ABERNATHY_P) (OPD)
READ:28-MAY-1996 09:15:27.31

TO: Paul K. Engskov (ENGSKOV_K) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 07:30:06.18

TO: Lori L. Anderson (ANDERSON_L) (WHO)
READ:29-MAY-1996 08:55:07.87

TO: Patricia F. Lewis (LEWIS_PF) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 10:03:11.75

TO: Gordon Li (LI_G) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 08:45:15.35

TO: Steven J. Naplan (NAPLAN_S) (NSC)
READ:28-MAY-1996 08:40:01.49

TO: Kevin Moran (MORAN_K1) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 08:43:02.91

TO: Remote Addressee (ssutherl@dol.gov@INET)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael Warren (WARREN_M) (OPD)
READ:28-MAY-1996 13:27:55.85

TO: Victoria L. Schaefer (SCHAEFER_V) (OMB)
READ:28-MAY-1996 10:05:10.16

TO: LAWRENCE J. HAAS (HAAS_L) (OMB)
READ: 4-JUN-1996 07:00:34.13

TEXT:
TRANSCRIPT

CNN LATE EDITION

MAY 26, 1996

SPEAKERS LIST: FRANK SESNO, CNN NEWS
HENRY CISNEROS, SECRETARY,
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD)
JACK KEMP, FORMER HUD SECRETARY
WILLIE BROWN, MAYOR OF SAN FRANCISCO
RUDOLPH GIULIANI, MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY
CLAIRE FREEMAN, CLEVELAND PUBLIC HOUSING DIRECTOR

SESNO: Hello, it's Sunday, May 26, 1996. To our viewers in the United States and around the world, welcome to a very special LATE EDITION. Today, America's cities.

It's been said that the fate of the nation follows the fate of its cities -- a poignant warning, for at the core of many urban areas, there are intense problems -- poverty, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, and substandard housing.

Today, our cameras will take you inside one of this country's inner cities, along with Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros. We will visit Cleveland, Ohio -- home to many who live in poverty but also home to an experiment that could change the face of urban America.

Then, some perspective from Republican Jack Kemp, the mayors of New York and San Francisco, and a woman who manages Cleveland's public housing.

First, an update on the hour's top stories, we check in with the news desk at the CNN center in Atlanta.

(NEWSBREAK)

SESNO: Thanks very much. Our focus today -- America's cities. How much hope amid the desolation? Earlier this week, I spent a day walking around the housing projects of Cleveland, Ohio, with Housing Secretary Henry Cisneros. The sights we saw and the people we met tell a great deal of the story of America's inner cities.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

SESNO: These buildings that we see here have not been renovated yet?

CISNEROS: Correct.

SESNO: And when you see the sheer number of buildings that are in need of repair...

CISNEROS: Yes. It would take 100 years to do everything that needs to be done.

SESNO: Especially at the rate you're going with less money, not more.

CISNEROS: Yes. Although I think we're making substantial progress on the worst, the worst of the public housing is coming down. We have identified the developments, including in this city King Kennedy. We are -- we have structured efforts to go after the worst of the developments.

SESNO: Look at this. Now, this is a swing set with not one swing.

CISNEROS: No swings. Yes.

SESNO: This is a playground where no one's playing.

CISNEROS: Childhood is lost. The innocence of childhood is gone living in places like this.
Well

-intentioned errors were made over the last, say, 20 years. The Congress and the administration said housing is scarce. We have to keep it for the poorest of the poor.

But when you put all of the poorest of the poor together, there are no role models of anyone who works, and all of the dynamics become negative. Every expert in America on housing says the key is to bring different income groups together.

And that's what we have to do. We just can't leave people, you know? And leave whole cities in the lurch, so we've got to keep working at it. I'm not an apologist for the people, that is to say they have to work. President Clinton believes responsibility -- individual responsibility is a key part of the equation.

But the society has responsibilities, too. And the loss of jobs and the discriminatory effects that keep people from getting those jobs and living out in the community -- those are real things. Those are not figments of the imagination.

The epidemic of drugs -- I mean, it's as if we'd unleashed a foreign enemy in our cities to poison the children and poison the people with drugs.

CISNEROS: If you or I, this afternoon were told, Frank, you've just -- we're going to tell you got leave CNN and you're going to have to start with no job, and you're going to live in that place over there, and I'm going to live in this apartment over here, I guarantee you, it would be very tough -- for you or me. I mean, we'd find our way out of it somehow with the advantages that we have, but this is depressing, gloomy, dangerous stuff with temptation of drugs all around. We've created incredible barriers as a society for these folks.

Gentleman, how you're doing?

UNKNOWN: All right.

CISNEROS: I'm Henry Cisneros.

UNKNOWN: How you doing?

CISNEROS: I'm the secretary of Housing in Washington. And this is Mr. Sesno, he's with CNN.

UNKNOWN: (OFF

-MIKE)

CISNEROS: George -- good to meet you. Is there work out there?

UNKNOWN: Well, yes. It's a job -- I haven't put a lot of applications, you know what I'm saying, but it's hard. You know what I'm saying? It's hard.

CISNEROS: They don't call you back?

UNKNOWN: I guess because I got a felony -- By me

having a prior case, I got a felony on my record.

CISNEROS: What was that?

UNKNOWN: I had a drug case back in '93.

CISNEROS: Yes.

UNKNOWN: Yes.

CISNEROS: You clean now?

UNKNOWN: Yes, I'm clean now.

CISNEROS: Were you selling or using, if you don't mind my asking?

UNKNOWN: Oh no, I was using.

CISNEROS: Using?

UNKNOWN: Yes.

CISNEROS: So, how did you get clean? That's tough.

UNKNOWN: I know, I want you to know in '93 when I got knocked they just sent me to the joint. They sent me to the joint. They sent me to a rehab. Yes.

SESNO: How many of your friends that you grew up with or hung out with are either in jail or on drugs or unemployed now?

UNKNOWN: Quite a few of them. Quite a few. I got a lot of friends that's in the joint right now. You know what I'm saying? Just all doing big time. They probably will never see daylight again. That's all we grew up knowing down in the projects. Growing up around the around the environment of drugs. So, so that's what we learned.

SESNO: Do you blame the projects for that?

UNKNOWN: No, you can't blame nobody but yourself.

CISNEROS: Is your mom at home right now?

UNKNOWN: Yes, she is at home.

(BREAK)

CISNEROS: Do you mind if we talk to her? I'll be right back, Frank, let me just...

Hello?

Frank, this is Martha Cunningham. Ms. Cunningham has been here for about -- she's said almost two years.

SESNO: Hello.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Hi.

SESNO: I'm Frank Sesno.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I'm Martha.

SESNO: Hi, Martha, come on out.

CUNNINGHAM: I was 40 when I came to (OFF

-MIKE). I was 41 years old. And my life just went downhill for drugs and alcohol. But, you know, I went to treatment and I had lots of other issues to deal with too. And that gave me hope, you know.

CISNEROS: Are you working right now?

CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

CISNEROS: Where are...

CUNNINGHAM: I'm a home provider. I work from my home.

CISNEROS: Well, what do you do?

CUNNINGHAM: I take care of girls (OFF

-MIKE) from
treatment.

CISNEROS: How much do you earn?

CUNNINGHAM: I make \$150 every -- I mean once a month.

SESNO: You make \$150 a month?

CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

(BREAK)

SESNO: Not to be cruel about it, but isn't the woman we just talked to in some fashion some demonstration that those who say we fought the war against poverty and poverty won, that there's some justification to what they've said?

CISNEROS: No, I would say, first of all, we fought a war against poverty and many, many Americans are better off. We have raised the incomes of not only the elderly in this country over the last 25 years, but we have raised incomes of many families who now live perfectly normal existences, but we have hardened a permanent underclass of people who are going to get trapped in these circumstances.

It doesn't mean that we fought the war and we lost it. What it means is that there are a lot of people who are refugees and left behind. The job's not finished.

(BREAK)

SESNO: What's going on here?

CISNEROS: Well, what this is, is the demolition, the replacement of some 450 units that are like that with hundreds on

-site. I think it's 286 when they build out that will look like new housing.

SESNO: But you can't just change the bricks and mortar, you got to change the caliber, frankly, brutally, of the person who's going to live in a unit like this.

CISNEROS: Well, there's a lot of things we need to do.

SESNO: Otherwise, there's nothing to say that this isn't going to be demolished, graffitied up five, ten years from now, too.

CISNEROS: You're absolutely right. We would come back in five years, it would be in the same shape unless we screen families so we are encouraging working families, screen out people with drug and criminal problems. They are not welcome here.

SESNO: You can't live here.

CISNEROS: Can't live here, sorry, this is for families who want to make something of their lives. Your record is such that we don't expect you're going to be able to make it here.

SESNO: That means you kick people out if they go on to

drugs?

CISNEROS: That means we tighten the leases so that we can evict people. That's what President Clinton's one strike and you're out initiative is all about.

SESNO: This unit, this renovation, as nice as it may look, is costing \$110,000 per unit to renovate -- \$110,000.

CISNEROS: I can justify it on several grounds. First of all, this housing has to be build stronger

than other housing because it's going to take a lot of wear and tear.

A lot of families are going to live here, not just one.

If we can get a family stabilized and get them moving on to a self

-sufficient existence, and then another poor family comes in here and they get stabilized and they move on, then this housing is serving the purpose. It's going to serve several generations of families, and the cost is worth it.

SESNO: You got 8,000 people on the waiting list for public housing in Cleveland alone. You'd be talking about a billion dollars just to accommodate the waiting list in this one city. The money isn't there for this.

CISNEROS: The money's not there for everybody on the waiting list, that's for sure. That's why we have four

-year waiting lists in virtually every city in America and that's why what the Congress has done in cutting housing programs is so serious.

SESNO: Your president stood before the country and said the era of big government is over. Isn't this big government writ large, the federal government as constructor, landlord, subcontractor, landlord?

CISNEROS: No, that's not true, Frank. No, we are working with the housing authorities, we are working with nonprofit organizations.

These are Cleveland

-based organizations putting Cleveland solutions together. We didn't select this site. We didn't select this architecture. We didn't select the contractor. We didn't write the rules locally that they're using.

We're providing some resources as a partner to help them get it done, but this is the best of marrying a local initiative with some federal support for it.

SESNO: What do you say to a resident or anybody else who says, this is lovely, but it's an island, it's an island of some rehabilitation for a very small group of people but still surrounded by a sea of distress?

CISNEROS: Well, you got to start somewhere is the

first thing I say. And a good place to start is to take something that has been an energy draw, a sinkhole, and convert it into a starting place. You establish a

beachhead, take a negative, convert it into a positive, and build from there.

SESNO: The one thing I've notice is I haven't seen a supermarket in my driving around today. There's no place for folks to go and shop.

CISNEROS: That is a problem. That is a problem. And that's why I went to the association of supermarkets recently, the Food Institute of America and told them we want the Safeways and the Albertsons and the Star Markets, the big national chains to work with us in the cities.

If the federal government were not here, there is no one to start this ball rolling. That's the whole point. That's the federal government's role.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SESNO: When we come back, we'll take you to a place that Henry Cisneros says is an inner

-city success story, a place called Renaissance Village.

(BREAK)

SESNO: Welcome back to LATE EDITION. We return to Cleveland's inner

-city now, this time to a very different place, a place called Renaissance Village.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CISNEROS: It is beautiful. This is public housing that has been remade. And this had exactly the same look as what we saw earlier, only now you see, instead of the hallways being at the end and people having to go into the hallways, now each have their own private entrance so it's safe.

You see people outdoors.

Hi, ladies, how are you?

You have your own entrance.

UNKNOWN: Right.

CISNEROS: Right. And before you had to go in the hallway, right?

UNKNOWN: Right.

CISNEROS: And when I was here before, some of the ladies told me they felt like that was real dangerous because the people would be drug dealers and people inside those hallways?

UNKNOWN: Right.

CISNEROS: And you have to go through men in order to get to your apartment?

UNKNOWN: Right.

CISNEROS: So how important is it to have your own

entrance?

UNKNOWN: It's nice. It's the best thing.

SESNO: Is it safer.

UNKNOWN: Yes, safer. It's much safer.

SESNO: How has it changed?

UNKNOWN: Oh, it's a whole lot of change. Because you can see them more. You know, see the person. And...

CISNEROS: Your neighbors can keep an eye on you?

UNKNOWN: Right.

SESNO: Is there less crime here now? Do you feel less threatened here than you did before?

UNKNOWN: There's less. There's less crime now.

CISNEROS: Once upon a time, the residents felt, no we don't want fences because they thought fences were to keep them in.

UNKNOWN: Right.

CISNEROS: And they said, you know, they're going to kind of put a corral around us, right?

UNKNOWN: Right.

CISNEROS: That's what I heard three years ago.

UNKNOWN: Yeah, OK.

CISNEROS: But now, the residents say, wait a minute. The nicest apartments in America have fences and guards and gates, and so forth. Why shouldn't apartments like these?

UNKNOWN: Right. I think this is nice.

CISNEROS: And what happens is, the people who used to -- people would come off the street, come out drunk from a place, walk right in here, throw their stuff out on somebody's porch, sit here, deal dope right here. It's amazing what a fence, a simple fence will do.

SESNO: Maybe this is too nice and people who move in here and may never be able to conceive of an even nicer place than this, so they stay and become permanent residents.

CISNEROS: First of all, I would say in answer to the question of too nice. As a father, there's no such thing as too nice to raise your children. This is not luxurious. It's pretty basic when you get into it. And people do want to improve, and so what we want to do is help people move on with education, with training, help them move on. No, I don't think this is too nice at all.

CISNEROS: Earlier, you saw a place where there were swings but no swings.

SESNO: A playground but no one playing.

CISNEROS: And here you see mothers outside, children playing. You hear the voices of children. It's a different place. This is a success story. This is what public housing could be like.

He was just asking me question, which I think you ought to ask him. If this is so nice, what incentive is there for you to ever want to move out? To get a job, a better paying job, and go into your own housing on your own?

UNKNOWN: You should always have incentive to do better. This is OK, but you always want to have incentive to do better no matter what you have. Everybody should want to do that. You know, it's a nice project. It's nice and everything, but some people would like to have a house. Some people would like to, you know, move on to a better place or more individuality than they have now.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SESNO: Well, joining us here now in our studio is HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, also Jack Kemp, conservative, and HUD secretary under President George Bush, currently with Empower America, and Claire Freeman, the chief executive officer of the Public Housing Authority that oversees the city of Cleveland, the authority responsible, for among other things, Renaissance Village. Welcome to you all.

KEMP: Thank you.

SESNO: Jack Kemp, let's start with you. It all looks pretty easy when you see these pictures. You go in. You rebuild the houses. It costs a lot of money, and everybody lives happily ever after. It is not that simple though.

KEMP: No, it isn't.

SESNO: The question I have for you is -- it's the same question I asked out there -- is it the housing that should come first? Or the jobs? How do you start?

KEMP: Well, it's both. Housing, a chance to own something and a job and an education for your children are the three ingredients of the American Dream writ large. Excuse me.

Claire Freeman, who worked with me and I worked with Claire at HUD when I was there under George Bush, and I implemented programs to try to bring home ownership.

KEMP: I have tremendous respect for Henry. He knows that. I introduced him to the Senate, and I believe that many of the things that Henry is doing are absolutely in the right direction.

But you cannot get this country's urban renaissance -- rebirth -- without jobs, education, dealing with drugs the way I believe Henry Cisneros wants to and is, and also providing -- that last man on the film that we showed just a minute ago, he said everybody wants to do better. I believe that with all my heart. And I think doing better means getting out of public housing into private housing to ownership and opportunity.

SESNO: Is it appropriate, Claire Freeman, that those buildings that we saw there are being built entirely with

federal dollars? There are no Cleveland city dollars there. There are no Ohio dollars there. They are all federal government dollars.

FREEMAN: Public housing in this country is a national asset. It's an asset of this country. It belongs to the

taxpayers, the citizens, the users of public housing.

SESNO: We're still talking about units that cost \$100,000 -- \$65,000 to \$100,000 per unit to renovate. Why did it have to be, every penny of it, federal money? We're in an era now where the Congress and others are saying give power back to the states. Give authority back to the states.

The states are not participating, at least not in this.

FREEMAN: Well, actually, for the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, we have -- we are a half a billion dollar business. Our assets are worth, book value, a half a billion dollars. If you went to market value, it would be three times that.

We could go to the private market and issue bonds. We are able to do that. We could go to the private market and borrow money to do the renovations.

SESNO: So why not do that?

FREEMAN: If we did that, we would have to raise the rent because we'd have to pay back those market

-rate

private loans, and we'd have to pay back those bonds. We would not be serving the same client.

SESNO: Henry Cisneros, why must this be a federal responsibility? And Jack Kemp, jump in here, please, because I'm interest in how you view this. I mean, I hear you talk, Jack Kemp, a lot, and you talk about local initiatives to create jobs, get the businesses involved and generate economic opportunity and growth from the bottom up.

I hear you saying as laudable as these projects are that they must be done from the top down.

CISNEROS: No, Frank, you don't hear me saying that. I think that...

