

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: SYSTEM@WH2.EOP.GOV (SYSTEM@WH2.EOP.GOV [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-AUG-2000 00:47:33.00

SUBJECT: Yesterday's mail for POTUS (20000815)

TO: Stephen K. Horn (CN=Stephen K. Horn/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The attached file is ASCII text.

- 20000815_PR.NEW

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Received: from mailsorter-105-2.iap.bryant.webtv.net ([209.240.198.118])

by WHITEHOUSE.GOV (PMDF V5.2-33 #41140)

with ESMTP id <01JT05GAX6HO8X150B@WHITEHOUSE.GOV>; Tue,
15 Aug 2000 15:28:14 -0500 (EST)

Received: from storefull-614.iap.bryant.webtv.net

(storefull-614.iap.bryant.webtv.net [209.240.198.34])

by mailsorter-105-2.iap.bryant.webtv.net (WebTV_Postfix)

with ESMTP id 63C1126B4A; Tue, 15 Aug 2000 12:28:13 -0700 (PDT)

Received: (from production@localhost) by storefull-614.iap.bryant.webtv.net

(8.8.8-wtv-e/mt.gso.26Feb98) id MAA18111; Tue, 15 Aug 2000 12:28:13 -0700 (PDT
)

Date: Tue, 15 Aug 2000 14:28:12 -0500 (CDT)

From: NancyLuft@webtv.net (Nancy Luft)

Subject: OTHERS LIST

In-reply-to: NancyAnnLuft@webtv.net (Nancy Luft)'s message of Mon,
14 Aug 2000 14:07:09 -0500 (CDT)

To: NancyAnnLuft@webtv.net (Nancy Luft)

Cc: chnun@undp.org, jcarollo@ci.miami.fl.us, cuba@un.int, charlotte@fbi.gov,
Media.chicago@fbi.gov, CINCINNATI@FBI.GOV, houston@fbi.gov, knoxville@fbi.gov,

little.rock@fbi.gov, los.angeles@fbi.gov, new.orleans@fbi.gov,

newyork@fbi.gov, Philadelphia@fbi.gov, phoenix@fbi.gov,

raleigh.charlotte@fbi.gov, richmond@fbi.gov, su@fbi.gov, seattle@fbi.gov,

tampa@fbi.gov, albuquerque@fbi.gov, First.Lady@Whitehouse.GOV,

Gephardt@mail.house.gov, wisgov@gov.state.wi.us,

governor.jesseventura@mail.state.mn.us, mayor@ci.mil.wi.us, mayor@dcgov.org,

mayor@metro-dade.com, Mrs.Gore@Whitehouse.GOV, lmpaul@nytimes.com,

carletk@nytimes.com, andergb@nytimes.com, rickf@nytimes.com,

Freedom-For-All@webtv.net, We_The_People_@webtv.net, president@Whitehouse.GOV,

president@gov.ru, info@kprf.ru, secretary@state.gov, connie@mack.senate.gov,

senator_hatch@hatch.senate.gov, opinion@smith.senate.gov,

senator_specter@specter.senate.gov, senatorlott@lott.senate.gov,

Vice.President@Whitehouse.GOV, webnews@washpost.com
Message-id: <12868-399999CC-19956@storefull-614.iap.bryant.webtv.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: Text/Plain; Charset=US-ASCII
Content-disposition: Inline
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
X-WebTV-Signature: 1
ETAtAhUAwbLlgi5a+4WGtI7hQig9uaTUj1ACFFMSyeBB4P+fy2hxXXLF5LACSXay
Comments: FCP version 1.7 jms/990907
Original-recipient: rfc822;EIR\$PR

Hi there President Putin!

What percentage of people in each and every nation on this earth are either working class, poor, truly needy, intelligentsia, ie., non rich?

That is the percentage of people in each nation that would support a PEACE TREATY with you and your Russia to end this insane, millenniums old, bullshit! Yes sir ree, a gigantic 80% to 95% of The People in each and every nation on this earth except for a few nations like Kuwait (which truly belongs to Iraq, but Rockefellers' REICH WING Rich Man's Mafia, aka The Conspiracy, criminally controlled England to steal it from Iraq and give it a bunch of renegade Iraqis who renamed themselves Kuwaitis).

Now with such enormous, solid, strong, grass roots, global support for a PEACE TREATY, such as the one your Special Sputnik Forces of your Russian Military has told me about for many, many years and it being easier then all hell to get the PEACE TREATIES, why has your Sputnik Military not already gotten those PEACE TREATIES?

Your Sputnik Military created all of the religions of this earth to brainwash mankind with superstitious bullshit to hide the existence of their sputnik laser technology. As your Sputnik Military, for millenniums to date, always wipes out democracy, PEOPLE POWER, socialism and communism that must be built upon democracy, PEOPLE POWER, and always uses the rich of this earth as surrogates, as an humanoid weapon system, to enslave The People, the masses, so that your Sputnik Military only needs to control a very tiny number of rich in order to control the entire human race for millenniums to date. Thus proving to everyone, beyond any and all reasonable doubt by their own actions, that your Sputnik Military ONLY believes in SLAVERY for millenniums to date.