SESNO: At least paid for that way.

CISNEROS: Well, not even that. I think it would be

tremendous if we could get state and local government and nonprofit organizations to join the federal government and, very importantly, private investment in these kinds of deals.

Now, I think we're moving in that direction. To date, it has taken mostly federal money. The states don't have it. Many of them have been through difficult economic times in recent years, and the cities, Lord knows they're in difficult shape in terms of their budgets.

So there's just nothing there that you can get. But some of the most interesting innovations today, Jack -- and I've got to give credit to Jack. He's been talking about this, working on it, is where we're getting companies -- private companies like McCormack and Baron in St. Louis and Corcoran

-Genesyn (ph) in Boston -- to invest

their own money, and then we do public and private together and lift the whole neighborhood with some private capital in it.

KEMP: I think that's admirable. I think we have to step back from the problem just a little bit and look at the bigger picture. I agree with the premise of the whole tape, which is that we cannot neglect our cities.

This very week, Eleanor Holmes Norton introduced into the U.S. Congress a bill to greenline the urban area of the District of Columbia. I happen to believe strongly that we've got to save the nation's capital from the implosion that's taking place, and just cutting spending is not going to solve the problem.

Now, listen to this. Excuse me, but I get excited about it. Eleanor Holmes Norton wants to eliminate -- zero the capital gain tax on any man, any woman of any color, any part of the country who invests his or her savings in capital in the inner cities of the country, in this case, D.C.

Now, I believe that public

-private partnerships would follow.

KEMP: We could get interest rates down. I'm not saying it would solve all the problems of housing, but the combination of jobs -- your first question -- coupled with ownership opportunities for people, expanding ownership, in my opinion, Henry, we can change behavior.

People who own something treat it differently than when they don't. And that was what...

SESNO: Is this a misplaced priority then, in your view, to be rebuilding housing like this that people don't own?

KEMP: I would rebuild it -- OK, I would say in a friendly, critical way that we ought to spend the money -- it's an investment. But it ought to be turned into ownership for the people. I would sell it to the residents.

SESNO: OK. Let's -- let me turn the corner here a little bit.

KEMP: That will change behavior.

SESNO: Let's turn the corner just a little bit. It is a political year. You are advising the Bob Dole campaign, are you not?

KEMP: Loosely, yes. I'm trying to...

SESNO: Bob Dole referred to Housing and Urban Development, the department, as perhaps the last bastion of socialism. The monies are being cut. The Republican Party, the Republican Congress have cut the funds to your agency saying that's not where the money should be going.

People should be going out and getting jobs and getting housing on the private market.

KEMP: Can't get jobs that aren't there. Henry and I would agree with that. There has to be a public

-private partnership, and we would agree with that. I would take it a step further than Bob Dole. I think the welfare system is almost a trap, and Henry talked about the drain of human resources in welfare.

And if you -- we've got to create incentives for people to get an education, to work and save and invest and own. And if we expanded it, I think we could change the climate in inner cities.

SESNO: Welfare? Welfare trap?

FREEMAN: In some sense, yes. But in public housing all across the country and especially in Cleveland, the average stay for a mother with, say, four kids on welfare is no more than six years. And it's probably more like four years because we're skewed by the high number of

(OFF

-MIKE) senior citizens...

SESNO: Well, how do you feel -- would it be useful then to have a welfare program that says if you're not working in six months, two years, you're off? There are other -- Senator Dole calls for that. Many of the governors, the president of the United States -- Clinton, a Democrat -- has said some of these programs work, have cut the welfare rolls.

Would it work?

FREEMAN: That's unrealistic. Because our experience is the mother really wants a job, and she -- we help her get training so she can get a job. But the job may not last more than six months, a year. And if she is thrown off of welfare, she has no health care for her children and if -- and she can't get back on welfare fast enough to bridge the gap between when that job runs out and when she is back getting some kind of funds to feed her family.

So there needs to be some middle ground.

SESNO: OK, we have to take a break. When we come back -- class, race, and stereotype. What happens when the government moves people from the inner cities to the suburbs? Stay with us.

(BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

UNKNOWN: The reason I want to go out in the county or into a better neighborhood is basically to have a choice to go wherever I want to go because I have that right.

UNKNOWN: What are they going to do 35 months from now when they ruin all of our neighborhoods?

(APPLAUSE)

UNKNOWN: We are people who have worked in our community -- have worked hard. We don't want to see the

crime come out here.

UNKNOWN: In America today, the subtext in all of this is race.

CISNEROS: Unfortunately, so much of the decline of our cities is about race. So much of the issues of whether people can live in metropolitan areas is about race. So much of the decline of our schools is about race. We just -- we're just having a real problem with this.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SESNO: A real problem. Welcome back to LATE EDITION. Thanks very much. Today we're talking about the state of America's cities. That example, folks, was about Baltimore -- a real life example where you -- HUD was sued by residents. As part of the settlement you're going to help several of them, several hundred families move out into largely white suburbs. You saw the reaction of the white suburbs.

Do they have a point -- that this is social engineering?

CISNEROS: Frank, the social engineering was when people were concentrated in high

-rise public housing over 40 years and left abandoned with no jobs. That was social engineering. All we're trying to do is give people certificates or vouchers to let them go into the open market. And I do not for a minute believe that 360 families a year, for about six years, in a metropolitan area of \$2.5 million is going to hurt anyone.

SESNO: What does Jack Kemp say to those white suburbanites who say, you know, not long down the line the crime -- all this business going to...

KEMP: Excuse me, I felt embarrassed -- watching that gentlemen stand up there and talk that way. That is -- that's racism. I mean -- I think white folks have to realize, that is racism benign or whatever.

Look, I want to agree with my friend Henry Cisneros. I think people should be given choice. Now, I don't think that government should do the engineering. I don't think that government should say you have to live in the suburbs. I think that government...

SESNO: Isn't that what they're doing?

KEMP: ... of the United States...

SESNO: Isn't that what they're doing?

KEMP: Well, to be honest I don't know that particular

case as well as someone else might. But I am saying that vouchers are supported by men and women of good will who recognize that it empowers people directly to give them greater choice. And they ought to have it in education as well.

SESNO: How many people in Cleveland, and those, some

of those projects that we saw when we walked around would like to move out into suburban communities?

FREEMAN: A very small number, because they know that they would be moving into harm's way because the suburban communities have not been educated, they have not been prepared to receive a population that looks different and appears different than those people who are already living there.

SESNO: But surely none of you would argue that you can impose an integrated?

CISNEROS: This is not imposition, Frank. This is certificates or vouchers given at...

SESNO: That sounded -- that one community sounded like they were about to imposed on...

CISNEROS: They're just wrong. This is a certificate or a voucher given to an individual family, not a class of people, not a mass of people, not a whole building, individuals families who then have choice. They go look for apartments, somewhere out in the metro area.

KEMP: In the metro area.

CISNEROS: In the metro area.

SESNO: Should inner

-city residents...

KEMP: I favor that -- Bob Dole...

SESNO: ... should the residents be encouraged to move out of the inner

-city?

KEMP: Oh, they ought to be encouraged to live where they want to. They ought to be -- they ought to have the same choice as other folk, A...

SESNO: Real choices, though?

KEMP: And B, you've got to do something to ease the

concern and that is to change the economic climate of urban American so that people can get the jobs where they live.

KEMP: And get education.

SESNO: Henry Cisneros.

CISNEROS: Let me just say something real quick.

KEMP: One of the paradoxes is, and I got to say this because it is a fact, the party to which to my good friend Henry Cisneros belongs is standing in the way of doing in education -- i.e. choice -- what you and I agree should be done in housing -- i.e. choice. Why is it that we give vouchers for housing, but not for education?

CISNEROS: Well, we have a different approach...

KEMP: Right.

CISNEROS: ... which is charter schools, break away from the bureaucracy of the central city schools.

And schools are a big part of this equation, improvement of schools is critical because it's the principal reason why people will leave, whites will leave

the city when they are fleeing what they believe to be chaotic, even dangerous schools. So the schools fit right into this.

But this choice issue is really important because the truth of the matter is we're not going to be able to bring the economy back to the cities fast enough to give people jobs. The jobs are growing up out in the airports and out in the circumferential routes and out on the research parts and out in the new...

KEMP: I disagree with (OFF

-MIKE).

CISNEROS: And so some folks have to be able to live out, you know, near where some of the jobs are.

KEMP: I totally disagree. The inner

-city economy in the United States of America is about a \$750 billion economy, it's bigger than the whole Canadian economy in total. It is a tremendous market waiting to be tapped, and it could be turned around, maybe not overnight, but almost, in the sense of history overnight. (OFF

-MIKE) to

do something bold. We're not doing anything in the

inner

-cities.

SESNO: On that score, you talk about the rebirth of Cleveland and some of our cities, but the statistics are very grim still. In our inner

-cities, there's 75 percent poverty, almost two

-thirds of households are headed by single women. And in some places we have 50 percent or higher teen unemployment, young Black men you cannot or are not working. Where is the rebirth?

CISNEROS: Frank, a city like Cleveland has suffered the loss of its manufacturing base that went with the rest of the country. It went offshore, it went to the suburbs, it went to the South. And Cleveland's going to have a heck of a road coming back.

Now, they're working back, but my disagreement with Jack is not a failure of effort to try to bring back business, it's just we can't let another, we can't risk another generation without jobs, and so that's why strategies to get people out to where some of the jobs are are as important as bringing jobs back. We have to do both, Jack, at the same time.

KEMP: I agree.

SESNO: I want to let...

KEMP: Excuse me.

SESNO: I'm sorry, I just want to let Clair Freeman have the last word here, and that is, you know inner Cleveland very well...

FREEMAN: Yes, I do. Yes, I do.

SESNO: Why should Americans who live in California or Oregon or Utah or Arizona care about what happens in Cleveland?

FREEMAN: If Cleveland can work, cities around the country can work. We are small enough so that we can get our hands around our city. Our housing authority is some 12,000 public housing units. It's small enough so that we can get our hands around it, build some model programs, create a sense of hope. And if we can work, anywhere can work.

SESNO: Claire Freeman, thank you very much. Jack Kemp, appreciate your time. And Henry Cisneros.

When we come back, ultimately it's the local leaders and taxpayers who must pick up the pieces when America's cities fall apart. Just ahead, we'll speak with two big city mayors as our look at America's cities continues.

(BREAK)

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

UNKNOWN: ... the central city goes, the whole metropolitan area pays a price for it. Cities are important to the country because ample evidence shows it's the cities that are the engine of the American economy.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

SESNO: Just ahead on LATE EDITION, the political leaders closest to the problems of our cities, New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown, up next on LATE EDITION.

(BREAK)

SESNO: And welcome back to LATE EDITION.

SESNO: Joining us now, two big

-city mayors --

Republican Rudolph Giuliani of New York and Democrat Willie Brown of San Francisco.

Mr. Mayors, thank you very much for joining us today.

BROWN: Thank you, Frank.

SESNO: Mayor Brown, let me come out to you in San Francisco first and talk to you about the fact. The fact is that the federal money is declining. As laudable as the goals may have been that we heard here over the last several minutes, the amount of federal dollars available to you as a mayor to take care of your city, to do the things you want to do is on the decline. Where is the new money going to come from? Or won't it?

BROWN: Well, no. In some cases it will not. In other cases, you will have to go to the private sector. You will have to go to the nonprofits. You will have to do

some clever financing, using tax increments, and you'll have to go back the federal government, returning to them the responsibility to handle things like the veterans, who populate many of our cities, and who are among the highest

users of our drug abuse programs, our homeless shelter programs, and our unemployment programs. All of that is part of what will be to be done.

SESNO: Mayor Giuliani, let me ask you about a success story

I know that you have in New York. The revitalization, if it's going to happen, of our cities is not only about inner cities. It's about the rest of the city, too.

Let's take a landmark that people know very well and that's Times Square in New York. Now that has really turned around. That's changed. It's not residential, I grant you. But there are residential components of it. What made the difference?

GIULIANI: I think the difference is, in essence, cleaning it up. We did a rezoning. We have a police precinct that is located right there, and crime is down like 60, 70 percent in Times Square.

Most of the sex shops -- I think actually now, all of the sex shops are gone because of the rezoning that was done. I think there's one left a block away.

And now we have major reinvestment in Times Square, a new theater that was started about three months ago. Disney is doing a major project with a live theater they're putting up where they're going to start in December.

We have a new hotel going up there. So Times Square is a very different place. It's been revitalized, and a lot of it has to do with taking care of the quality of life issues that had gotten to a point in Times Square that it was really choking the place.

SESNO: Well, Mayor Giuliani, Mayor Brown, what does Times Square, what does Renaissance Village, which we saw in Cleveland, tell us, if anything, about turning America's cities around? Is it just neighborhood by neighborhood, and therefore, scatter shot? Or is there a bigger message here?

Mayor Brown, go ahead.

BROWN: It literally, it is in many cases neighborhood by neighborhood. As a matter of fact, you can predict your success if you involve the people. And you can't involve the people from one side of town, if it's not

their side of town, with any degree of commitment and with any degree of integrity.

I have to also say, Mayor Giuliani will echo that his business improvement district that Times Square became, in which the people who are the retailers in the Times Square area and the businesses, literally kicked in on a voluntary basis to become the government's partner in an

effort to do the clean

-up.

So it literally takes neighborhood by neighborhood.

SESNO: Go ahead, Mayor Giuliani.

GIULIANI: Mayor Brown is absolutely right. The business improvement district there has a lot to do with the revitalization of it. And now what we've done is, we have 38 business improvement districts all throughout the city, even in some of the neighborhoods that would be considered some of the poorer neighborhoods. And they're beginning to feel the same kind of revitalization.

Critical to it is getting people to invest in neighborhoods, getting people in the neighborhoods to start businesses, and getting people in those neighborhoods to own their own homes. And that has made a very, very big difference in the different neighborhoods of New York City and the revitalization of it.

SESNO: You both talk about revitalization, but you're both having very severe budget constraints and you're having to cut your budgets, and in some cases city services. Mayor Giuliani, if I'm not mistaken, last week a Manhattan judge held you and a couple of agencies in contempt for situations revolving around homelessness.

GIULIANA: Well, this particular judge has held both of my predecessors in contempt as well.

SESNO: But the issue is homelessness and being able to provide the services, the very expensive services across the board that the city must provide with declining budgets.

GIULIANI: Well, I mean there's no question that there are declining budgets. But the fact is that we also spend an enormous amount of money on homelessness, and it's really our job to spend it effectively. And it's also our job to try and target our requests, as Mayor Brown indicated before, of the federal government to keep up

with their responsibilities.

In the case of New York, for example, the federal government is trying to retreat from its responsibility to fund the issues that are created by illegal immigration and immigration. And rather than some of the things they're trying to do in Washington, it'd be a lot more effective if the federal government stepped up to the responsibility of funding some of the problems created by the federal government's inability to deal with immigration.

BROWN: The business of homelessness, which is unique, frankly, to the urban areas of America, and particularly in my own city in California, I don't think anybody has a true formula on how to deal with it. I think Mayor Giuliani is correct when he says we need to more effectively spend the dollars that we have.

We have something called a Continuum of Care program in

San Francisco. It's good in whatever respects we've been able to get it going. The problem is the resources are just not there to do the effective job.

We need to create jobs. We need to have a WPA

-style

project going. We need to have a cooperative relationship with the welfare system so that in fact you work as you receive. Those are the kinds of innovative things that you've got to build a relationship with to break the cycle of poverty. Homelessness is poverty.

SESNO: You raised the issue of the welfare system, let me ask you about the welfare system. We're now talking about, if you're not back working within two years, you're off the welfare rolls. The proposals on both sides of the aisle really are that you could have a five

-year maximum

for being on welfare altogether, you're out. Drug testing.

Time for tough love? Will this turn things around, Mayor Giuliani?

GIULIANI: Well, we actually have reduced welfare by about 130,000 people. Right now there are 30,000 people working for New York City that were on welfare a year ago.

SESNO: Do you throw them off the rolls if they're not working?

GIULIANI: Only if they can work. We also...

SESNO: Do you deny benefits to teen moms if they have additional kids?

GIULIANI: It depends on the age of the child. If the child is five years or younger, we don't deny benefits. If the children are older and people can work, we find them jobs.

We've got 30,000 people that were on welfare last year working for the city of New York now in just about every capacity, and it's been a very, very successful program. We've moved more people from welfare to work in the last year than ever before in the history of the city, and it's a very positive thing for people that hadn't been happening before.

SESNO: All right. Mayor Brown, last word.

BROWN: It's important that all of us understand that if we are to deal with the cycle of poverty existing in America, we've got to be about job creation, we've got to be about a smooth transition from the institutional poverty into productivity that allows the government to step out at a certain measured period of time, and we have to do it with the complete cooperation of all the units existing, including the private, nonprofit sector and government.

SESNO: OK. Mayor Willie Brown, thanks to you very

much.

SESNO: Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, we appreciate your time today, joining us for this important discussion on the future of our cities. Bruce Morten and the last word still ahead.

(BREAK)

UNKNOWN: At the age of four, five, 10, 15 years old, and this is not just one time, but two or three friends, and it's like a war zone.

SESNO: Just ahead, Bruce Morten has the last word on America's cities. What's different today, he says, has something to do with families.

(BREAK)

SESNO: Time now for Bruce Morten and the last word. Today, fixing America's cities. Not a new idea.

MORTEN: This is Southeast Washington. Just around the corner from where I live, they're planning to replace this abandoned public housing with new public housing. Not everyone in the neighborhood thinks that will work.

Almost 30 years ago, the Kerner Commission surveyed America's cities, many of which has burned that decade, and concluded that we are moving toward two societies -- separate but unequal. We still are.

Cities are a part of that movement. So is public housing. I remember a few years ago, going with a camera crew to the Robert Taylor Houses (ph), stark towers on Chicago's south side to film a young woman arriving at a new apartment with her small children.

She was maybe 20 minutes late, and while we waited on a warm pleasant day, we heard gunfire twice. The residents reacted about the way most people would to a fire engine going by, regular occurrence, no big deal, and you had to wonder what kind of lives the woman's children would have growing up in a such a place.

Chicago's director of public housing that year said, no, he hadn't lived in the projects as a kid. But he'd envied the children who did because in those days, the projects were full of families, full of men who worked at salesmen or bus drivers or carpenters.

Now all those men have left. The projects hold women and children, and the only male role model most of children see is the man on the corner, selling drugs.

You can make \$500 a day, easily, a drug dealer told me a few years ago. More, if you work at it. Sure beats the hamburger shop.

We have learned some things about public housing. It should look like houses, not skyscrapers. It's better if people have a stake, so that they can look forward to someday owning their own home. But none of that may do any good unless we can bring the families back.

That argues for mixing public housing in with all the other housing, or giving poor people vouchers so that they can choose where to live. The trouble is that middle

-class neighborhoods don't want the poor, and in any

case, rebuilding a family may be something the government doesn't know how to do.

Almost 30 years after Kerner, the gap between the very poor and the rest of the country is still growing. I'm Bruce Morten.

SESNO: One final observation, it is, as we say, old news that America's cities are in trouble. But there are rays of hope. On the street corners and the community centers and in the living rooms across the land where dedicated people are laboring often against the odds to turn things around.

No one should underestimate the task or the trouble or the potential of people who want a better life. It is still the American dream. That's it for this LATE EDITION. For now, from all of us at the program, thanks very much for watching. I'm Frank Sesno in Washington. Enjoy your weekend.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: BCS41@aol.com@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1996 09:46:00.00

SUBJECT: Articles - 5/28/96 (3)

TO: Yandura_P (Yandura_P@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 13:10:00.43

TO: fanning_e (fanning_e@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:28-MAY-1996 10:16:14.20

TEXT:

CONTENTS:

1. THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS: Good local guest column on marriage issue

2. (ST. LOUIS MO) RIVERFRONT TIMES:

a. Missouri Rep: "There's been a large public outcry against same-sex marriages in my district." Responds another: "Well, you certainly come from a different district than mine, because I haven't received one single call. Not one."

b. Good guest opinion written by the publisher: "The victory may serve to mobilize gay-bashers much the way Roe vs. Wade spurred the anti-choice movement. Far-right politicians will have a field day beating on those commie-liberal judges who want to make a special protected class out of 'those child-molesting, AIDS-spreading homos.'"

3. FEEDBACK: Everyone keeps saying 53% of the people voted or Amendment 2 -- but it was REALLY only 53% OF THE PEOPLE WHO VOTED, which is something else entirely

THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS

Box 655237,Dallas,TX,75265

FAX 214-263-0456, E-Mail: DMNeditor@aol.com or tdmned@pic.net

Saturday, May 26, 1996

VIEWPOINTS PAGE

MARRIAGE: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT CROSSES RACIAL, SEXUAL BARRIERS
by Carrie Sperling and Gary Biewenga

Less than 30 years ago, a man and woman were exiled from Virginia. They chose exile instead of a 2-year jail term for the crime of marrying someone of another race.

Virginia argued that Divine Will deemed interracial unions intrinsically unnatural and that, therefore, it was against social custom to recognize mixed-race marriages.

In 1967, the American Civil Liberties Union successfully argued before the U.S. Supreme Court that marriage is a fundamental right that couldn't be denied based on discriminatory racial classifications.

The court ruled that Virginia couldn't deny the benefits of civil marriage to interracial couples, just as it couldn't have two separate educational systems for its children.

Today, gay men and lesbians are struggling for the same rights the citizens of Virginia won in 1967-the freedom to marry whomever one chooses.

Hawaii is on the verge of ending the state-sponsored discrimination against same-sex couples by recognizing the right to marry regardless of the gender of one's spouse.

With Hawaii's historic decision probably less than two years away, some members of Congress have seized the issue by introducing a bill targeted at same-sex marriages.

The bill, entitled the Defense of Marriage Act, seeks to withhold from same-sex couples federal tax, welfare, pension, health and immigration benefits automatically provided to heterosexual couples. The bill also would grant states the authority to reject the legality of same-sex marriages performed in other states.

Despite its sponsors' rhetoric claiming protection of marriage and the family, this anti-marriage bill actually degrades the institution of marriage and harms families. In addition, the bill would allow the federal government to intrude in a sacrosanct area tradition ally left entirely to the states.

Civil marriage is the way our society defines one's most intimate, committed relationships. Marriage also identifies our partners for everything from retirement programs to the simple right to be together in crisis situations, like the hospital emergency room.

At a time when the institution of marriage seems to be falling apart, denying same-sex couples the right to marry can only continue to degrade the institution of marriage even further.

A society that automatically heaps a wealth of benefits and responsibilities upon a couple regardless of their proven commitment to each other, yet denies those same benefits and responsibilities to loving and committed partners simply based on their gender, should reassess its priorities.

States put few restrictions on heterosexuals' ability to marry. Both spouses must consent to the marriage at an age we deem them capable to consent. They must apply for a marriage license and swear they aren't married to anyone else.

Few, if any, behaviors automatically end a marriage between heterosexuals. If a man abuses his wife, he may be guilty of assault, but they still are married. Husband and wife can engage in adulterous relationships, but they remain married. A couple can wed by mail and never meet, yet they receive all the benefits and responsibilities of marriage.

On the other hand, a gay couple who have been together for 30 years, lived in the same home for 25 years, cared for each other through illnesses, comforted each other after the loss of loved ones and shared most of their lives together are denied the rights and protections that automatically attach to any heterosexual couple with a marriage license.

They remain legal strangers.

The faithful partner of 30 years has no legal right to make important medical decisions for his incapacitated partner. He gets no help from federal legislation that would protect his job in the event that he must care for his sick partner. The government denies the couple the benefit of filing a joint tax return, even though they have but one household.

Insurance companies deny them the opportunity to obtain joint policies for automobile, health and home insurance. When one of them dies, the other may have no legal right to continue living in their home. The deceased's unaccepting family members can contest a will and leave the long-term dedicated partner bankrupt and without a home. Such insensitive maneuvers aren't uncommon to gay men and lesbians grieving the loss of a lifelong partner.

Recognizing same-sex marriage as a fundamental civil right won't, as some critics claim, "contribute to the further deterioration of the family unit."

Allowing same-sex partners the means to seal their union legally only strengthens the principle that society values faithful commitment.

Denying marriage rights and responsibilities to same-sex couples isn't a protection of family values; it devalues families. Remember, gay men and lesbians already have families. Same-sex couples come from families, and many have children of their own, whether through adoption, prior marriage or artificial insemination.

The children of same-sex couples deserve the same dignity and protections we provide gender-opposite couples. A lesbian should expect to pay child support if she chooses to leave a child she has agreed to care for. Likewise, she should be able to make emergency medical decisions for the child if the natural mother isn't available. Unfortunately, the law fails to give adequate protection to the children of same-sex unions.

The merchants of virtue in Congress are busy telling us that we will usher in a period of steep moral decline if we allow same-sex marriage. We disagree.

Today, we look back to the laws forbidding interracial marriage with disbelief and remorse. But those same laws enjoyed enormous popular support at the time. Thirty years from now, we will look back to the debates in Congress concerning the Defense of Marriage Act with the same reaction.

We will lament this time when gay men, lesbians, their families and children were sacrificed for election year politics. We will regret the fact that we allowed a Congress that continually finds itself in the midst of yet another ethics scandal to define and impose its exclusive version of family values on the states and their citizens.

(Carrie Sperling is director of the North Texas region of the American Civil Liberties Union. Gary Biewenga chairs the Dallas Gay and Lesbian Alliance's Marriage Project.)

THE RIVERFRONT TIMES

1221 Locust Street, Suite 900, St. Louis, MO 63103

FAX 314-231-8674

May 22, 1996

GENERAL DISASSEMBLY (excerpts)

* Legislators retreat to their districts after the conclusion of another wearying -- and not very productive -- session
by Melinda Roth

JEFFERSON CITY -- It's 7 p.m. on Friday, an hour after the final adjournment of the 1996 General Assembly, and, as legislative tradition dictates, lobbyists, aides, and interns are making the round of offices to shake hands, pick at party food and say goodbye.

But there's little cause for celebration this year. Rep. Patrick Dougherty is sitting slumped in his office chair like a veteran victim of shell shock.

"It's been a hard year," says Dougherty, a Democrat from St. Louis, who chaired the Children, Youth, and Families committee. "My committee got the maternity bills, childhood-immunization bills, five abortion bills, domestic-violence bills, child-support bills, same-sex marriage bills, and the transsexual-bisexual-homosexual parenting thing. About the only thing that I didn't get was concealed weapons and lobbyist reform."

The hollow feeling of resignation seems widespread. On the one hand, not enough had been accomplished amidst all the fighting, debating, and

jockeying for attention. On the other hand, too much bad legislation seeped out in the final days of the session, and now lawmakers have to go home and try to look their constituents in the eye. It's been a rough session for everyone...

..."Amendments are proliferating like rats around here, complained Sen. Harold Caskey (D-Butler).

Amendments seemed to have the reproductive habits of rodents and proliferated even more successfully in the House. A ban on same-sex marriages -- first believed dead in Dougherty's committee earlier in the session, then resurrected in the Senate by Sen. Peter Kinder (R-Cape Girardeau), and then found dead again on the bottom of the House calendar -- finally made it into law on the last day, piggybacking as an amendment sponsored by Rep.

William Gratz (D-Jefferson City) onto a bill dealing with family trusts.

"There's been a large public outcry against same-sex marriages in my district," Gratz explained uneasily as Rep. Sue Shear (D-Clayton), an outspoken opponent of the measure, stood with her arms crossed tightly and stared at him fiercely as he spoke. "Well, you certainly come from a different district than mine," Shear snapped back when she reached a microphone. "Because I haven't received one single call. Not one."

The measure passed anyway and is expected to be signed by the governor. "We should be deeply ashamed of ourselves today," said Rep. Nancy Farmer (D-St. Louis).

*

COMMENTARY

By Ray Hartmann, publisher

WINNING A BATTLE BUT NOT THE WAR

* Gays get solace, not safety, from Colorado decision

It was a historic decision, a landmark decision, a great decision.

But when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Colorado's notorious Amendment 2 ban on laws protecting gays and lesbians Monday, it did not produce a peace settlement in the nation's "culture war."

Not even a cease fire.

With Reagan appointee Justice Anthony Kennedy writing the decision -- how fitting is that? -- the court put a stop to the far right's zealous campaign to make homophobia the law of the land. The justices didn't assert the rights of gays and lesbians so much as they rejected the notion of an inalienable right to discriminate against them, but it was still a big day for freedom.

"We must conclude that Amendment 2 classifies homosexuals not a further a proper legislative end but to make them unequal to everyone else. This Colorado cannot do," Kennedy wrote. "A state cannot so deem a class of persons a stranger to its laws."

This brought welcome relief to gays and lesbians in Colorado, where voters had been persuaded to pass Amendment 2 to override state policies and local ordinances in Denver, Aspen and Boulder that had the audacity to extend human-rights provisions to non-heteros. As Kennedy wrote, "It is not within our constitutional tradition to enact laws of this sort."

It is, however, part of our unconstitutional tradition to persecute people for having the "wrong" sexual orientation. And it was about to become part of our political tradition to have state after state, locality after locality, voting on just how far to go with the persecution.

Several ballot measure modeled after Amendment 2 are pending around the country, and had the Supreme Court upheld Colorado's bigotry, a whole slew of

other states (including, no doubt, Missouri) would have been right behind. Stopping this runaway train was a big deal.

Still, it should be understood that this was not some sweeping proactive victory for gays and lesbians. It didn't outlaw discrimination against them in the military, in marriage laws, in employment, in housing or in any other area.

It simply protected the *protection* of gay rights. And it didn't end the culture war.

By ruling that tyrannical majorities could not deny people the possibility of equal protection under the law, the justices removed just one lethal weapon -- homophobia-fueled referenda -- from the arsenal of the cultural warriors of the far right. This should not be mistaken for total disarmament.

And no one is surrendering.

If anything, Monday's victory for tolerance may serve to mobilize gay-bashers much the way Roe vs. Wade spurred the anti-choice movement.

Far-right politicians will have a field day beating on those commie-liberal judges who want to make a special protected class out of "those child-molesting, AIDS-spreading homos."

Never mind that the justices appointed by Presidents Reagan and Bush voted 3-to-2 in favor of protecting gays and lesbians (not to mention being joined by Justice Paul Stevens, an appointee of President Ford). This will play in the boondocks as a triumph of creeping socialism.

And it will play a lot. That's why it's critical for those of us who cherish freedom -- and it makes no difference whether we're straight or gay -- to realize that the Supreme Court decision is likely to energize those who impose their definition of morality on the rest of us. In the name of religion.

It should also be noted that this was a 6-to-3 decision of the justices -- most assuredly not unanimous -- and if the dissenting opinion of Justice Antonin Scalia (joined by Chief Justice William Rehnquist and Justice Clarence Thomas) is any indication, the whole matter has made the crazies crazier than ever.

Scalia, always good for a fun sound bite, was even more in a huff than usual, accusing the other justices of "terminal silliness." Scalia said, "I vigorously dissent" to the court "pronouncing that animosity toward homosexuality is evil."

Consider that court sanction of such animosity fell just two votes short of becoming reality.

Locally, the wisdom of the court's decision was confirmed by the reaction of local freedom fighters (pun intended). Phyllis Schlafly, president of the Eagle Forum, said, "It's a ruling that says your vote doesn't count. I think the court doesn't care what the people think."

That sentiment was echoed by Jan Klarich of the Missouri Christian Coalition, who said, "I think it's a tragedy. Apparently it doesn't pay to vote anymore if the courts can overrule the majority of the voters."

Fortunately, the ladies are right. It isn't the job of the court to worry about what the people think, especially when a majority of the people think it's OK to abrogate the rights of a minority.

If the views of the majority were all that mattered, we wouldn't need a Bill of Rights, would we?

Maybe that's not a good seed to plant with the "religious right." Consider the ominous words of Klarich, quoted in Tuesday's Post Dispatch. "This can go on for only so long before there is a grass-roots

uprising."

Yes, this is culture war. And we don't have to be gay or lesbian to be under attack.

If you care about freedom, don't think of Monday's court decision as a victory to savor. Think of it as a peace initiative, rejected by the enemy.

This is a culture war. Fight back.

FEEDBACK:

* From Chaz64@AOL.COM - Any idea how we could find out what percentage of the Colorado electorate turned out for the Amendment 2 election? Everyone keeps saying 53% of the people voted on Amendment 2 -- but it was REALLY only 53% OF THE PEOPLE WHO VOTED, which is something else entirely.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:28-MAY-1996 09:49:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I58GQR21OW013FPC@PMDf.EOP.GOV>; Tue, 28 May 1996 09:46:31 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from emout14.mail.aol.com (emout14.mx.aol.com)

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I58GUGS06400007K@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Tue, 28 May 1996 09:49:31 -0700 (MST)

Received: by emout14.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id JAA17977; Tue, 28 May 1996 09:46:15 -0400

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: jamest@usia.gov@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-JUN-1996 13:22:00.00

SUBJECT: 6_4_Yeltsin's_Comeback

TO: matsui_d (matsui_d@A1@CD) (WHO)

READ: 4-JUN-1996 14:06:10.49

TEXT:

FOREIGN MEDIA REACTION
DAILY DIGEST USIA

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND MEDIA REACTION

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, WASHINGTON, DC 20547
Branch Chief Media Reaction, (R/MR), Tele. No. (202)619-6511

Patricia McArdle,
Ann Pincus, Director

Tuesday, June 4, 1996

WILL YELTSIN'S COMEBACK GET HIM RE-ELECTED?