Now my question is, President Putin, when it is so very extremely easy for your Special Sputnik Forces of the Russian Military to get PEACE TREATIES with virtually every nation on this earth, why wasn't the criminally insane, sons of a bitches, already done so? They lying to me and wanting to bring true and real democracy to each and every nation on this earth, real PEOPLE POWER, and about wanting to be THE PEOPLE'S military/police that guarantees true and real democracy forever? Since you Sputnik Military ONLY practises SLAVERY using surrogates, humanoid weapon system that they create and protect, is this WORLD WAR THREE SHOWDOWN about getting rid of their surrogates that they create, protect, and use to enslave THE PEOPLE, the masses, and ENSLAVING THE

ENTIRE HUMAN RACE DIRECTLY UNDER THEM, THE SPECIAL SPUTNIK FORCES OF THE RUSSIAN MILITARY? Like with such enormous, massive, global grass roots support for PEACE TREATIES to end this bullshit forever, and it being so god damned easy to get those PEACE TREATIES, exactly why has not your Special Sputnik Forces of your Russian Military already gotten them? Why to they continue to act like uncivilized, utterly mentally deranged, homicidal maniacs killing utterly innocent non rich people who would vote for the PEACE TREATIES if they were freed and completely informed about the entire TRUTH?

All your Sputnik Military has to do to free the USA is to kill all of those who knew about your sputniks with lasers prior to me informing people about them, plus their extended families, including all of their posterity, loved ones, and burn up their receivers that pick up on your mind reading sputnik lasers. That your Sputnik Military has told me, millions of times, they can very easily accomplish in one night's time. All of the rest in Rockefeller's RIGHT WING Rich Man's Mafia, aka The Conspiracy, would slither off and find under rocks in fear your Sputnik Military would kill them and their loved ones next if they did anything wrong. They would all be crying that the mad lunatic Rockefeller's intimidated them into doing shit with death threats against them and their loved ones, blackmailed them into doing crap, brainwashed and deceived them into doing garbage, etc., or some combination of the above and that would be the TRUTH, too! That means THE PEOPLE would get control of the USA virtually over night, and THE PEOPLE all want to do that PEACE TREATY with Russia. Everyone who I have spoken to in person does. On the Internet everyone fears Rockefeller's REICH WING Rich Man's Mafia, aka The Conspiracy, so enormously that they are all afraid to state the TRUTH and ONLY stooges of Rockefeller's Mafia post things, as Rockefeller's Mafia can every easily learn the identity of anyone who posts anything that they do not like and mess them, or their loved ones, up enormously in endless ways.

And it is easy to get The Chinese People to do a PEACE TREATY, also, as their current neo-Moaist government is a totalitarian RIGHT WING MAFIA, anti socialistic and anti communistic as all hell, as there is no validity in any Dictatorship of the Proletarian (Workers) what so ever. China's government is extremely suited to keep out Rockefeller's INTERNATIONAL Rich Man's Mafia, true. BUT is it anti socialistic and anti communistic as all hell as the only basis for socialism and communism is PEOPLE POWER, ie., democracy, freedoms, liberty, a bill of rights, a one person gets one vote with all required to vote and ballots designed to register non votes, ie., I hate all candidates for this office, I am not informed, etc.. Anyhow, a totalitarian government is a piece of cake for your Sputnik Military to reason with, ie., if the top people say no to the PEACE TREATY, your Sputnik Military uses their sputnik lasers to butcher them and ALL of their extended family, loved ones, and posterity, then offers the PEACE TREATY to the next in line, if they turn it down, them and theirs are next, ..., the third group is sure to accept the PEACE TREATY. That also works great in today's totalitarian USA, ie., first butcher all those with their extended families loved ones, and posterity, that knew about your sputniks with lasers prior to me informing people of them, then offer the PEACE TREATY to those politicians left alive in our federal government and if their

turn down the PEACE TREATY, use the sputnik lasers to butcher them and their extended families, loved ones, and all of their posterity to put the USA under Marshal Law with the US Military ruling it. Well, the US Military will be HAPPY to accept the PEACE TREATY!

The reason it all works like a charm in the USA and China both, is the massive, grass roots support from THE PEOPLE for the PEACE TREATY.

Now, my dear President Putin, your Special Sputnik Forces of your Russian Military said they wanted a PEACE TREATY with both the USA and Red China, so assist them put something sane in place on this earth, ie., real, true, DEMOCRACY, etc., and with that being so god damned easy, simple, to do, WHY THE HELL HAVE THEY NOT ALREADY DONE IT? I have listened and debated this matter, via their total mind controlling sputnik lasers, for YEARS AND YEARS and I am truly sick of doing that with them. ALL WORDS AND NO ACTIONS MEANS DISINFORMATION and the pigs are lying to me about wanting a PEACE TREATY, right? Why doesn't your Sputnik Military shit or get off the pot, ie., if they want PEACE TREATY then get it or shut their fucking faces about it? Forgive me sir, President Putin, BUT I am sick and tired of hearing about PEACE TREATY bullshit year after year, as I watch your mentally deranged Sputnik Military kill utterly innocent people in the USA, in Red China, etc., who would support the PEACE TREATY as the perverts refuse to kill the right sons of a bitches, who are very few in number and enslaving THE PEOPLE so that THE PEOPLE are not free to ever speak to you about the PEACE TREATY!

Tell you Special Sputnik Forces of your Russian Military to PLEASE shit or get off the pot, President Putin! Tell them to take out the garbage they littered the USA and Red China with by creating and protecting Rockefellerism and Moaism, so WE THE PEOPLE can do the PEACE TREATY or tell your Sputnik Military to shut their mouths about the PEACE TREATY! Your Sputnik Military drives in nuts about the fucking PEACE TREATY, President Putin, because they total mind control me to think about it, write about it, etc., against my will, as my American morals tell me that FIRST your Sputnik Military must completely STOP hurting, killing INNOCENT AMERICANS, innocent people all around this earth, and call a TRUCE TO THEIR BULLSHIT BEFORE THEY TALK TO ME ABOUT ANY PEACE TREATY! Like your Sputnik Military should ought to prove by their own actions that they are truly interested in a PEACE TREATY WITH THE PEOPLE of the USA, of Red China, etc., before we talk about any PEACE TREATY.

Anyhow, President Putin, there is absolutely NOTHING to talk about when it comes to a PEACE TREATY as any fool, any moron KNOWS that over 80% of Americans and Chinese SUPPORT one that guarantees them real, true, meaningful democracy, PEOPLE POWER, forever! WE THE PEOPLE WANT THE POLITICAL POWER, your paranoid, war crimes, atrocity doing, genocidal Sputnik Military wants the MILITARY POWER, so we just make a deal and they become THE PEOPLE'S POLICE/MILITARY who guarantee we get and forever keep true and real democracy, etc.. WE OBSERVE YOUR SPUTNIK MILITARY to make sure they are obeying the terms of the PEACE TREATY, etc.. NO PROBLEM, President Putin!

Bastards who steal other people's wealth and/or political power, need

all the military power that they can get to keep that stolen wealth and/or political power, a fact of life. BUT WE THE PEOPLE who steal nothing, do NOT need all of the military power for ourselves, personally, and our honest asses are FREE TO SUBCONTRACT IT OUT TO OTHERS! WE THE PEOPLE JUST SUBCONTRACT OUR DEFENSE TO YOUR SPUTNIK MILITARY. HONEST FOLKS ARE FREE TO DO THAT, President Putin, whereas dishonest people like lunatic Rockefeller's RIGHT WING Rich Man's Mafia, aka The Conspiracy, are not.

WE THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA greatly need to subcontract our national defense and defense against internal insurrectionists to someone as the idiots, fools, fuck ups, in our own Pentagon very obviously have grossly failed to do their jobs in both of those areas. Who better to subcontract it to then your Sputnik Military, President Putin, the most awesomely all powerful military on the face of this earth? And WE THE PEOPLE get the job done for peanuts compared to that blackhole of our own Defense Department that sucks endless tax dollars up and provides absolutely NO protection from foreigners like your Russians murdering us and is always totally criminally controlled by lunatic Rockefellers' RIGHT WING Rich Man's Mafia since WORLD WAR TWO ended. Rockefellers' Mafia caused that huge over kill of nukes that President Ike did not want when he was trying to make peace with you Russians that caused Ike to give his famous speak damning the Industrial/Military Complex upon leaving office when he finally learned the TRUTH of what had taken place. George W. (WEASEL) Bush, a committed member of Rockefellers' Mafia, already had plans to use the USA Military against THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA if he gets elected, your Sputnik Military informs me. And the TRAITORS in our Pentagon will obey his treason ass, too! Yes sir ree, WE THE PEOPLE are extremely interested in subcontracting all of our DEFENSE NEEDS to you Russians with a PEACE TREATY! "TRUST BY VERIFY", all we want is observers to know that you Russians are carrying out the terms of the PEACE TREATY. Our won god damned Pentagon insists on carrying on TREASONOUS WARS being part of the UN, knowing that they can not legally wage war against any nation UNLESS if first attacks the USA, because the pigs are members in Rockefellers' RIGHT WING Rich Man's Mafia. Junior officers are quitting our military in record numbers, currently, because they are learning the TRUTH! Anyhow, President Putin, WE THE PEOPLE are in the market for a military that we can subcontract our national defense to, as the treasonous double and triple dipppers who leave the Pentagon to get extremely well paying jobs with their very own defense contractors upon retiring from the military, are part of The Conspiracy that has completely and totally overthrow our US government. Our US Military has become nothing buy the goons of Rockefellers' RIGHT WING Rich Man's Mafia ... very say, but it is the TRUTH!

Anyhow, Commander in Chief of the entire Russian Military, President Putin, could you PLEASE order your Special Sputnik Forces of your Russian Military to commence taking out the garbage that they littered the USA, the planet earth with, so that WE THE PEOPLE can do a PEACE TREATY with you and your Russian and subcontract our defense to you all? WE THE PEOPLE are in desparate, urgent need, of a DEFENSE DEPARTMENT, as lunatic Rockefeller's RIGHT WING Rich Man's Mafia has everyone on this earth who is honest and in their right mind wanting to kill all of us

Americans becaue of them and their INTERNATIONAL crimes, atrocities,
human rights violations, genocide, etc.?

PEACE, President Putin, PEACE!