Following several successful recent initiatives, crowned by the Russo-Chechen ceasefire accord of May 27, President Yeltsin was widely viewed by the media overseas as "regaining the initiative" for the presidential elections June 16, perhaps even enough to edge out his principal opponent, Communist Party leader Gennady Zyuganov. Nevertheless, the uncertainty hanging over the already fraying deal with Chechen rebel leader Yandarbiyev, coupled with all the other imponderables of Russia's nascent experiment with democratic elections, left observers uneasy as to what the future holds for Russia and its ties with the international community. They were at odds over whether the West should support Mr. Yeltsin despite criticisms of anti-democratic behavior or whether failing to do so would spell a Zyuganov victory and usher in a full-blown retreat into the Communist past. Dailies in Germany and Canada warned that a Communist victory "could bury all hopes" for Russian democracy and pose "a danger to the world." Others in Russia, Italy and Argentina emphasized that Russia is now too far along the road of capitalism and political change to return to a Soviet-style dictatorship. Two Moscow columnists detected a more favorable domestic mood: Reformist Izvestia concluded, "The whole society looks better off now, as it has more chances of normal, constitutional development before and after the elections." Centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta added, "Russian society today differs from what it was in 1993. It will not let itself be dragged into a life-threatening confrontation.... (The winner's) prime task will be to seek a formula of national reconciliation and compromise."

The truce signed with the Chechen leaders, which dominated

commentary in the past two weeks, left the majority of writers convinced that, if it holds, it will greatly boost the Kremlin leader's chances of re-election. Many in the press, especially among Russia's pro-government and reformist publications, praised Mr. Yeltsin's signing of the deal as "the strongest move" in his election campaign. But, as fighting erupted again in the Caucasus, Moscow's reformist, youth Komsomolskaya Pravda echoed suspicions voiced by others: "Peace has been declared, but it is yet to come." Most analysts, in addition, were not as sanguine regarding the ceasefire's bringing an end to the war that one British pundit described as "the largest black spot" in Mr. Yeltsin's record. Liberal Asahi of Tokyo pointed to the accord's most glaring weakness: "The political question of whether Chechnya will remain within the Russian federation is unresolved."

Journalists tracing Mr. Yeltsin's improved fortunes in the campaign suggested that fear of a Communist takeover prompted his newly won endorsements from CIS leaders and, by inference, from the Chechen rebels, who presumably judged this was their best chance to secure some of their goals. In Moscow, the press divided among those praising the president's "vigor, force and confidence" while setting goals "as a statesman," those who insisted that a democratic alternative must fight on against both Mr. Yeltsin and Mr. Zyuganov, those stumping for the Communists and those disenchanted by the "lack of vision" and the dreary sameness of all the candidates.

This survey is based on 91 reports from 19 countries, May 15-June 4.

EDITOR: Mildred Sola Neely

EUROPE

RUSSIA: "Voters Have Become Smarter"

Yelena Shestopal of Moscow State University stated in reformist, youth Komsomolskaya Pravda (6/4): "Experience shows that voters have become smarter, too. They aren't easy to take in and they don't make their decisions on the basis of TV shows alone."

"Desperate Zyuganov"

According to Yevgeny Yuryev in reformist, business-oriented Kommersant Daily (6/4): "Zyuganov has clearly been losing the election campaign to Yeltsin. He is so desperate for a boost he is ready to do anything to get it. Zhirinovsky is perhaps the biggest puzzle of this election campaign. Should he pull out of the race a few days before the elections, all public-opinion schemes would collapse, as no one can tell what a move like this might lead to."

"Moscow Talks: Cover-Up For Yeltsin Trip"

Alexander Khokhlov opined on page one of Komsomolskaya Pravda (6/4): "Moscow and the Chechens continue playing cat-and-mouse. Peace has been declared, but it is yet to come and perhaps it was not supposed to, as the Yeltsin-Yandarbiyev 'talks' were merely a cover-up for secret services' operation to 'drop' President Yeltsin in Chechnya."

"Good Mark For Yeltsin"

Tatyana Malkina judged on page one of reformist Segodnya (6/1): "Obviously, Boris Yeltsin deserves a firm 'good' for his performance in this election campaign. Given his status as president and with his chief opponent doing only 'satisfactorily,' the president has every reason to feel optimistic."

"Too Much Optimism"

Segodnya (6/1) commented editorially, "The ever growing optimism the latest public opinion polls have incited among Boris Yeltsin's supporters seems excessive."

"IMF Approval: Mark of Professionalism"

Leonid Lokotkov and Viktor Ivanov, commenting on Boris Yeltsin's economic program, pointed out on page one of Kommersant Daily (6/1): "The fact that Yeltsin's economic course...has already been coordinated with the IMF, in effect, leaves a mark of professionalism on the economic and financial principles of his program. Unlike Zyuganov's declarations, they put an exact price on everything and say what Russia can afford and what it cannot afford to do now."

"Active Democratic Opposition Needed"

Alexei Arbatov of the Yabloko faction in the State Duma surmised in centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (5/31), "For Democrats, to merge with Yeltsin would mean to be smothered to death in his powerful embrace and thus yield all of the opposition ground to Communists and Nazis.... Only an active and united democratic opposition with a single leader can give society more than just a choice between two evils come June 16 and after it, keep the 'lesser evil' from becoming the 'worst.'"

"Moscow Overdoes It With Anti-American Rhetoric"

Segodnya's Vladimir Abarinov held (5/31),: "Bill Clinton clearly made concessions to Boris Yeltsin during their last summit meeting in Moscow.... Since then, Russian officials, by

contrast, have stinted no words and missed no chance to demonstrate their anti-Americanism, probably considering this an unquestionable

virtue of a patriot.... It seems that Moscow overdoes it. It was clear even in December that the public cared but little about foreign policy, and those banking on anti-Western and imperial slogans suffered a defeat."

"New Ice Age In Offing?"

Yuri Glukhov stated on page one of reformist business weekly Vek (# 21, 5/31): "Whether we want it or not, we are in for a new ice age in international relations, what with the programmed reaction of a considerable part of the world community to the possible comeback of Communists in Russia.... The Republicans and their leader Dole, eager to take over the White House, will be more than happy to see Yeltsin lose. That would mean a flop for Clinton's foreign policy, damaging his re-election chances."

"Yeltsin's Event of The Year"

Official government Rossiyskaya Gazeta (5/30) front-paged a comment by Mikhail Gurevich: "There is every reason to consider the signing of an accord on a ceasefire in Chechnya, followed by Boris Yeltsin's visit to that republic, the strongest move in his election campaign yet and a key event of this year. As a politician, Yeltsin has demonstrated his best qualities which are typical of a state figure of a presidential caliber. Those include a masterly organization of talks, an ability to conduct a dialogue with a serious opponent, civic and human boldness, and being true to one's word.... As shown by those events, the president is determined to go further, since it is clear to those directly involved and others that the documents signed are only the beginning of a difficult and long process aimed at bringing peace to Chechnya and maintaining Russia's integrity."

"Invincible Yeltsin"

Sergei Leskov said on page one of reformist Izvestia (5/30): "The president's statements are marked by vigor, force, and confidence. At one time he seemed to have lost those qualities...but then they came back with second wind. In attack, Yeltsin, for some mysterious reasons, becomes invulnerable and invincible for opponents.... As proven by the events of the last few days, the president acts as a politician and he sets goals as a statesman."

"Extraordinary, Courageous"

Teimuraz Mamaladze exulted on page one of Izvestia (5/29) in the wake of President Yeltsin's lightening visit to Chechnya: "Just like almost five years ago, this personal victory of Yeltsin is viewed--at least today--as a common victory for those who in August of 1991 pinned their hopes on the Russian president.... Its political, 'pre-June' implication recedes far into the background as one thinks of the chances we now have for peace, an end to bloodshed, and freedom from our deadly, blundering policy in the Caucasus."

"Yeltsin's trip to Chechnya has not won him the elections. Not yet. He might have scored several points, though, by swaying those disappointed with the 'post-August' Yeltsin, those caught between the threat of Communist revanche and the pitfalls of choosing the least evil. The two courageous moves--the invitation of Yandarbiyev to Moscow and Yeltsin's trip to Chechnya--hopefully, will help the undecided and disappointed make the right choice."

"Chechens: Voluntary Hostages?"

Segodnya (5/29) also front-paged a comment by Tatyana Malkina and Maria Eismont: "With Yeltsin dashing off to Grozny, the position of the Chechen delegation in Moscow looked like that of voluntary hostages."

"How Strong Is Yeltsin-Yandarbiyev Axis?"

Nikolai Kozhanov held on the front page of neo-Communist Pravda (5/29): "The separatists' main forces have been routed and their strongholds destroyed, and there's been less of an edge in the voices of their field commanders, as they sense an imminent disaster. But what will their voices sound like after they rest and gather strength, taking advantage of the ceasefire? In short, there's no telling how strong the Yeltsin-Yandarbiyev axis is and whether it will help resolve the Chechen crisis."

"Separatists: Now Or Never"

Mikhail Leontyev opined on page one of Segodnya (5/28): "For the 'separatist leadership,' the loss of Bamut became a signal--now or never. So, Yandarbiyev dashed to Moscow. They realize that the president needs concrete results before the elections, that assessing the situation in Chechnya from the outside does not give much cause for optimism in the time immediately ahead, and that now they have the last chance to get from Russia much more than they would normally get under the circumstances. Yandarbiyev came over to 'surrender' for a 'reasonable price.'"

"Whole Russian Society Looks Better Off Now"

Yury Levada of the Russian Center of Public Opinion Studies remarked in Izvestia (5/28): "The dynamics of the electoral situation are not only in that Boris Yeltsin's chances have improved. The whole society looks better off now, as it has more chances of normal, constitutional development before and after the elections."

"Candidates Lack New Foreign-Policy Ideas"

Vasily Lipitsky said in Nezavisimaya Gazeta (5/28): "The main reasons why presidential candidates evade foreign policy issues are

the lack of new ideas and the similarity of their positions. This is especially obvious when it comes to NATO's enlargement plans.... Of all international problems, that one has been handled in a most tendentious and incorrect way.... To believe our politicians and experts, the West thinks of nothing else than finally and firmly setting its foot in Eastern Europe."

"Russians Choose Non-Violence"

Nezavisimaya Gazeta (5/23) ran a piece by Mikhail Gorshkov: "Russian society today differs from what it was in 1993. It will not let itself be dragged into a life-threatening confrontation. As indicated by the results of studies, non-violence is a value which reigns supreme in the minds of the Russian people. It is perceived by society as a kind of safeguard against politicking. Whoever wins the elections must remember that. After the vote, his prime task will be to seek a formula of national reconciliation and compromise."

"Communists Underestimate Yeltsin"

Gleb Cherkasov stated on page one of Segodnya (5/21), "Masterminds behind Zyuganov's election campaign underestimated their colleagues from the Yeltsin headquarters and, above all, the potential of the president himself."

"None Of The Above?"

In the view of Natalia Konstantinova on page one of Nezavisimaya Gazeta (5/21), "Nothing of what the main contenders have said or done so far has been original enough to make any one of them look better than the others."

"Adherents Of Reform Should Not Kid Themselves"

Otto Latsis observed on page one of Izvestia (5/16), "The dollars which might be flowing into the country are flowing out. They will return if the adherents of reform win.... But what if those who are 'against everyone' carry the day? Another six months of suspended animation? Such games cannot be played with impunity.... The adherents of reform--whether they are going to vote for Yeltsin or Yavlinsky, Lebed or Fyodorov--shouldn't kid themselves. They don't have victory in the palms of their hands. Russia is passing through a dangerous stretch of its historical path, and it will have to pay dearly for any light-heartedness."

GERMANY: "A Model For Solving Chechen Conflict?"

Wolfgang Guenther Lerch observed in an editorial in right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (5/30), "Moscow wants to turn Chechnya within the Russian Federation into a republic with restricted sovereignty. The model is Tatarstan, whose population gets along

with this status pretty well. The question is whether the Chechens have a common view.... The political leadership in Tatarstan was in accord, but the Chechen leadership is probably not. Skepticism toward the latest peace hopes remains."

"I Come First, And Then Russia"

Left-of-center Frankfurter Rundschau (5/30) said in an editorial, "Boris Yeltsin has not yet furnished proof of the fact that he is serious about peace in Chechnya. What is even worse: He torpedoed this peace even before the sensitive ceasefire agreement has come into effect.... During the election campaign, one forgave Yeltsin a lot of things he did--the fear of the Communists was greater. If he is now again forfeiting the chances for a true peace for the downtrodden Chechens and refuses to accept the hand the rebels have reached out, then this czar has revealed (his true intentions): I come first, and then Russia."

"Yeltsin Possibly Forfeited What He Won Yesterday"

Regional radio station Westdeutscher Rundfunk of Cologne (5/28) aired the following commentary by Moscow correspondent Peter Josef Bock: "Yeltsin is acting like a careless gambler. With his trip to Grozny, but mainly with his speech there, he greatly jeopardized the success of his ceasefire agreement with the Chechen resistance fighters.... The rebel leaders....must now feel duped.... The speech Yeltsin delivered in Grozny must even provoke the rebels.... It is questionable whether the agreed ceasefire will hold until election day. Today, Yeltsin possibly has forfeited what he won yesterday."

"New Developments Under Old Premises"

Lothar Ruehl analyzed the Russian presidential election campaign in an editorial in right-of-center Die Welt of Berlin (5/21), "The presidential propaganda machine in Moscow is now at full steam and is overrunning everything else in the media. Boris Yeltsin is presenting one initiative after the other...but by doing so, he is now adding even more question marks to the many on the future development of Russia. What would be the policy and what would be the partner with whom the West had to deal in case Boris Yeltsin is re-elected? Will he guarantee reform and stability?...

"An even bigger question mark stands behind Yeltsin's policy of reintegrating the 'former Soviet space' in connection with his treaties in the framework of the Community of Independent States.... The answer to the political question of power will decide how 'sovereign' the states of the former Soviet Union or the 'integrated states' like Kazakhstan, Belarus and Kyrgyzstan will be.... But the momentum of reintegration pushed by the dependence on energy supplies from Russia has now been set in motion.... The preliminary conclusion regarding the developments in Russia irrespective of the outcome of the presidential elections must be: There are a lot of

new developments that take place under the old premises of Russian territorial and hegemonic thinking.

"It Is Right That The West Supports Yeltsin"

Moscow correspondent Thomas Urban filed the following editorial for centrist Sueddeutsche Zeitung of Munich (5/20), "It is right that Western politicians are pinning their hopes on Yeltsin, since Yeltsin's re-election would be the lesser evil not only for the West but also for the Russians, since the Communist Zyuganov would clearly be the greater evil. It is true that Yeltsin's re-election would not guarantee a democratic development, but the way to democracy would remain open. However, if Zyuganov wins, we could bury all hopes for a democratic development.... The return of the Communists to power would isolate Russia in the medium-term and would restore the division of Europe into two parts. And for this development, the West would have to pay a much higher price than the current support of Moscow through generous loans."

"Why Is West Supporting Yeltsin?"

National radio Deutschlandfunk of Cologne aired these views (5/17): "What is prompting the West to support Yeltsin with all available means? Is it also the fear that a Communist could enter again the Kremlin? This seems to be the case, and the West has to take on part of the responsibility. In the West, nobody looked around to find an alternative to Yeltsin, but he was courted to such a degree that he saw himself confirmed with his policy again and again, thus creating the situation in which the Communist Zyuganov could become a competitor."

BRITAIN: "Beginning Of A Compromise, Or Cynical Pre-Election Ploy?"

The independent Financial Times said in an editorial (5/29), "This week's agreement between President Boris Yeltsin and Mr. Zelimkhan Yandarbiyev, the Chechen separatist leader, has brought a badly needed ray of hope to the bloodiest of the former Soviet Union's war zones. After 17 months of unspeakable misery...both sides may have finally accepted that the war is unlikely to end in an outright military victory. However belated, an accord based on this hard reality would help to wipe out the largest black spot in the record that Mr. Yeltsin is defending in next month's elections. Whether this is really the beginning of a compromise, based on humanity and common sense, or simply a cynical pre-election ploy, remains to be seen. A trail of broken ceasefires has left most observers of the conflict justifiably skeptical."

"Peace In Our Time?"

Under the headline above, the conservative tabloid London Evening Standard judged in an editorial (5/28), "Reports that peace has

broken out in Chechnya are premature, so we hesitate to congratulate President Boris Yeltsin on his wise statesmanship.... The agreement has all the hallmarks of a patched-up deal to get Mr. Yeltsin out of a political dilemma entirely of his own making.... It is too early to put Mr. Yeltsin on the short list for this year's Nobel Peace Prize."

"Yeltsin's Political Coup In Chechnya"

The centrist Independent said in a front-page report (5/28), "It is unclear how long the proclaimed ceasefire will last, but the agreement is a political coup for the Russian president.... Both sides avoided the most difficult issue--Chechnya's demands for independence, which remain on the table."

"Chechens Would Rather See Yeltsin In Power Than Communists"

A separate item in the Independent pointed out (5/28), "Although Mr. Yeltsin is hated in much of Chechnya, the separatists' decision to talk with him now makes it clear they would rather see

him in power than the Communists, who deported the Chechen nation to central Asia in 1944. It means the Communist presidential candidate, Gennady Zyuganov, who claims to be moderate, is being held to account for the atrocities of Stalin."