Nancy Ann Luft

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Valerie A. Karras" <karrasva@SLU.EDU> ("Valerie A. Karras" <karrasva@SLU.EDU> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-AUG-2000 19:04:15.00

SUBJECT: [Fwd: WHY KOSOVO? FOLLOW THE MONEY!]

TO: Elizabeth Prodromou <prodromou@mediaone.net> (Elizabeth Prodromou <prodromou@mediaone.net> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

Paul D. Glastris (CN=Paul D. Glastris/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Elizabeth,

This sounds way out, but eerily rings true, too. I remember Serbs talking last year about the mines' being the ulterior motive for the NATO campaign.

Valerie

----- Original Message -----

Subject: WHY KOSOVO? FOLLOW THE MONEY!
Date: Thu, 17 Aug 2000 10:53:46 -0700 (PDT)
From: John Suhayda <suhayda9@netscape.net>
To: Suhayda <suhayda9@netscape.net>

<http://www.antiwar.com/justin/pf/p-j081600.html>

ANTIWAR, Wednesday, August 16, 2000

Behind the Headlines
by Justin Raimondo Antiwar.com

WHY KOSOVO? FOLLOW THE MONEY!

When the Kosovo war broke out, and the "Allies" took up the cause of that Albanian terrorist gang known as the Kosovo Liberation Army,

Antiwar.com received a lot of email from baffled readers who wondered: "Why Kosovo?" Here was an impoverished and isolated country in a notoriously unstable region of the world, without any strategic

or military value to the US, the conquest of which could only add to our burdens.

Virtually none of my correspondents believed the official explanation ? that the Milosevic regime was slaughtering tens of thousands of ethnic

Albanians in the province, and was determined to "cleanse" Kosovo so that it would be ethnically Serb. Since the inhabitants of Kosovo were

then more than 90 percent Albanians, this would have meant the complete depopulation of the province ? a policy that made absolutely no economic or political sense. The supposedly "humanitarian" motives of the NATO-crats were a fraud from the very beginning, it was clear, and

in any case their fraudulence was proved after the war when UN forensic experts went in and recovered and identified a little over 2,000 bodies (including Serbs). But this only deepened the mystery, and the question went unanswered: why Kosovo, of all places, the closest thing to a

Third World country in all of Europe? Over a year after the "humanitarians" bombed Belgrade and reduced much of Yugoslavia to rubble, the answer is beginning to take shape. . . .

THE \$5 BILLION DOOR PRIZE

Yesterday 900 British, Danish, and French troops moved in to take over the Trepca complex of mines in the northern city of Mitrovica ? and

were met with determined resistance by hundreds of mine workers. Hurling rocks, sticks, and stones, and wielding the tools of their trade as

weapons, Serbs downed four Brits, shouting their defiance at this escalation of NATO's war on the last Serbs left in Kosovo. For the Trepca

mining complex is an ancient treasure, mined by the Greeks, the Romans, the Turks, and is the richest source of lead and zinc in Europe. There

is enough lignite deposits in those mines to last for the next

13 centuries. The capacity of Trepca's refineries ranks third worldwide.
The
now-deposed mine director reported that "in the last
three
years we have mined 2,538,124 tons of lead and zinc crude ore and
produced
286,502 tons of lead and zinc and 139,789 tons of pure
lead,
zinc, cadmium, silver and gold." We don't need to ask why this action
was
taken:
we have only to note Trepca's estimated value ? over \$5
billion. What else do we need to know?

ENVIRONMENTALLY CORRECT LIES

Naturally, they couldn't just go in there, and grab
Kosovo's
crown jewels, without coming up with a politically correct rationale.
Leave it
to
"Unmik," the acronymic tyranny set up by the NATO-crats
to
administer their conquered province, to come up with the most
transparent lie
imaginable ? albeit one that, in its sheer ludicrousness,
will
appeal to such enthusiasts of the Kosovo war as the German Greens and
their
even
flakier American counterparts. According to a report from
MSNBC, French spokesman Colonel Henry Aussavy solemnly declared: "We've
noted a significant increase in the level of lead in the
air,
which was dangerous for the people of Mitrovica and for KFOR (NATO-led)
troops.
We had to react."

THE ARROGANCE OF POWER

Let's see if I get this straight: after a year and some
months
of organized ethnic cleansing by the Kosovar Albanians against the
defeated
Serbs ?
as NATO not only stood by but actively aided the KLA's
campaign
for a Serb-free Kosovo ? Unmik finally decides to react: not, mind you,
to
the murder, rape, and pillaging of Kosovo's embattled
Serb
communities, but to the alleged threat of air pollution. Do these people
even
care if

anyone believes their lies? I don't think so. Real power means that your lies don't even have to be convincing. It means further humiliating your victims ? in the process of beating them to the ground and robbing them blind ? by constructing the flimsiest of pretexts, the more absurd the better.