"Risky Business"

An editorial in the Independent cautioned (5/28), "It is no surprise that the United States and the EU should be hoping for a Yeltsin re-election, given the repercussions throughout NATO and Eastern Europe if Zyuganov were to win.... But there are risks in this strategy. For a start, Zyuganov might still win.... But even if Yeltsin wins, the West will have tolerated and endorsed an awful lot of Russian boot stamping to make it happen."

FRANCE: "Yeltsin Does His Best To Please The World"

An editorial in economic Les Echos stressed (5/29), "With velvet gloves on in Moscow, Monday, and an iron hand in Grozny yesterday...Yeltsin did his best in two days to please the world on the question of Chechnya. He seemed less concerned about having a clear policy and more with getting over the electoral deadline (as a winner)."

"Yeltsin Significantly Increased His Chances For Re-Election"

Bernard Guetta concluded on France Inter Radio (5/28), "Yesterday, Yeltsin significantly increased his chances for re-election.... This ceasefire agreement gives him what he lacked, i.e., evidence that he is capable of making decision, of getting out of a quagmire, of governing. This will give voters reason to think that stability is better ensured with him in power rather than with a

new man."

"Chechens Bet On Yeltsin"

On RTL Radio, editorialist Marc Ullmann said (5/28), "The Chechens bet on Yeltsin."

ITALY: "Yeltsin The Wolf Won Once Again"

Giulietto Chiesa observed from Moscow in centrist La Stampa (5/29): "Russian voters will learn only two things: that Yeltsin won in Chechnya and that the terrorist Yandarbiyev surrendered, kneeling down before Moscow's czar.... The outside world, perhaps, in its heart, has a different view, but will not say it because it is inconvenient. Yeltsin the wolf won once again."

"Chechnya's Future Remains A Puzzle"

A commentary by Enrico Franceschini in left-leaning, influential La Repubblica (5/28) maintained, "It is not a real peace yet: It is only a truce, the most awaited ceasefire.... Nevertheless the step taken in the Kremlin is a great one.... The separatists obtained a lot. The recognition of their new leader Yandarbiyev as a legitimate 'president' with whom Moscow agrees to negotiate on the same footing as Yeltsin, who in the past had always rejected any proposal for direct negotiations at the level of 'heads of state.'... Chechnya's future remains a puzzle. Independent and sovereign? Associated with Russia, in a confederation with wide autonomy?"

"Yeltsin Has Built Framework For Democratic Institutions"

A front-page commentary by foreign affairs pundit Sandro Viola suggested in La Repubblica (5/25), "The truth is that...Yeltsin has built the framework for democratic institutions, the first continuity in electoral rounds (1993, 1995, 1996) that Russia had never experienced. It is necessary to reflect on this, if we want to have an idea of what is happening in the former

homeland of socialism.... This is the incontrovertible truth.... It is, however, clear we should keep our fingers crossed. First because a traumatic jolt--for example the suspension of the elections--could still take place. Secondly, because the Communists might win the elections, and that would mean the end of the reinforcing process of democratic institutions and practices.... But if these two pitfalls are avoided...Russia will take another step in its journey toward the West."

"A 'Normal' Society Emerges In Russia"

An editorial in new daily Il Foglio (5/24) suggested, "Behind the dramatic adventure of a forced march into capitalism, one sees emerging in Russia for the first time a 'normal society' that has

in common a desire for stability."

BELGIUM: "Without Compromise, There Will Be No Peace"

In independent Le Soir (5/28), Pol Mathil commented, "Mr. Yeltsin is scoring against the Communists, he is satisfying the democrats opposed to the war and he is allowing the Westerners to feel a 'cowardly relief': Until further notice, their candidate will have less blood on his hands.... Advantages are no less obvious for the independence fighters.... But they also know that this is the best--and perhaps unique--moment for discussions with Moscow and that by entering the Kremlin as free men and temporarily equal partners, they (can) receive from Moscow a legitimacy which has always been denied them....

"No miracles are to be expected. The setting up of a genuine peace process will require much time. But both sides have recognized for the first time that the principle of 'all or nothing' is unproductive.... Without compromise, there will be no peace."

"CIS Heads Support For Yeltsin A Major Trump"

Michel Rosten commented in conservative Catholic La Libre Belgique (5/18), "The support which Boris Yeltsin has just received from the CIS chiefs of state...represents for him a major trump before the final stage of the campaign."

CANADA: "Zyuganov Win: A Disaster For Russians, A Danger To The World"

International affairs columnist Marcus Gee said in the leading Toronto Globe and Mail (5/29), "Mr. Zyuganov has another, far less attractive side. To begin with, he is an open admirer of Stalin.... His economic ideas are far less benign than he lets on to the suits at Davos.... Mr. Zyuganov's economic ideas are old hat. As a former vice chairman of the party's ideology department, he is instinctively hostile to a market economy.... Among other things, Mr. Zyuganov has promised to work for the 'voluntary' rebuilding of the Soviet Union. He is not likely to succeed. The Communists could not restore the empire even if they tried. Russia is not strong enough. Nor will they be able to reimpose Communism. Things have gone too far for that. But a Zyuganov victory in the coming presidential contest would mean a weak, stagnant, pushy, stubborn and obstreperous Russia, a disaster for its citizens and a danger to the world."

NORWAY: "Real Progress In Russia"

Leading tabloid Dagbladet stressed (5/28). "The peace agreement does not touch upon Chechnya's future status, and observers doubt Yeltsin's real will for peace. However, just the fact that the people can force the president to come to his senses is real progress in Russia."

SPAIN: "Sad Precedents"

An editorial in Madrid's conservative ABC found that (5/28) "the present attempt at finding a

peaceful solution in Chechnya is saddled with several sad precedents in the refusal by the military to implement previously signed agreements.... Just now, the Russian generals deployed in Chechnya keep telling journalists about their deep skepticism regarding the credibility of the papers to be signed in the Kremlin by the two delegations which will establish the terms of the ceasefire and the reduction of armament controlled by the rebels."

"Yeltsin Regains The Initiative"

Liberal El Pais's editorial judged (5/20), "Boris Yeltsin has regained the initiative in the electoral race.... Yeltsin's undisguised support from the United States and Europe, as well as that from other former Soviet republics, is based on the fact that he is considered to be the only candidate capable of confronting Zyuganov."

"History Returning To 1917"

ABC said in an editorial (5/15), "Regarding Russian politics, history is returning to 1917: Reformers, Communists and nationalists share the crumbling electoral pie in a country which can hardly consolidate a system of Western-type freedoms amidst a brutal economic crisis."

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

JAPAN: "Russia Standing At The Crossroads Again"

Readers of economic-oriented Nihon Keizai saw this editorial (6/3), "If (Zyuganov) wins the presidential race by accepting the opinions of the extreme-left group, the future of reform in Russia will become unpredictable. The results of the coming presidential election may make Russia's four-and-a-half year efforts toward reform meaningless suffering. Despite the significance of the election, both Yeltsin and Zyuganov seem to be fighting the race without a vision.

"Although the two candidates seem to be divided on policies, the problem of most concern for Russia is its serious economic situation. In this regard, they have in fact only limited choices. Generally speaking, the speed of reform will be slowed down and government control will be tightened. There is a fear that this election may introduce an unexpectedly extreme policy change in Russia."

"If Ceasefire Fails, Russia Will Lose West's Trust"

Business-oriented Nihon Keizai's editorial maintained (5/29), "Nearly 18 months of fighting...appear to have finally come to an end with the cease-fire accord.... Last July, Russia and Chechnya agreed to a ceasefire but did not implement it. It is, therefore, difficult to predict whether the latest truce will be implemented.... Because there are hardliners within the Yeltsin administration, it is not certain that front-line commanders will follow in the direction that their president leads. Yandarbiyev's control over rebel leaders is also weak.... If the present ceasefire ends up as one more election ploy and battles break out again, Russia's leaders should understand they will lose much of the trust of the Western nations."

"Chechnya's Ultimate Destiny Still Undecided"

In the opinion of liberal Asahi (5/29), "The latest agreement cannot be regarded as a final settlement since the political question of whether Chechnya will remain within the Russian federation is unresolved.... Even with a second term, Yeltsin cannot ensure that this tragedy will not be repeated unless he is able to shed his authoritarian inclinations."

CHINA: "Peace Followed By Rumble Of Gunfire"

Kun Jiang pointed out in the official, Communist Party People's Daily Overseas (6/4), "According to the ceasefire agreement signed between the Russian government and the illegal Chechen armed forces, beginning on June 1 all military action will cease in Chechnya. However, what has accompanied the agreement is not peace but the rumble of gunfire. Even after signing the accord, hostilities continue because the root of the crisis has not been solved--the Chechen separatists' demand for independence. Although Yeltsin and Yandarbiyev have held negotiations, they have so far avoided the issue of Chechen independence. Nor does the agreement signed recently mention this most crucial issue."

"A New Blow to Peace In Chechnya"

This piece by official news agency Xinhua appeared on the front page of official, English-language China Daily (6/3), "Violence has continued in Chechnya despite a ceasefire supposedly beginning at midnight on Friday.... The fighting is a blow to Yeltsin's hopes of ending almost 18 months of fighting in Chechnya, an accomplishment that would likely boost his chances of winning the presidential election on June 16."

AUSTRALIA: "Chechnya Truce Is A Farce"

The liberal Canberra Times (6/4) said in an editorial, "The much

trumpeted 'truce' in Chechnya is a farce. It is no more than a transparent ploy to gain Russian President Boris Yeltsin a perceived advantage in his re-election campaign.... Unfortunately, the Russian media are not alone in the extraordinary and counter-productive attitudes adopted to gild the Yeltsin lily.... Clinton has fallen victim to the same malady with his comparison of the Chechen conflict to the American Civil War which sees Mr. Yeltsin in the same light as President Abraham Lincoln. Neither the press nor the president can make the Communist opposition disappear by pretending they do not claim very substantial--and perhaps majority--support among the Russian people."

SOUTH KOREA: "A Pause Before Election?"

According to pro-business Joong-Ang Ilbo (5/28), "With the ceasefire agreement signed between Russia and Chechnya, there is now a greater chance than ever to actually end the fighting. Despite this, a long way lies ahead before a full resolution of the Chechnya situation can come. Among difficult issues is Chechnya's legal status, which was not dealt with at this round of talks. It may be that the agreement does not mean much more than a mere pause before the general election."

PHILIPPINES: "Communist Victory Would Not Be That Surprising"

Former Philippine envoy to Europe J.V. Cruz predicted in the independent Manila Chronicle (5/22), "The Americans have put all their eggs in Yeltsin's basket and his defeat would be a disaster for them. But everywhere in the former Communist bloc led by the Soviet Union, the Communists have been winning elections and returning to power under different names, mostly as social democrats.... So a victory for them in Russia wouldn't be that much of a shock or surprise. But if Yeltsin wins in the end, we hope it will not have been through 'dagdag-bawas' ['add-subtract' or deliberate miscounting of votes to favor certain candidates]. This could provoke a backlash that would be most dangerous not just for Russia but for the rest of the world."

SOUTH ASIA

INDIA: "A Surreal Peace"

An editorial in the nationalist Hindustan Times insisted (5/31), "It would be naive to think that Moscow and the Chechen rebel leaders can paper over all their regional differences on the basis of a brittle ceasefire accord. The peace document signed by the two leaders has to be taken with a handful of salt, since ceasefires in war-torn Chechnya have a habit of lasting no more than a few days at a stretch.... Ever since Yeltsin's re-election

campaign got under way, he has been obsessed with correcting the biggest mistake of his presidency--the Russian invasion of Chechnya.... If the Russian military had raised glasses of vodka to the peace accord, it must have been in mock appreciation. For every time Russian field commanders had the Chechens on the run, the Kremlin had halted the fighting with a ceasefire--allowing the grateful Chechens to regroup. So it should not come as a surprise if...Yeltsin's offer of a surreal peace proves to be just that, and his olive branch catches fire in the Chechen Caucasian mountains."

"Accord Gives Both Sides Much-Needed Respite"

An editorial in the centrist Pioneer (5/30) said, "Yeltsin has signed similar accords in the past, particularly with regard to Chechnya. Those accords did not quite take off the ground. This one too seems to be similarly destined. By all accounts, it is a modest accord, reflecting the limited political intent. It will give both the sides a much needed respite.... Yeltsin gets to look temporarily the victor, having got the problem, yet again, out of the way for the moment. There is one difference this time around, however, and this is crucial. This time, if the accord backfires, Yeltsin cannot instruct anybody else to carry the can, as has been his habit. It will be too late for that."

"CIS Leaders Threw Propriety To The Winds In Endorsing Yeltsin"

The "Global Watch" column in the pro-economic reforms Economic Times by pundit K. Subrahmanyam stressed (5/22), "Leaders of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)...threw all propriety to the winds in endorsing Yeltsin's candidature. It is a clear indication to the outside world of how far the other CIS republics depend on Russia, and their perceived stakes in the elections.... By extending their support openly to President Yeltsin, the CIS leaders are legitimizing a future Russian support to particular candidates in elections in their own country.... Whoever wins the Russian presidential elections, economic and security interests will firmly tie the CIS states with Russia.... As NATO tries to advance eastward, the Russian population will become increasingly sensitive to accommodating the CIS states into closer relationship with themselves. That is likely to be reflected in the forthcoming elections."

NEPAL: "Pact Will Hold Till Elections"

According to the government-owned Rising Nepal (5/31), "Unlike earlier attempts that failed, there are indications that the peace pact, touted by President Yeltsin as 'historic,' will hold, at least until the forthcoming Russian presidential polls are over."

PAKISTAN: "Beware Of Postponing Elections"

This op-ed by M.B. Naqvi in Karachi's independent Dawn (5/30) held, "Mr. Yeltsin seems to be toying with the idea of postponing the election. But if he does so, the forces that are propelling Mr.

Zyuganov would become very angry and a reaction is sure to follow. How severe it can be is anyone's guess. Thanks to too many contradictions and problems in the Russian body politic, such reaction can easily result in conflicts and possible civil war."

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA: "Yeltsin's Defeat Does Not Mean Communism Will Return"

Jorge Castro, assistant editor-in-chief of business/financial El Cronista, maintained (5/27), Yeltsin plays the cards of fear of Communism. But five years after the disintegration of the Soviet Union...what is at stake is his immensely unpopular government.... Russia is now a strong and vigorous capitalist society. But corrupt, violent and grossly unfair.... If there is a country where Communism has died, it is Russia. History is an unending creator of what is new. There are no restorations."

BRAZIL: "This Truce Has More Of A Chance"

An editorial in center-right O Estado de Sao Paulo (05/30) maintained, "There are two basic issues: one military, in the short term, dealing with the possibilities of the announced truce, and the other political, far more profound, dealing with a final constitution for the republic, acceptable to both sides. The truce just announced has much more chances of working than the ceasefire declared unilaterally by President Yeltsin in March, which failed immediately....

"The success of separatist Chechnya could unleash centrifugal forces with great potential damage to the Russia Federation. On the other hand, the devastation caused by Russian forces only aggravated the historical resentment of the republic against Moscow's rule. Military and political factors cause us to believe [more] in the viability of a cease-fire. A lasting political solution is too far in the horizon."

##

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 4-JUN-1996 13:24:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I5IGAS77KW011GLZ@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for
matsui_d@a1.eop.gov; Tue, 04 Jun 1996 13:21:35 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from usia.gov (XGATE.USIA.GOV) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879)

id <01I5IGE3TGO000007K@STORM.EOP.GOV> for matsui_d@a1.eop.gov; Tue,
04 Jun 1996 13:24:23 -0700 (MST)
Received: from Connect2 Message Router by usia.gov via Connect2-SMTP 4.00; Tue,
04 Jun 1996 13:24:06 -0400
Organization: USIA
X-Mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.00 MHS to SMTP Gateway
===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (ALL-IN-1 MAIL)

CREATOR: Joe Trahern (TRAHERN_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1996 15:16:57.40

SUBJECT: DAILY

TO: Gordon Li (LI_G) (WHO)

READ:17-JUN-1996 15:27:19.40

TEXT:
attached

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:17-JUN-1996 15:15:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:p

ATT CREATOR: Joe Trahern

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
Bob Dole

Dole predicted today that the GOP dispute over anti

-choice
language in the GOP presidential platform would be resolved soon.
"Piece of cake," Dole told reporters on his plane as he headed to
California for a three

-day campaign swing. Dole said he would
meet with Henry Hyde to iron out their differences, saying "I
know the press will be unhappy but we'll work it out."

Missouri

The First Lady was in Kansas City, MO on Friday, June 14.
She attended a children's conference titled "Youth Talk: A City
Listens to Children" sponsored by the United Way and Kansas City
Mayor Emmanuel Cleaver and a luncheon with community leaders.
The trip received moderate but positive coverage.

At the conference, which lasted over two hours, the First
Lady and Mayor Cleaver discussed drugs, violence, education,
jobs, health care and other subjects with nine area youth. The
First Lady said "children need us -- they are not rugged
individualists. Even good parents need all of the help we can
give them." Discussing the harmful effects of racism and
classism on young people, she said "you don't have to like
everybody -- I don't like everybody. And believe it or not, not
everybody likes me but we all should respect everyone's feelings
and opinions." Mrs. Clinton lauded the Partnership for
Children's "No. 1 Question project," which encourages employers,
groups, churches, schools and government to always ask whether

the changes they consider are good for children. She said: "If we did that, I think we would find ourselves making some very different decisions." When the forum was over, the First Lady chatted with each of the nine participants. One said the First Lady "wished me good luck and told me I had a lot of potential. She is a very famous person so I was like, 'Wow.'"

Iowa

The Iowa Republican Party held its convention this weekend, passing a very conservative platform and voting for an equally conservative slate of delegates to attend the national convention. The platform mentions the party's opposition to abortion in almost a dozen different sections. All 25 of the delegates selected yesterday are abortion opponents and pledged to oppose altering the platform's anti

-choice plank. Those who declined to sign the pledge found themselves relegated to the sidelines. For example, Rep. Tom Latham (R) and Darrell Kearney, who ran Dole's caucus campaign, refused to sign the pledge and will attend only as alternates. The only setback for the party's right wing was the failure of Ione Dilley, the head of the

state's Christian Coalition, to win a spot on the Republican National Committee. In her speech to the group Dilley said this year's election was "a war of values between Republicans and Democrats. This is in reality a fight between freedom and socialism."

Alan Keyes, the keynote speaker, warned against changes in the anti

-choice GOP platform plank, saying "if you want to be a fiscal conservative, you've got to be a social conservative. We are one party." Governor Terry Branstad's (R) take on the event was "the conventions have gotten more conservative. The country club set doesn't have the clout it once had." He said the conservative tenor of the convention was due to the months GOP presidential candidates spent organizing among the party's right wing, with the delegates to this weekend's convention being selected at the caucuses in February.

Ohio

Governor George Voinovich (R) has come under increasing pressure in recent weeks for his decision to use up to \$20,000 in taxpayer dollars to fight the \$1,500 fine levied against him by the FAA for violating a no

-fly order during a trip the President made to the state last year. Bowing to that pressure, Voinovich has announced that he plans to use only private money for the challenge. In a statement, Voinovich said that "while I continue to believe that [the airport] was closed by mistake, I understand the concern of using taxpayer dollars to defend this case."

Wisconsin

The Wisconsin Democratic Party held its convention this

weekend. Secretary Shalala was the keynote speaker and was well

-received. Senator Herb Kohl (D) told the convention that "we stand for the solid center that works hard every day." One of the convention's platform resolutions opposes Governor Tommy Thompson's (R) "W

-2" welfare reform program and calls on the Administration to reject the state's request for waivers, saying "W

-2 does not provide an adequate safety net for the most vulnerable members of our community." For his part, Senator Kohl told reporters after his address that he hopes the Administration and Governor Thompson can reach agreement on the waivers, saying "if either party wants to make this a political football, then it's not going to get done."

Other platform resolutions oppose parental and spousal consent and notification restrictions on abortion, oppose block granting of welfare, oppose repeal of the Earned Income Tax Credit, support raising the minimum wage to \$7.25 by the year 2000, support single

-payer universal health coverage and condemn

the U.S. Senate and Kenneth Starr for their handling of the Whitewater investigation.

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: uucp@Whitehouse.GOV@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JUN-1996 22:31:00.00

SUBJECT: scanner results

TO: binns_m (binns_m@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:24-JUN-1996 06:55:21.58

TO: horn_s (horn_s@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:
SCANNER RESULTS

your lovely wife Hillary by leading her to the example of The Virgin Mary - Resurrect your presidency! Jesus and Mary! Not, Adam and Eve! Even if you do not understand, just be obedient to the commandment "Thy shalt not kill". Jesus and Mary were always obedient to "The Will of The Father" - that is where

MESSAGE BODY

From nobody@Whitehouse.GOV Fri Jun 21 22:32:13 1996
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by WhiteHouse.gov (8.7.1/uucp-relay) id WAA01672 for <President@WhiteHouse.GOV>; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:32:13 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from storm.eop.gov/198.137.241.51 via smap
Received: from DIRECTORY-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I66QIIPVKW000J83@STORM.EOP.GOV> for President@WhiteHouse.GOV; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:33:09 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SCAN-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I66QIHGV7K000J82@STORM.EOP.GOV> for president@Whitehouse.GOV; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:33:07 -0700 (MST)
Received: from www2.whitehouse.gov by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I66QGUYBS00007Z@STORM.EOP.GOV> for president@Whitehouse.GOV; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:31:48 -0700 (MST)
Received: by www2.whitehouse.gov (951211.SGI.8.6.12.PATCH1042/940406.SGI.AUTO) for president@whitehouse.gov id WAA10493; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:30:52 -0400
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:30:52 -0400
From: "Dr. Robert J. Mannix" <@none>
Subject: Inbound-White_House_WWW_MAIL => PRESIDENT
Apparently-to: president@Whitehouse.GOV
To: president@Whitehouse.GOV
Errors-to: The Postmaster <postmaster@Whitehouse.GOV>
Reply-to: "Dr. Robert J. Mannix" <@none>
Message-id: <199606220230.WAA10493@www2.whitehouse.gov>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Keywords: WWW-Correspondence; ; Register disagreement with a position; No

Answer; Private Citizen;
Comments: Forwarded from White House WWW
Comments: This message scanned by SCAN version 0.1 jms/960226

[Connection Information]

CLIENT: unknown1.pci.pitt.edu[136.142.110.250]
BROWSER: Mozilla/1.0N (Windows)
URL: http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/Mail/html/Mail_President.html

[Sender Information]

PERSONAL-NAME: Dr. Robert J. Mannix
EMAIL-ADDRESS: @none
ORGANIZATION:
RELATIONSHIP:
STREET-ADDRESS: 108 North Woodland Road
CITY: Pittsburgh
STATE-PROVINCE: PA
ZIP-CODE: 15232
COUNTRY: USA

[Message Information]

PURPOSE: Register disagreement with a position
TOPIC: No Answer
AFFILIATION: Private Citizen
SUBJECT: Condemn your veto of "Partial Birth Abortion Ban"

[Message]

You may hope that Catholics do not FOLLOW Pope John Paul II and the 8 U.S. Cardinals in their opposition to you pro-abortion actions; however, I hope that all Catholics FOLLOW their beloved leaders with so much devotion that they find themselves LEADING THEIR LEADERS in opposition to your barbaric action. Please wake up Mr. President, you are clearly the worst president in American history. I can not recall any action, by any president, as morally wrong as your veto! You are a good man who sent a monthly donation to Rev. Billy Grahmm. What happened to you? You kindly paid for the good preaching of Rev. Grahmm, why don't you listen to him? Your actions show that you follow socialism. The nazis and communists were socialists, now the Democrates have taken up the cause. The fruit of nazi socialism was

the holocaust. Communist socialism lead to the "utopia of radioactive Chernobal". The fruit of Democratic socialistic utopia is - abortion on demand. Hillary seems to have socialistic views, have you abandoned morality to gain the favor of a confused woman? Adam did the same thing to please Eve. It is sad to behold this Adam and Eve Presidency - the downfall of America will surly follow! Follow Jesus and help your lovely wife Hillary by leading her to the example of The

Virgin Mary - Resurrect your presidency! Jesus and Mary! Not, Adam and Eve! Even if you do not understand, just be obedient to the commandment "Thy shalt not kill". Jesus and Mary were always obedient to "The Will of The Father" - that is where Christianity starts! I want history to remember you and Hillary as the best, not the worst.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:21-JUN-1996 22:33:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I66QFOX0S0001WL2@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Fri,
21 Jun 1996 22:30:52 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from whitehouse.gov (whitehouse.gov)
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I66QIYCRUU00007Z@STORM.EOP.GOV>;
Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:33:30 -0700 (MST)
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by WhiteHouse.gov (8.7.1/uucp-relay)
id WAA01696; Fri, 21 Jun 1996 22:32:25 -0400 (EDT)
===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: jamest@usia.gov@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-JUL-1996 13:30:00.00

SUBJECT: 7_1_Run_Off_In_Russia

TO: matsui_d (matsui_d@A1@CD) (WHO)

READ: 1-JUL-1996 13:40:44.22

TEXT:

FOREIGN MEDIA REACTION
DAILY DIGEST USIA

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND MEDIA REACTION

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, WASHINGTON, DC 20547
Branch Chief Media Reaction, (R/MR), Tele. No. (202)619-6511 Ann Pincus, Director

Patricia McArdle,

Monday, July 1, 1996

RUN-OFF IN RUSSIA: 'UNCERTAINTY' REIGNS

Relief among media watchers overseas regarding President Yeltsin's rising electoral fortunes as the July 3 run-off nears was shadowed by new concerns over his health and uncertainty as to what a Yeltsin victory might bring to Russia. Uppermost in commentators' minds were the possibility that the Communists would eke out a win and the role that Mr. Yeltsin's new right-hand man, Alexander Lebed, would play if there is a second Yeltsin administration.

ZYUGANOV'S CHANCES--Although still wary that the Communist candidate, Gennadi Zyuganov, might pull together enough votes to surge ahead of Mr. Yeltsin, the majority of observers judged that Mr. Yeltsin would win if there is a large turnout of voters. They pointed to Mr. Zyuganov's proposal for a coalition government if he is elected and his "sleep-inducing" campaign as indications that he knows he will lose. In Moscow, neo-Communist Pravda fed this assumption with a story detailing how "big money" and Western financial institutions are propelling Mr. Yeltsin to victory.

LEBED'S FUTURE--Assessments of the former general were often positive, particularly following the June 20 firing of three hardliners in the Kremlin and the subsequent sacking of several Russian army generals. This "velvet coup" reassured many journalists that pro-democratic reformers now have the upper hand in the government and prompted others to predict that Mr. Yeltsin's re-election chances were now vastly improved. Brussels's independent Le Soir maintained that "the conditions required for the genuine democratization of the regime are finally met," while economic Les Echos of Paris said, in a pointed endorsement of Mr.

Yeltsin, that "the choice which voters are facing in the second round of the elections is absolutely clear." Mr. Lebed's now legendary zeal for "law and order," however, worried writers who feared he may prove a double-edged sword for Russian democracy. Commentary focusing on his less desirable traits variously referred to him as a "robocop," the "exterminator" and the new "strongman" of Russian politics. Recalling the sad history of Russian soldiers who have "sought the Kremlin scepter," London's conservative Daily Telegraph dismissed Mr. Lebed as "the Ross Perot of Russian politics: He can pronounce with passion on what is wrong with the way things are, but shows little sign of knowing how to put them right." In Moscow, reformist dailies noted the Russian army's "shock" and "anxiety" following the sackings. Even official government Rossiyskaya Gazeta sounded a warning about Mr. Lebed's housecleaning: "Going further down this road, encouraging emergency measures, even if dictated by noble, supreme state interests, society may soon after the elections find the constitution replaced with the law of 'revolutionary expedience.'"

YELTSIN'S TASK--Media voices agreed that Mr. Yeltsin, if he is re-elected, must move ahead with democratic and economic reforms that have languished in the past year. Alexei Arbatov, member of the pro-reform Yabloko faction, concluded in Moscow's centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta, "If Yeltsin should win on July 3rd, our strategic task would be to keep him from sliding down into authoritarian rule."

This survey is based on 80 reports from 28 countries, June 20-July 1.

EDITOR: Mildred Sola Neely

EUROPE

RUSSIA: "Zyuganov's Opponents Relax Early"

Reformist, business-oriented Kommersant Daily (6/29) pointed out in a comment by Vladimir Lapkin and Vladimir Pantin: "In the final analysis, the outcome of the run-off vote hangs on the turnout of Zyuganov's opponents. There's a quality of being relaxed about them after the first round and major reshuffles (in the Kremlin) that followed it."

"Stop Yeltsin From Waxing Authoritarian"

Alexei Arbatov, deputy chairman of the Duma defense committee and member of the Yabloko faction, concluded in centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (6/29): "If Yeltsin should win on July 3rd, our strategic task would be to keep him from sliding down into authoritarian rule, putting him on a democratic road instead, but failing that, we would have to try to oust the Communists as the alternative to the ruling regime."

"The Kingmaker"

Lev Gudkov of the all-Russia Center for Public Opinion Studies said in reformist Segodnya (6/29): "Recruiting Alexander Lebed and his latest actions which have knocked the public off its feet may prove a key factor for Boris Yeltsin in the vote.... In a strict sense, Lebed's success is a backlash of the democrats' defeat, a setback for political modernization or...civic civilization in Russia. It is not only his coming in third in the poll but also a rapid rise in all sort of positive expectations regarding him as a national leader, imparting to him a host of virtues and giving him the halo of a legendary warrior, if not a savior of the Fatherland, who has come to bring in order."

"'Revolutionary Expedience' May Prevail"

Official government Rossiyskaya Gazeta (6/29) cautioned in a comment by Tamara Zamyatina: "Clearly, with Alexander Lebed riding the wave of popularity, the public welcomes his every move, no matter how rough. But going further down this road, encouraging emergency measures, even if dictated by noble, supreme state interests, society may soon after the elections find the constitution replaced with the law of 'revolutionary expedience.'"

"Zyuganov Prepares His Voters For Defeat"

Gleb Cherkasov wrote on page one of reformist Segodnya (6/27): "It looks as if Zyuganov has decided to prepare his voters for an imminent defeat.... The Communist leader is out to peg his opponent as a cause of all errors and crimes of the Soviet regime. The way the Communists have been acting of late leads many observers to call their behavior hysterical."

"Dialogue With Opposition Needed"

Lilia Shevtsova held on page one of centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (6/27): "The president can only win if he gives up anti-communist rhetoric and tries to become a guarantor of social peace. Incidentally, that is the role on which Lebed has set his sights, too. Meeting with Zyuganov and starting a constructive dialogue with the opposition on this country's future would be a sign of Yeltsin's strength, not weakness. He will have to do this anyhow. It is better that he should take the initiative now and begin forming a new social basis of the future regime."

"Big Money Stands Behind Yeltsin"

Neo-Communist Pravda (6/27) published this by Viktor Trushkov: "Voting for Yeltsin, palpably and weightily, was money big enough to keep the masses (of people) in a state of permanent ideological intoxication, on the one side, and buy off votes, on the other. Money has proved the

only reliable instrument in the Yeltsin election campaign.... The personified symbols of big money...have been acting, both for the

West and Russia, as signs of the Kremlin's willingness to submit to the diktat of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and other overseas 'directors.'"

"Army Concerned Over Mass-Scale Sackings"

Reformist, business-oriented Kommersant Daily (6/26) said in a comment by Ilya Bulavinov: "It was clear that Grachev's departure would usher in a new era in the army. But it was hard to imagine the old one being shut down so violently.... Yeltsin's order shocked the Defense Ministry and the army's General Staff. If Grachev left without anybody so much as batting an eye, the lightning-swift sacking of a whole group of generals, including those directly responsible for troop control, has caused anxiety in the army as well as in the top command."

"It Sounds Like Old Joke"

Lev Bruni remarked on page one of reformist Segodnya (6/26): "The persistence with which Gennady Zyuganov has been trying to recruit politicians into his 'popular-trust government' and the way they decline this dubious honor remind one of the old Jewish joke about a mother claiming that getting her daughter married to the Duke of Edinburgh is an easy matter, since her daughter's consent has already been secured."

"Reform Wins Votes"

Mikhail Leontyev remarked on page one of reformist Segodnya (6/25): "It is worth noting that real reform, no matter how shaky or questionable socially, is finding popular support."

"Lebed Is Only Hope"

Roman Stoyanov held in centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (6/25): "So far, Lebed has been the only bold figure in the public eye, and the only hope for change.... He is sensitive to public views and readily responds to them, whether they agree with his own or not. He is bold, indeed, but not in the sense that he might want victory in the protracted (Chechen) war immediately and at any cost. He can be counted upon to make sure that any decision, once made, is implemented quickly and consistently.... If Lebed is sincere in his desire to end the war in Chechnya, he must start a 'war' in Moscow. To win it, the general might need powers so extensive that the whole thing might look like a transition of power. If this does not happen, Lebed, sooner or later, will be blamed for a failed settlement process and share General Rutskoi's fate."

"Army, Crime Are Top Priorities"

Marietta Chudakova, a member of the Presidential Council, pointed out in reformist Izvestia (6/25): "Society expects the new Security Council secretary to make efforts in two huge areas--army reform and combatting crime and corruption. It is vital that he should

not meddle in the economy, as any violent action in this sphere may have unpredictable consequences and is fraught with new chaos."

"Responsible, Sensible Voters"

Alexander Golz commented in centrist, army Krasnaya Zvezda (6/22) on the results of the first round of the presidential elections:

"By and large, Russians have proved responsible and sensible voters. So all they need is a chance to make a choice peacefully and calmly."

"Murky Business"

Viktor Sokirko said on page one of reformist, youth Komsomolskaya Pravda (6/22): "Now that

some of the dust has settled, the epic style of the story of a red-haired knight overpowering a three-headed dragon sounds, mildly speaking, grossly exaggerated. General Lebed's remark 'a murky business' fits in here far better."