DUBIOUS DIAGNOSIS

While the UN bureaucrats insisted that air samples indicated levels of pollution 200 times above World Health Organization standards, the

Serbs counter that their measurements indicate ".12 milligrams of lead per cubic metre (permitted level .15 mg), .019 mg of zinc (permitted level

.4 mg), copper .004 mg (permitted level .01 mg), iron .002 mg (permitted level .2 mg), etc." As to the medical rationale for this brazen act of

thievery, doctors from the local hospital were more than skeptical about the veracity of the NATO-crats' diagnosis. Dr. Radoslav Jankovic

wryly observed that "we haven't had a patient with a toxicology problem for years. Today only soldiers and Unmik police officers suffer problems of lead in the blood."

THE MONEY TRAIL

Are you beginning to see the answer to "why Kosovo?" A \$5 billion prize ? but who gets to claim it? Trepca was state-owned under Yugoslav

suzerainty, but now it will be "privatized" and sold off to Western investors. In this context, it is important to realize just whom we are talking about. . . .

THE SOROS CONNECTION

When George Soros invested \$150 million in the region ? most of it backed up by fail-safe US government guarantees ? he declared that this was not strictly a humanitarian effort. While known for

his
philanthropy, Soros said that in the case of his Balkan investments he
would
be

guided by the concept of "tough love" and insisted that
the new
enterprise must be "driven purely by profit." With \$100 million of the
US

taxpayers' money in his pocket, Soros and his gang are
swooping
down on the prostrate body of the Serbian nation like vultures feeding
on the

liver of Prometheus ? the Titan of Greek mythology who
stole
fire from the depths of the earth and gave it to mankind. The Titans, a
subterranean race, were the first miners, who taught
their
metal-smelting techniques to mortal men and were punished for the sin of
such

extravagant gift-giving, were obliterated by the gods of
Olympus. Our own Olympians seem determined to visit a similar fate on
the
Serbs ?

who, for their part, seem to be guilty only of getting
between
George Soros and \$5 billion.

JOHNSTONE'S PREDICTION

That the NATO-crats dare to invoke such a pathetic
pretext for
their plundering is not exactly astonishing. These people are moral
monsters,
after all, who would have reduced Belgrade to a smoking
ruin if
they hadn't been too afraid of the political consequences ? and they may
do
so

yet. What is truly astonishing is that all this was
predicted,
down to the details, back in February by Diana Johnstone, in a
remarkably
prescient
article on Emperors-Clothes.com, in which she foretold
not only
the expropriation of the Trepca complex, but also exposed Soros as the
source

of the scheme. Analyzing two key documents ? a November
1999
International Crisis Group (ICG) paper on the Trepca mining complex, and
a February 2000 article in the Toronto Star by ICG
consultant
Susan Blaustein ? Johnstone saw it all coming, and with such stunning
accuracy

that one can hardly believe that her piece wasn't written yesterday. What is especially revealing is the role of the International Crisis Group in fomenting the takeover of Trepca ? and the role of Soros as the ICG's main sugar-daddy. In its report, the ICG drools at the prospect of having such a rich prize fall into its benefactor's hands. As Johnstone relates:

"In the 'game-plan of measures' recommended by the ICG, UNMIK is advised to instruct a 'Zvecan environmental assessment team' to report on the status of the equipment and thereupon 'advise as to what measures must be taken'... Environmental hazards are to be the pretext to shut down Zvecan and deprive the last Serbs in Kosovo of their livelihood. Meanwhile, 'Stari Trg, one of the richest mines in Europe, must be potentially profitable again and should be a priority for donors interested in setting Kosovo on its feet.'"

PHILANTHROPY FOR FUN ? AND PROFIT

Chief among these "donors" is none other than Soros, who now expects to be paid back for his "philanthropy" ? with interest. Trepca can be profitable again, but the question is: for whom. Trepca seems to have fallen into Soros's lap ? or was it pushed there? Another interesting aspect of this whole affair is that the seizure of the Trepca complex by NATO forces is part of the Sorosian "business strategy" designed to forestall and ultimately nullify the claims of two European companies derived from contracts signed with the Serbs. As the ICG report puts it:

"In July 1999, shortly after the conquest of Kosovo, one Jean-Pierre Rozan showed up claiming that 2.8% ownership of Trepca belonged to the Paris-based SCMM, of which he was a director. Rozan's claim was based on an agreement with Belgrade, in which SCMM took over Jugobanka's subsidiary in Kosovo as a result of Belgrade's

default.

SOROSIAN ETHNIC CLEANSING

The ICG derides the Soci?t? Commerciale de M?taux et de Min?raux (SCMM) claim as being without foundation on the somewhat questionable grounds that the French government is giving it no backing. But just in case this is not enough, they throw another factor into their

argument that Rozan's claim must be summarily dismissed.

This being Kosovo, there is an ethnic angle in all this, underscored by the ICG

report,

"Some Kosovar Albanians, always ready to believe in a conspiracy however unlikely, are prepared to perceive SCMM as part of a wider

Franco-Serbian understanding, which incorporates French KFOR acquiescence in the partition of Mitrovic?, French economic interests in Trepca, and even the appointment of Dr Bernard Kouchner himself

as head of UNMIK and Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General. The recent award of a GSM telecommunications concession, regardless of the transparency of the process, to French company Alcatel, has fueled the suspicions of such conspiracy-theorists."