"Yeltsin Confident He Can Be In Control"

Veronika Kutsillo concluded in reformist, business-oriented Kommersant Daily (6/22): "By sacking the 'troika,' Yeltsin showed that he is so confident of his being firmly in control that he can safely part with the 'power' ministers."

"'Old' Russia, 'New' Russia"

Reformist Izvestia (6/21) front-paged a comment by Otto Latsis: "This is a standoff not between Korzhakov and Lebed or Chubais and not even between Yeltsin and Zyuganov. It is a standoff between 'old and new ideas,' old Russia and new Russia."

"Russia Wins"

Vitaly Tretyakov, editor of centrist Nezavisimaya Gazeta (6/21), stated: "Clearly, Russia won a victory on the night of June 19, no matter how selfish and corporate the interests of those behind it. In this particular case, they coincided with national interests, since the winners are opposed to risking a civil war. Such a war would have been unavoidable, since no dictatorship can last longer than three days in Russia."

"It is good to have Lebed. It is great. So far, he is none the worse even for his army uniform. But why not have the civilian Yavlinsky with his seven percent of the vote, as well? This way, a return to two or 20 years ago would be absolutely impossible."

GERMANY: "Yeltsin Does Not Show Any Mercy"

Werner Adam judged in an editorial in right-of-center Frankfurter

Allgemeine (6/26), "Lebed is now reshuffling not only the general staff, but he is also removing close advisors to the president from the powerful Security Council. But this is not enough; Yeltsin has now taken away the hopes of the reformers who surround him to stay...by saying that he wants a new team that will show consideration for the vote of the electorate.'

"It is not yet clear what this vote will look like even though the Communists seem to have given up the race. Not even Lebed can be certain of his position. And the most loyal of his vassals only recently had to feel what Yeltsin thinks of loyalty: If the problem is power, Yeltsin does not show any mercy."

"Seven With One Blow"

Centrist Neue Osnabruecker Zeitung pointed out in an editorial (6/26), "Seven at one blow--such kind of mass dismissals...only took place during political coups. Yeltsin's rigorous moves are highlighting the quickly changing power balances in this powerful CIS republic. First, it confirms the rapidly increasing influence of the new security advisor Lebed, whose opponents have now been deprived of their influence by this wave of dismissals. Second, the president will profit from this in the election campaign, because the previous military leadership was completely discredited among the people because of its war in Chechnya. The announcement of a partial withdrawal fits the picture. The voters should get the impression that an end to the bloodshed is near. There is no doubt: The president is fighting for every vote--with all available means."

"Zyuganov Driven To The Wall"

Jens Hartmann judged in an editorial on the front-page of right-of-center Die Welt of Berlin (6/25), "Communist leader Zyuganov feels driven to the wall. For the time being, he is pinning his hopes on the Russian proverb: Hope dies last. He can hope for a low voter turnout, possibly some votes from ultranationalist Zhirinovsky, and he can hope that some Lebed voters do not stick to the recommendation of the ex-general."

"Greetings From Machiavelli"

National radio Deutschlandfunk of Cologne aired this commentary (6/20): "For the second time, the cunning Yeltsin has taken the wind out of the sails of the Communists. And the reform democrats are also satisfied. But the Russian president has shown how even a long, joint political career and personal friendship will not protect anybody from a sudden withdrawal of support.... Greetings from Machiavelli: Kingmaker Lebed would be well advised to include this characteristic of Yeltsin in his calculations."

BRITAIN: "General Uncertainty"

The weekly independent Economist remarked in an editorial (6/28): "The omens now favor Boris Yeltsin in his bid to be re-elected president of Russia. That is good. It is vital for Russia that the incumbent, erratic and flawed as he is, sees off the Communists' dangerous Gennady Zyuganov in the run-off on July 3rd. But that is still not certain and, since the first round on June 16th, the picture has in some respects become less clear. There have been painful reminders that Russia is still unstable. Indeed, although the first ballot went off relatively hitch-free, the subsequent ructions in the Kremlin suggest that democracy in Russia is far from safe....

"Mr. Lebed's presence on the Yeltsin team should strengthen the president's chances in the election. Thereafter the Lebed effect is harder to predict.... If Mr. Yeltsin wins, he has two main tasks. The first is to keep Russia on the road to economic reform. The second is to establish a broad civil society. This means nourishing the sorts of institutions that are taken for granted in the West: an independent judiciary, a free parliament and press, and a public service in which power and promotion do not rest wholly in the hands of politicians.... In a stable democracy, it should not be necessary for...a recently retired general, especially one who showed scant respect in uniform for the idea of political control over the army, be the arbiter of the country's democratic future.

"In other words, Mr. Yeltsin would be foolish to put too much faith in Mr. Lebed, or to give him too much power."

"Lebed--The Ross Perot Of Russian Politics"

Writing in the conservative Daily Telegraph, same paper, deputy editor of the conservative weekly Spectator Anne McElvoy commented (6/24): "As far as the West is concerned, General Lebed's outstanding quality is that he is neither Mr. Zhirinovsky nor Mr. Zyuganov.... But the prospect of a general in de facto charge of the power ministries--state security, defense and interior--and openly lined up by Mr. Yeltsin as his millennial successor, leaves me with a sense of unease. The odds are firmly against this marriage of the military and politics being a success--or even a lasting one. Russian history, from the Decembrists onwards, is littered with the corpses, literal and figurative, of soldiers who have sought the Kremlin scepter....

"General Lebed is the Ross Perot of Russian politics: He can pronounce with passion on what is wrong with the way things are, but shows little sign of knowing how to put them right. Running a vast modern state in transition demands qualities of intellectual flexibility and transparency which the Motherland's men in uniform traditionally lack. The real enemies of

reform in Russia are weak civic structures and primitive ideas of what constitutes legality and financial probity. Something more secure and reliable may yet take root, but it will do so by slow degrees--not at the barking command of even the most dashing of soldiers."

"Way Cleared For A Series Of Positive Developments"

In the editorial view of the independent Financial Times (6/21), "The impact of General Alexander Lebed on the highest ranks of Russia's mysterious power structure has been even swifter than anybody expected. Within a couple of days of his appointment as head of the Security Council, the balance of power in the Kremlin has tilted. The advantage has gone--for the moment at least-- to the liberal camp.... In the short term, the way has been cleared for a series of positive developments....

"But his current alignment with those forces in Russian politics that are attractive to Westerners does not guarantee he himself will prove a friend of the West.... His outbursts in Moldova not only suggest a preference for brute force over legal niceties but also a troubling lack of sophistication--and hence, perhaps, a vulnerability to nationalist ideologues who are more devious than he is. While the angels may, for now, have won the war for Mr. Yeltsin's soul, the battle for General Lebed's may only now be starting."

"Skies Have Lightened This Week In The East"

The conservative Times commented in an editorial (6/21): "The result is no less dramatic for being played down. Mr. Yeltsin, so often indecisive, has broken the last links with reaction. If he wins, it will now be at the head of a new and much more solidly reformist team. The choice is now crystalline--and that should encourage the high turn-out that Mr Yeltsin needs to win. The battle to modernize Russia may only then enter its decisive phase; this campaign has revealed entrenched opposition throughout the governing machine and diehards hold the balance in the Russian parliament. But for the West and above all for Russia itself, the skies have lightened this week in the East."

"Yeltsin Casts Out His Rasputin"

The centrist Independent said under the headline above in a splash front-page report (6/21): "Yeltsin... finally opted to support the democrats in his entourage after a power struggle that briefly threatened to disrupt Russia's presidential elections. He finally sacrificed three of his cronies, whose presence in the Kremlin had raised serious doubts about his commitment to democracy.... The arrival in the Kremlin of the gravel-voiced retired soldier (General Lebed), like some sort of avenging Robocop, is critical to yesterday's events....

"The key question now is whether the episode harms Mr. Yeltsin, as he prepares for the July 3 run-off, or helps him. His campaign message is that he represents stability and normality. Such upheavals create the opposite impression."

FRANCE: "Thin Dose Of Democracy"

Editorialist Jacques Amalric said in influential Liberation (6/21): "No one will miss these (dismissed men). But the fact that this might be a show of strength (by Yeltsin and Lebed) in between the two rounds of the election reflects how fragile democracy still is in Russian society."

"Choice Is Now Clear"

Economic Les Echos concluded (6/21): "The reformers, who were sacrificed in the wake of the December 1995 Communist victory, are happy. Now, the choice which voters are facing in the second round of the elections is absolutely clear."

ITALY: "Russia At Risk Without Yeltsin"

Left-leaning, influential La Repubblica commented (7/1), "When many fears and uncertainties seemed dispelled, speculation on Yeltsin's health has again made Russia's political prospects shaky.... Yeltsin's victory in the run-off election was no longer in question....rumors of his deteriorating health may destroy this reassuring scenario.... Of course, Yeltsin may again surprise us with a quick recovery. But let's try to imagine what would happen if his illness were confirmed.... First, the agreement among the democrats would go to pieces...opening the path to predictable attempts to dismantle the embryo of democracy now existing in Russia.... Without Yeltsin, it is presumable that all economic and financial relations between Russia and the West, which are so necessary to the recovery of the Russian economy, would come to a standstill. The presence of General Lebed in the Kremlin in case Yeltsin were compelled to retire...might mark the beginning of a Russian 'Bonapartist' development...with the Russian armed forces frustrated and seriously divided...thus, creating a serious risk of military coups and counter-coups.... These scenarios are so gloomy that we can only hope they are disproved in a few hours.... But Yeltsin's illness--mild or serious--of the past few days reminds us that a Communist comeback, however frightening, is not the only danger threatening Russia.... The process to which we looked with wonder and admiration in the past couple of years--the birth of a democratic life for the first time in Russia--is far from consolidated. And without Yeltsin, it would reveal its precariousness."

"Purge Of Hawks And Generals Is Good News"

An editorial in left-leaning, influential La Repubblica (6/26) held: "The purge which has decapitated the leadership of the

Russian armed forces was decided by Boris Yeltsin, just as Yeltsin was the one who removed other important members of his cabinet over the last few days. But the coincidence of the arrival of Lebed and the departure of the 'hawks' is too obvious to be an accident. The new 'strongman' at the Kremlin asked of the president, and obtained, some house cleaning: in exchange for that, he promises to bring him the 11 million votes of his supporters in the runoff election.... The purge of 'hawks' and generals is good news. It means the departure of those who believed in democracy least, those responsible for the secret plots and massacres of the last few years, those whom Yeltsin would have needed in order to declare the elections void and attempt a solution by force. Their dismissal is the evidence that the outcome of the Russian presidential elections will be decided by the popular vote, not by tanks or the secret services."

"Enter The Exterminator"

Paolo Garimberti filed from Moscow in left-leaning, influential La Repubblica (6/21): "Yeltsin continues to repeat that his Russia should be a 'normal country,' like those of the G-7 group.... But Russia is not a normal country yet, and perhaps will not be for a long time.... Like a Siberian bear, Boris Yeltsin has shown once again that he has an extraordinary instinct for survival which can save him in the most critical times.... Lebed is the 'exterminator' Yeltsin needed in order to break the stranglehold which might have suffocated him.... But Lebed is 46 and enjoys excellent health; Yeltsin is 64 and his health is precarious. The political future of this odd alliance may be decided by medical records rather than by ballots."

BELGIUM: "Lebed: Giving Americans 'The Creeps'"

Freddy De Pauw asserted in independent Catholic De Standaard (7/1), "Many world leaders frowned at their summit in Lyon when the news from Moscow reached them. President Boris Yeltsin's 'fatigue' a few days before the decisive round in the presidential elections has sparked many questions about his health. The behavior of 'strongman' Lebed--who presents himself as Russia's next president--is all the more alarming.... 'Strongmen' often tend to be unpredictable. Their populism is often not the same as democracy--frequently, it is quite the opposite. Lebed gave the Americans the creeps last week with his statement that 'foreign religions'--like the

Mormon religion--do not belong in Russia.... The former general does not intend to work in Yeltsin's shadow. Today, he is insisting that the function of vice president be reintroduced, adding that he does not necessarily have to get that function. Nevertheless, his ambition to succeed Yeltsin is very clear."

"Zyuganov's Admission Of Powerlessness"

Independent Le Soir (6/25) suggested that the Communist leader's

proposal for a coalition government if he is elected amounts to "an admission of powerlessness before the second round." The paper's Moscow correspondent Pierre Celerier commented that Zyuganov "pretends to ignore the meaning of any presidential election which is to choose between two contenders."

"Everything Is Possible In Russia"

Again in independent Le Soir (6/25), Pol Mathil concluded, "The Communists will probably not win, but in a democracy, everything is possible.... Especially in Russia."

"A Full-Fledged Revolution"

In independent Le Soir (6/21), Pol Mathil observed: "In spite of appearances, this is not a palace revolution, it is a full-fledged revolution. The record of the first 24 hours of the Yeltsin-Lebed alliance is impressive. The former general honors his word."

"Lebed: A Real Blessing"

Conservative Catholic La Libre Belgique's Michel Rosten wrote (6/21), "One can consider that the real blessing of the first round was the emergence of Alexander Lebed who...practically forced Boris Yeltsin to come to terms with him.... He started a real cleaning of the Kremlin's stables by obtaining the dismissal of three generals--Grachev, Korzhakov, Barzukov--who were considered to be unsinkable, and of Oleg Soskovets, who believed that he was a future prime minister. By proceeding to this task of national interest, he saved Boris Yeltsin himself. The president had enough savy to understand it....

"This big cleansing operation can represent an electoral trump: The general's supporters immediately obtained confirmation of his weight in the new hierarchy surrounding the president and of his ability to impose the reforms which he promised.... One can think that the conditions required for the genuine democratization of the regime are finally met."

BULGARIA: "Velvet Coup Not Over Yet"

Ruling Socialist Party Duma (6/21) maintained, "The threat to both democracy and Yeltsin's future is evident. What still remains doubtful for now is who personifies this threat?... Yeltsin decided that the goal was accomplished, though partially. Now, it's time for him to get even with his opponents. The first victims have fallen. They belonged to the closest and most loyal circles.... However, it's too early for those who survived to celebrate. The night of Russia's 'velvet coup' has just started, and the actual winners will become known later, because every coup only ends when the people yell, 'The King is dead, long live democracy.'"

MALTA: "A Major Victory For Russia's Democrats"

An editorial which appeared in the English-language, independent Times of Malta (6/22) read, "President Boris Yeltsin's dismissal of three Kremlin hawks on Thursday was a major victory for Russia's democrats,' designed to lure liberals to his camp and likely to boost his chances of re-election.

SPAIN: "Unarguable Successor To Yeltsin"

Pedro Gonzalez, a well-known international affairs analyst (6/27), wrote in centrist Diario 16, "What is obvious and essential too is that Lebed is behaving more like an unarguable successor to Yeltsin than like a Rasputin-type intriguer. His attitude is backed by the EU and the United States alike. Because of health reasons and the complexity of interests around the Kremlin, Yeltsin had left many important decisions in the hands of his iron circle. In many cases, the country appeared to be heading toward chaos, something from which Zyuganov profited to force a second round. Yeltsin, who likes pragmatism, uses Lebed the same way he used Grachev and Rutskoy, but this time Lebed is not ready to give in to any of his demands. At the same time, it converts Yeltsin into an enemy of the ousted and makes him more dependent on his new security head."

"Purges And Strongmen"

Barcelona's centrist El Periodico (6/21) judged in an editorial, "Russia still has spectacular purges as they move toward democracy.... Just like the old days, when a new strongman emerged from Stalin's purges, this time it is General Alexander Lebed who is the new man with the iron fist. He moved quickly to dispose of certain individuals who'd stood in his way, and now the new strongman stands at virtually the peak of power.... Western governments have bet too heavily on Yeltsin, and have indirectly brought on the current situation. They may yet live to regret the authoritarian power of the general."

"A Good Administrative Cleansing"

An editorial in conservative ABC (6/21) stated, "Yeltsin has carried out a good administrative cleansing process and General Lebed will in time benefit from it."

SOUTH ASIA

INDIA: "Russian Elections Are Not Free"

Leftist former West Bengal Finance Minister Ashok Mitra wrote in the centrist Telegraph of Calcutta (6/26), "The election in Russia...is supposed to be a free election, but the left must not be allowed to win it; actually the left have no right to exist....

To ensure a left free world, it was decided between President Boris Yeltsin and President Bill Clinton to globalize the Russian poll. U.S. money poured in a torrential flow to bribe the Russian electorate.... The U.S. electronic media took charge of the Russian television channel; saturated propaganda was organized on behalf of the candidate of the United States, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, and only for him.... In contrast, Zyuganov, the Communist candidate, was treated as a non-person. The Russians, to wit, had the essential truth rubbed in for them; yes, it is a free election, but it is not for them to choose freely their next president."

BANGLADESH: "A Communist Is A Communist"

The independent, English-language Morning Sun commented (6/30), "There was a bipartisan sigh of relief in Washington when Yeltsin came out ahead in the first round of voting.... A foresighted choice can rescue Russia from the quagmire of passing difficulties and tribulations for a lasting growth of the country. A slip in the coming ballot may push Russia over the point of no return. If a Communist candidate is elected, he would promote a revisionist socialism with a human face. However, a Communist is a Communist. It is inconceivable that an enlightened nation will ever choose a totalitarian leadership freely without being imposed upon by a revolution. For a struggling democracy in Russia what is needed is a renewed endeavor to reinforce and revitalize it, not to surrender."