OUR CONSPIRACY THEORIES, AND THEIRS

Soros and his hired hands have an inherent hostility to "conspiracy theorists," quite naturally, but that doesn't stop them from placing the blame

for everything that goes wrong in the Balkans on Slobodan Milosevic

"To other veteran observers of the Balkans, however, the involvement of SCMM looks like a Milo?evic-style attempt to create a diversion

(including by encouraging exactly that Balkan and Kosovar propensity for conspiracy-identification outlined above), and confuse the thinking of

international officials charged with working out the problem.

By putting this and other claims to due process of arbitration, and meanwhile getting

on with what needs to be done, the problem can be neatly sidestepped. "

ARREST THAT MAN!

How's that for a conspiracy theory? SCMM's claims are all part of a plot by Milosevic to "create a diversion." How convenient for Soros &

Company that their chief competitors turn out to be enemy agents. Now that the NATO-crats have definitively settled the question of the

ownership of the Trepca mines by force of arms, the next logical step is to lock up Monsieur Rozan and be done with it. In any case, it is clear

that the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo will be carried out in the mines, if the ICG has anything to say about it. The author of the ICG report notes

with some irritation that:

"The UNMIK regional office in Mitrovica meanwhile occupies the Jugobanka building and continues to display Jugobanka insignia in the very

meeting room to which Kosovars are invited to discuss Trepca ?

some report that they feel uneasy in such surroundings. Rozan, as 'owner' of

Jugobanka and the building, is demanding rent, which UNMIK has refused to pay."

OUR ORWELLIAN AGE

Who cares about property rights when those poor sensitive souls, the Kosovars, reportedly feel "uncomfortable" in close proximity to anything

Serbian, even a company logo. The ICG is basically making the argument that the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo must be completed: not only churches and other historical monuments must be destroyed

? and there is hardly a Serbian church left standing in Kosovo ? but everything

Serbian must go. The ICG describes itself as a "private, multinational" organization devoted to strengthening the capacity of the international

community to anticipate, understand and act to contain and prevent conflict." In our Orwellian age this means a government-connected tool of

corporate plunderers devoted to anticipating the profits to be made from military conflict, and acting to furthering the interests of war profiteers.

THE GREEK CLAIM

Another company, the Greek firm of Mytineleos, has a claim through contracts with Yugoslav companies to market Trepca's lead and zinc, and

this claim is going to be "a harder problem than SCMM for UNMIK" as the ICG report admits. With close ties to the Greek government, and a

sterling international track record for solidity and performance, Mytineleos can make a strong case. The report also somewhat reluctantly notes that

"UNMIK cannot simply ignore claims which may be genuine, and the UN legal advisers in New York have concluded that the rights of claimants like Mytineleos must go to adjudication. The question arises as to which court. So far that is left in abeyance, as is the nature of the

legal proceedings themselves. If all other decisions are left to depend upon the resolution of this issue, it could be many years before Trepca starts working again."

A PROBLEM NEATLY SOLVED

The military occupation of Trepca solves Soros's two major problems by arrogating de facto ownership of the mines to "the international

community" embodied by Unmik ? and deftly sidelines the French and the Greeks. Never mind the legal technicalities, and the risks of adjudication: just go in there and grab it! This is how the much-vaunted "Third Way" between socialism and capitalism, touted by the Clintonians

and their British Laborite first cousins, works in practice.

First, you invade a country; then you strip it of its assets, and sell them off to your

politically connected friends, such as Soros ? this is called "privatization," but there is nothing "private" about it. The source of Soros's Balkan coup is government power: the armed fist of the State, and not the invisible hand of the market. As the declared enemy of laissez-faire capitalism, which he rails against in several unbearably pretentious books, Soros practices what he preaches: using NATO and the UN as his instruments, he profits from the plundering of a proud nation ? while his bought-and-paid-for shills rationalize the schemes of this modern Visigoth in the name of "humanitarianism" and "multiculturalism."

It kind of makes you want to puke, doesn't it?

A QUESTION NEATLY ANSWERED

For years, Soros funded the American Committee to Save Bosnia, the Balkan Action Council, and a plethora of other groups devoted to persuading US policy makers that nothing less than American military intervention in the region could save the Kosovar Albanians from "genocide." Soros himself spoke out on the issue, and chided the West for "appeasing" the Serbs. Now comes the payoff. Trepca is his, or will be shortly. So we have finally come up with the answer to the question that has been haunting us for over a year: why Kosovo? The answer consists of two words: George Soros. All you would-be tycoons out there, take heed: If you want to know what investment strategy to follow in era of the Third Way, then Soros has certainly set the example.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: lgbt-politics@egroups.com (lgbt-politics@egroups.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 19-AUG-2000 09:23:15.00

SUBJECT: [lgbt-politics] Digest Number 124

TO: lgbt-politics@egroups.com (lgbt-politics@egroups.com [UNKNOWN])

READ: UNKNOWN

Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

-----<e|
Find long lost high school friends:
http://click.egroups.com/1/8016/11/_/332436/_/966691173/
-----|e>-----

To Submit a Newsclipping or Press Release, send it to the moderator at:
lgbt-politics@eGroups.com

To Unsubscribe, send a blank message to:
lgbt-politics-unsubscribe@eGroups.com

There are 10 messages in this issue.