NEPAL: "A Pound Of Flesh"

The government-owned Rising Nepal (6/21) noted in an editorial, "While it remains to be seen as to whether or not Mr. Lebed's supporters would be throwing their weight behind Mr. Yeltsin in the second round, what is also likely is that the new security chief will undoubtedly extract his pound of flesh as and when his new boss comes out with flying colors in the second round face-off. This can be gleaned from his recent interview where he is reported to have said that 'there have been a few mistakes in the privatization program under President Yeltsin.' It needs no reiteration that privatization of almost all state-owned enterprises was one of Mr. Yeltsin's major electoral planks. That he did not emerge as the outright winner of the first round of the presidential polls shows that not all his programs have gone down well with the Russian electorate.... Mr. Lebed is still for economic liberalization initiated by Mr. Yeltsin--but with due 'corrections.' And herein lies the million rouble query: Will Mr. Yeltsin allow this? Especially when he is not noted for heeding even his closest friends' advise concerning economic policies."

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

AUSTRALIA: "The Velvet Coup"

According to the Moscow correspondent for the national, business-oriented Australian Financial Review (6/28), "What Russia has gone through over the past week is a velvet coup. For the first time since the collapse of the Soviet Union, a political realignment is taking place in Moscow without the use of tanks.... This time, Mr. Yeltsin's authority is not being challenged from outside the Kremlin, it is being undermined from within. The immediate agent is Alexander Lebed."

"Real Winners Behind The Scene In Russia"

The liberal Canberra Times (6/26) carried this op-ed view, "The run-off election in Russia next week is unlikely to decide who will be the real rulers of the country.... Foreign observers have reported that the voting in the first round was free and fair, and this is no doubt largely true. But the campaign itself was far from fair. Boris Yeltsin has had his populist successes, but it is fanciful to regard him as a democrat. During the campaign he controlled all the important media channels and, with one exception, excluded his opponents from them. The exception was...Alexander Lebed.... Without their domination of the media it is possible that neither would have done so well.... The price that Yeltsin paid for Lebed's cooperation was considerable.... Yeltsin...is barred from standing for a third term, and he has already announced that he sees Lebed as his successor. It may be that, conscious of his uncertain health, he looks forward to a progressive hand-over of power in the coming years.... Lebed may be popular with the people, but he has had little experience in the vicious infighting that seems to be prevalent in Moscow as in the days of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, he has already demonstrated his ability to act ruthlessly and he may prove to be a match for his opponents. He is unlikely to be concerned with democratic niceties and will no doubt be as ready as Yeltsin to use the powers now at his disposal to manipulate public opinion."

MALAYSIA: "Yeltsin's Retreat In Chechnya"

Independent Harakah said (7/1), "How much faith can be placed in Yeltsin's latest promises? The simple answer is: very little. He is a desperate man grasping at every straw to get re-elected in the June 16 presidential elections. He is on record as saying that unless he stops the war in Chechnya, it will end his presidential ambitions. By agreeing to meet the new Chechen leader, Yeltsin has had to face a humiliating climb-down. In the past, he had flatly refused to countenance any such meeting with the Chechens, demanding instead, their surrender. Yeltsin's world of make-believe has been shattered on the rocks of the Chechen mountains.... The Chechens' achievement is of great significance. They have lived up to their

tradition of not giving in to the Russians and have continued their

fight for more than 200 years. Their indomitable spirit lives on in the mountains inspiring, people all over the world.... The Caucasus region does not belong to Russia. There is nothing common between them-culturally, linguistically or religiously."

NEW ZEALAND: "A Returned Incumbent?"

In an editorial (6/19), the top-circulation, moderate New Zealand Herald indicated, "The emergence of the moderate nationalist [General] Alexander Lebed offers Mr. Yeltsin a potentially wider constituency than if he had had to depend on liberal reformists.... With pragmatism likely to prevail over ideology, the bulk of the general's supporters can be expected to follow his lead. The result on July 3 should logically be a returned incumbent with a strong president-in-waiting at his side. But is Russian democracy too new to take logic for granted?"

PHILIPPINES: "Zyuganov's Nationalism: Resentment Of Other Countries"

Former Philippine Ambassador Armando Manalo wrote regarding the possibility of a Communist victory (6/28) in the government-controlled Philippine Journal, "Key industries...will be nationalized. With the Communist chieftain at the helm, there is little assurance that the tentative gains of private enterprise will not be wiped out.... Zyuganov's view of closer ties with other states of the old Soviet Union would mean...at least the revival of the Russian sphere of influence.... Zyuganov's nationalism is expressed as a deep-seated resentment of other countries. Critics think he may in fact have no foreign policy since he may favor a Russia isolated from other countries. Americans tend to be bothered by Zyuganov's seeming anti-Americanism, which is a generalized distrust and hostility, independent of the merits of particular issues."

SOUTH KOREA: "Welcomed Coalition"

A commentary in conservative Chosun Ilbo (6/22) stated, "A coalition led by National Security Chief Alexander Lebed and former Deputy Prime Minister Anatoly Chubais replaced the Korzhakov-led group. The Russians welcome the ouster of Korzhakov's group which was considered corrupt and abusive of power. They have high hopes for the birth of an orderly free market economy which will supersede the corrupt market economy."

THAILAND: "Zyuganov's Problem"

Elite Naew Na's Charnnarit Boonparord concluded (6/27), "President Boris Yeltsin is likely to spurn Zyuganov's proposal that a coalition government be formed (to effectively tackle the country's economic ills.) Since the victory is already within easy reach, why on earth should Yeltsin share his power with Zyuganov?"

MIDDLE EAST

MOROCCO: "Yeltsin Will Owe Victory To U.S., West"

This assessment by Abdellatif Jebrou was featured in opposition, leftist, Arabic-language Al Ittihad Al Ichiraki (6/21), "If Yeltsin succeeds and wins the elections he'll undoubtedly owe his victory to the United States in particular and the West in general. Americans, today, control the world and don't wish to see that change. The United States and its allies have moved to protect Boris Yeltsin from the Russian people's anger. History, thus, repeats itself. After the October revolution and the end of the First World War, Bolsheviks faced a civil war which could have been limited without the intrusion of Western countries into Russian internal affairs.... Today, 65 percent of Russian voters have voted in the first round of the elections against the current president and there are many different reasons to interpret their position."

OMAN: "Zyuganov Throwing The Fight?"

The following unsigned commentary appeared in the semi-independent, English-language Times of Oman (6/25), "Plenty of people in Russia are scared of a Communist victory in the presidential election--and they might include Communist candidate Zyuganov himself. With 10 days left to a runoff vote, President Boris Yeltsin has reshuffled his team and gone back on the campaign trail to hunt for votes. But Zyuganov...has sat tight in Moscow, appearing only at a series of sleep-inducing news conferences. His aides say he has no plans to go anywhere before the July 3 runoff. No big rallies. No kissing babies. No killer soundbites. In short, the moon-faced Communist leader looks like a sparring partner who has been quietly told to throw the fight and let heavyweight champion Boris Yeltsin successfully defend his title....

"In a country where elaborate conspiracies go hand in hand with elementary political blunders, there is always the risk that the plans of both parts of Russia's political elite will go horribly wrong."

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

ARGENTINA: "Stagnation Of Zyuganov's Electoral Base"

Julio Barboza, international columnist of pro-government La Prensa (6/27), judged, "It is precisely the reluctance of the center that is producing the stagnation of Zyuganov's electoral base. He has turned too much toward the Russian nationalistic electorate to present anything now that can be acceptable to those in the middle. His recent offer to create a coalition government--should he win--has been tepidly acknowledged, and seems to be more an electoral maneuver and a sign of weakness than an act of sincere tolerance and the desire national unity."

"Will Lebed Survive Second Round?"

According to special correspondent Telma Luzzani in leading Clarin (6/26), "Yeltsin helped Lebed before the first round with funds for his campaign. The question now is if after the second round the general will be able to maintain his highly privileged position. Everybody knows that Lebed's new and powerful position does not guarantee the collection of the 11 million votes which supported Lebed in the first round due to his strong image against corruption and because he opposed the Chechen war, negatively perceived by the majority of the Russians and an authentic destabilizer for the electoral chances of the chief of the Kremlin."

BRAZIL: "Russia's Lack Of Democratic Experience"

An editorial in center-right O Estado de Sao Paulo (6/23) asked, "Why is today's Russia so similar to the Communist USSR and to feudal Russia? Because it is not democratic. Russian history does not offer any experience of democracy. On the contrary, it is dominated by despotism and by tragic destiny. What is really tragic in today's Russia is that the majority of its population is committed to the fight for survival and has no opportunity to look out to the horizon. Because of this, the fate of Russian policy is obvious."

CHILE: "Russian Democratic Transition Advancing, But Concerns Remain"

Influential, conservative El Mercurio (6/20) said in an editorial, "The Russian transition to democracy and economic freedom seems to be advancing amidst significant obstacles. Nevertheless, there remains great uncertainty about (Russian) foreign policy, which depends on a powerful military establishment and has a history of expansionist pretensions."

COLOMBIA: "A Safe Alliance"

The lead editorial in leading, Liberal Party-oriented El Tiempo (6/21) said about the Yeltsin-Lebed duo, "In order to ensure the presidency, Yeltsin, like any Latin American politician would do, made a safe alliance."

JAMAICA: "This Is No Vote For Liberalism Over Communism"

The moderate, influential Daily Gleaner printed this op-ed piece by regular columnist and university lecturer John Rapley (6/21), "The betting, risky though it may be, probably remains on Mr. Yeltsin.... Still, this will not amount to a vote for liberalism over Communism, as Western observers are sometimes tempted to conclude. More than half of Russia's voters backed candidates who

called for a return to one form of authoritarianism or another, and there appears to be little love for Mr. Yeltsin.... Investors may be happy, but Russia's economy began contracting again in May. There are dark days ahead, and Russia may yet return to the heavy-handed ways of old."

PARAGUAY: "An Effective Appeal To The Will Of The People"

Pro-government El Dia (6/20) of Asuncion's editorial held, "It's worth noting that Russian democracy was able to bring about in a very short time what Communism never attempted: an effective appeal to the will of the people.... One cannot forget that under the Communist regime, the now defunct Soviet Union promoted a bloody imperialism, attempting to abolish nations' right to self-determination.... The example offered by this great country (Russia)...is comforting. And we applaud the ability of its leaders and the strong democratic convictions of the people."

AFRICA

SOUTH AFRICA: "Negative Reaction To Images Of Past"

The liberal Mail and Guardian (6/21) stressed that "if the margin had gone to the Communist Party...this would have been seen as a comprehensive verdict against the Russian president's shambolic and sometimes brutal leadership.... The vote for Yeltsin was not a positive endorsement of the president, or of the mixed blessings of the free market: It was a negative reaction to images of the past.... The U.S. administration has said it seeks to avoid any blatant endorsement of Yeltsin, yet the sigh of relief in Washington is plainly audible in Moscow.... We should neither prejudge Russia's democratic choice nor demise one possible outcome.... Whatever the outcome, a new president will feel obliged to reassert a wounded sense of nationhood.... Whoever wins or loses, Russia is still embarked on a difficult transition into a very uncertain future."

ZAMBIA: "Russia's Painful Entry Into Capitalism And African Democracy"

On page one, the government-owned Times of Zambia's editorial (6/20) maintained, "The unfolding events in Russia have direct relevance to what obtains in many emergent democracies, particularly in Africa because Gorbachev's vision of a post-Communist era has turned into a mirage as capitalism bares its fangs on a hapless people who only recently celebrated the collapse of Communism.... The West will have to do more than they have done to help consolidate democracy (and) threats to cut aid on young democracies is the surest way of undermining democracy. The transition from a command economic regime to a market economy is proving too bitter a pill to swallow not only for the Russians but many others whose governments have embarked on the painful reform process."

##

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 1-JUL-1996 13:33:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I6K6H21L9S008SWY@PMD.F.EOP.GOV> for
matsui_d@a1.eop.gov; Mon, 01 Jul 1996 13:30:27 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from usia.gov (XGATE.USIA.GOV) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879)
id <01I6K6JP5BIQ00007Z@STORM.EOP.GOV> for matsui_d@a1.eop.gov; Mon,
01 Jul 1996 13:32:34 -0700 (MST)

Received: from Connect2 Message Router by usia.gov via Connect2-SMTP 4.00; Mon,
01 Jul 1996 13:35:07 -0400

Organization: USIA

X-Mailer: Connect2-SMTP 4.00 MHS to SMTP Gateway

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: uucp@Whitehouse.GOV@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-JUL-1996 20:36:00.00

SUBJECT: scanner results

TO: binns_m (binns_m@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: horn_s (horn_s@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:16-JUL-1996 11:01:43.78

TEXT:
SCANNER RESULTS

society. It is very scary to see how our culture accepts violence as "the norm." You cannot turn on the television without seeing news of a murder or a show that centers around a murder. Then you watch late night talk shows, and the jokes revolve around terrible acts of violence (i.e. O.J Simpson or the Menendez brothers). I seriously doubt that Jay Leno would say the same

MESSAGE BODY

From dsnapp@conductor.codamusic.com Mon Jul 15 20:35:26 1996
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by WhiteHouse.gov (8.7.1/uucp-relay) id UAA11875 for <President@WhiteHouse.GOV>; Mon, 15 Jul 1996 20:35:26 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from storm.eop.gov/198.137.241.51 via smap
Received: from DIRECTORY-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I745DAQ7LC001NPZ@STORM.EOP.GOV> for President@WhiteHouse.GOV; Mon, 15 Jul 1996 20:34:58 -0700 (MST)
Received: from SCAN-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I745D9FV00001IDY@STORM.EOP.GOV> for president@Whitehouse.GOV; Mon, 15 Jul 1996 20:34:56 -0700 (MST)
Received: from 205.198.126.3 (205.198.126.3) by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I745BM40KO00007U@STORM.EOP.GOV> for president@Whitehouse.GOV; Mon, 15 Jul 1996 20:33:37 -0700 (MST)
Received: from [205.198.126.150] (dsnapp1.codamusic.com [205.198.126.150]) by conductor.codamusic.com (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id TAA16793 for <president@whitehouse.gov>; Mon, 15 Jul 1996 19:33:54 -0500
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 1996 19:33:54 -0500
From: dsnapp@conductor.codamusic.com (Doug Snapp)
To: president@WhiteHouse.GOV
Message-id: <v01530502ae104db61892@[205.198.126.150]>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Comments: This message scanned by SCAN version 0.1 jms/960226

Dear Sir,

I am quite sure that this message won't be read by the President, but maybe some of my concerns will be read by someone who can start to address some of the critical issues that face us today.

I just finished reading the news where there was a quote that the worlds 358 billionaires have more assets than the combined income of countries that house over 45% of the world population. With all of the attention of this election on other issues, I think this growing disparity between the rich and the poor is a major cause of a number of problems that face this nation and the world. I am sure that if this enormous wealth of this very small minority of people were spread across the land, we would have better schools, educated people, less drug use and violence, more working people contributing to the economy, and more focus on family and morals. With the current decline in economic status for most individuals and families, people are unable to further their education, or have time with their families, or keep their kids out of bad situations (gangs and drugs), or spend their time and money on things that promote family, morals, and culture. I know that when you begin to think about money for the whole population instead of the individual that you approach Socialism, but there must be a middle ground where those who succeed due to our free civilization must contribute back to the perpetuation of our civilization.

The other area seriously concerns me is the changing attitudes of our society. It is very scary to see how our culture accepts violence as "the norm." You cannot turn on the television without seeing news of a murder or a show that centers around a murder. Then you watch late night talk shows, and the jokes revolve around terrible acts of violence (i.e. O.J Simpson or the Menendez brothers). I seriously doubt that Jay Leno would say the same jokes if Nichole Simpson was his sister or daughter. I do think that much of this change in attitude is due to the media, but a lot of the fault lies with all americans with our general acceptance of the violence that we see on a daily basis.

I do not know what the answers are to these problems, and I am as guilty as most for not making an effort to make possitive change in this country. I hope that some of these problems can be addressed by the government as a whole without the nonsense of partisan politics.

If someone did indeed read this message, I appreciate your time. If it goes unread, I at least had the opportunity to put some of my thoughts and concerns into words.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Doug Snapp

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:15-JUL-1996 20:37:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:
RFC-822-headers:
Received: from storm.eop.gov (storm.eop.gov)
by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.0-4 #6879) id <01I745F11RCG003OTA@PMDf.EOP.GOV>; Mon,
15 Jul 1996 20:36:22 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from whitehouse.gov (whitehouse.gov)
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.0-7 #6879) id <01I745EWHKS00007U@STORM.EOP.GOV>;
Mon, 15 Jul 1996 20:36:15 -0700 (MST)
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by WhiteHouse.gov (8.7.1/uucp-relay)
id UAA11927; Mon, 15 Jul 1996 20:35:52 -0400 (EDT)
===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====