Topics in this digest:

1. Gay Alabama Delegate
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
2. NYT: Democrats, Family Values and an American Dream For Gays
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
3. Gay Democrats enjoy unprecedented visibility
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
4. Mississippi Democrats draw line between civil rights and gay
rights
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
5. Tammy Baldwin Addresses Demo Convention
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
6. Gay Contributions Now Major Source of Money to Democrats
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
7. [NGLTF Press] National Day of Protest against BSA
From: listmgr@ngltf.org
8. Democratic delegates boo the Boy Scouts of America
From: LGBT Activists List <doug.case@sdsu.edu>
9. Greens Attack Rep. Barney Frnak (fwd)
From: Eva Young <eyoung@biosci.cbs.umn.edu>
10. Fwd: Re: [SDDC-Board] Democratic delegates boo the Boy Scouts of
America
From: Doug Case <doug.case@sdsu.edu>

Message: 1

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 06:48:48 -0700

From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>

Subject: Gay Alabama Delegate

Huntsville Times, August 17, 2000

Box 1437 - West Station, Huntsville, AL, 35807

(Fax 205-532-4420) (E-MAIL: htimes@htimes.com)

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

<http://www.al.com/news/huntsville/Aug2000/17-e2090.html>

Gay delegate waves banner for Alabama

David White says others make him feel 'like a member of the family'

By JOHN ANDERSON, Times Political Editor

LOS ANGELES -- Much has been made of the Alabama delegation to the Democratic National Convention this week because the group is led by a black,

Joe Reed of Montgomery.

But history is also being made with the seating of another delegate.

David White of Birmingham is the first openly gay delegate from Alabama

to attend either major party's national political convention.

His reception among Alabama delegates "has been fantastic," White said

on the convention floor Wednesday night as he clutched, and later waved,

the rainbow banner, the flag adopted by gays and lesbians as their standard.

"They've treated me like a member of the family," he said. "I couldn't be happier."

"Democrats are nice people," White said. "They tend to be more inclusive."

White, who works for Blue Cross-Blue Shield insurance, is president of

the Gay and Lesbian Alliance of Alabama. "Our goal: just to be treated

like everyone else."

The only bad reaction he's gotten here has been from national reporters, White said, who've asked if any crosses have been burned in his yard.

"That bothers me because their impression of Alabama is (worse) than it

really is," he said. "I really believe that the majority of Alabamians

believe everyone should be treated the same."

But Alabama Democrats' likely ambivalence about emphasizing gay rights at home was reflected by Amy Burks, a vice president of the state party, when she overheard a reporter asking a colleague to take a photograph of White in front of the Alabama convention banner.

"He's only one delegate," Burks said with a frown.

White is one of 212 gays and lesbians attending the Democratic convention, he said, up from 130 homosexual delegates at the 1996 convention.

Message: 2

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 06:50:15 -0700

From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>

Subject: NYT: Democrats, Family Values and an American Dream For Gays

New York Times Syndicate, August 17, 2000

Democrats, Family Values and an American Dream For Gays

By CHUCK COLBERT

What a difference two weeks and the Democratic Party make.

"I am honored to speak here as a gay American," said Elizabeth Birch, executive director of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation's largest gay-rights advocacy organization.

Birch made history this week as the first leader of a gay group to address a national political convention. Standing at the podium before a prime-time television audience and thousands of delegates -- including more than 200 who were gay and lesbian -- Birch appealed to the heart of the nation.

Poised and articulate, she spoke of real family values, of "healing the fractures -- soothing the wounds -- to making our American family truly whole."

The mother of twins, Birch spoke directly and poignantly to parents who have gay and lesbian children: "To parents -- some of whom have left their gay children at the margins of family life and out of a vision of America

--

I say this: I want you to know that your gay children are gifted and strong.

All are heroic in that they have conquered barriers to their own self-respect."

Birch's speech was all about breaking down the barriers of discrimination, dismantling the walls of intolerance and opening closet doors.

Her prime-time address underscores the vast difference between our two major political parties on civil rights for gays.

"On nearly every issue, Al Gore is in agreement with the Human Rights Campaign," Birch said. "He supports the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which would ban workplace discrimination based on sexual orientation. He is an outspoken supporter of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act."

While she emphasized Al Gore's and Joe Lieberman's endorsements of such legislation, the Democratic Party platform could not be any stronger in articulating an entirely different approach to gay civil rights than that of the GOP: "We continue to lead the fight to end discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion, age, ethnicity, disability and sexual orientation.

We support the full inclusion of gay and lesbian families in the life of the nation."

That statement of principle implies ending workplace discrimination, enacting hate crimes legislation and lifting the ban on gays in the military -- even a variety of domestic partnership benefits.

Meanwhile, the language of the GOP platform reinforces the walls of intolerance, bolsters the politics of separate and unequal and keeps those closet doors shut: "We do not believe sexual preference should be given legal protection or standing in law."

That unambiguous statement implies support for the Boy Scouts discriminatory policy toward gays, support for "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," as well as support for the Defense of Marriage Act, along with its contempt for gay and lesbian couples, parenting and adoption.

Two weeks ago in Philadelphia, the closest George W. Bush came to dismantling barriers was when, during his acceptance speech, he said: "When these problems aren't confronted, it builds a wall within our nation.

On
the
other side of the wall are poverty and prison, addiction and despair.
And
my
fellow Americans, we must tear down that wall," he said

Yet George W. failed to acknowledge the walls his party and its
policies
uphold -- barriers to true compassion for gays and our full
participation
and
inclusion in the American dream.

Birch had one word for the GOP party platform: "shameful." In
describing George W. and his running mate, Dick Cheney, she said: "They

practice silent apathy in the face of hatred and call it leadership.

They
forgo invective but embrace indifference and call it compassionate
conservatism.

"... Deep within their hearts, they know this to be true, that not
a
single gay American seeks special rights or favored treatment. We seek
simple equality -- the equal right to work, raise a family, serve our
country
in every way and be free from the shackles of brutality and hate."

Several months ago here in Boston, I asked Birch about her
organization's
support and enthusiasm for Al Gore.

"With 5 percent of the electorate nationwide, the gay vote is a
significant slice of the electorate," she said. This is especially
true
in
Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

"We
cannot be complacent, and we must elect Al Gore," she added.

Asked about her wish list for gay Americans under a Gore presidency
and
Democratic control of the House of Representatives, Birch said: "My
dream
list is everything short of marriage."

"We are such stuff as dreams are made on," said Prospero in William

Shakespeare's "The Tempest." Equal rights for everyone -- including
gays
--

is the right stuff of a fully inclusive American dream. It's a dream
worth
fighting for. It's a dream worth our Democratic votes on Election Day.

??½ Chuck Colbert is a divinity student at the Weston Jesuit School
of
Theology, located in Cambridge, Mass. He serves on the board of the
National
Lesbian and Gay Journalists Association.

Message: 3

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 06:51:19 -0700

From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>

Subject: Gay Democrats enjoy unprecedented visibility

San Francisco Examiner, August 16, 2000

P. O. Box 7260, San Francisco, CA, 94120

(Fax 415-512-1264) (E-MAIL: letters@examiner.com)

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

Gay Democrats enjoy unprecedented visibility

Convention spotlight on speakers, issues

Judy Holland, Examiner Washington Bureau

LOS ANGELES -- When Jim Kolbe, the only openly gay Republican House member, spoke at his party's national convention in Philadelphia, a handful

of delegates showed their disapproval by removing their hats, bowing their

heads and praying for his salvation.

By contrast, the Democrats are giving prime time to advocates of gay

and

abortion rights.

Tuesday, Elizabeth Birch, a lesbian mother of twins and president of

the

Human Rights Campaign, the nation's largest gay and lesbian political group,

delivered an impassioned plea for equality and acceptance.

"We seek simple equality -- the equal right to work, raise a family,

serve our country in every way and be free from the shackles of brutality

and

hate," she said.

Birch also addressed parents who have not been able to accept their gay children.

"I want you to know that your gay children are gifted and strong," she

said. "All are heroic in the way they have conquered barriers to their own

self-respect. Many have suffered cruelty or violence. Some serve their

communities with leadership and grace. Many are rich in faith, and have

a

deep love for this nation and democracy. Tens of thousands have served

with
distinction in the armed services. Many have lost their lives."

Kate Michelman, president of the National Abortion and Reproductive
Rights Action League, followed Birch on the podium, warning that the
1973

Roe
vs. Wade Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion could depend on
this
election's outcome.

"A woman's right to choose took a century to win," she said. "But
it
could be lost in only one day -- Election Day."

She added, "Today, that freedom hangs in the balance of a closely
divided
court. If he has the opportunity, George W. Bush will appoint enough
Supreme

Court justices to overturn Roe vs. Wade and end legal abortion. At
every
opportunity, Gov. Bush has made clear his intent to restrict a woman's
right

to choose. He is one of the nation's most anti-choice governors."

Juanita Owens, a lesbian and a San Francisco School Board member and

candidate for the Board of Supervisors, praised the efforts of the
Democratic

candidates to outlaw discrimination against gay workers. "When Al Gore
and

Joe Lieberman occupy the White House, they will put an end to unfair,
unproductive and un-American persecution in the workplace," she told
delegates.

At least 200 gay delegates are attending the convention. Other gays
on
the official agenda are Rep. Tammy Baldwin, D-Wis., who spoke Tuesday
about

health care; Rep. Barney Frank, D-Mass.; Andrew Tobias, national
treasurer

for the Democratic National Committee, and Gloria Nicito, a Democratic
committeewoman at-large from New Mexico.

Message: 4

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 06:54:43 -0700

From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>

Subject: Mississippi Democrats draw line between civil rights and gay
rights

Commercial Appeal, August 16, 2000

P. O. Box 334, Memphis, TN, 38101

(Fax 901-529-6445) (E-MAIL: letters@gomemphis.com)
(<http://www.gomemphis.com/>)

Mississippi Democrats draw line between civil rights and gay rights
The Associated Press

As a black man who grew up in the Mississippi Delta, David Jordan knows the sting of racial bigotry and the importance of civil rights. But gay

rights? To Jordan, that's something completely different.

Like almost every member of Mississippi's delegation to the Democratic National Convention, he's opposed to gay civil unions, an idea supported by gay men and lesbians who say they are the discrimination victims of this

era.

"What they're talking about is their own creation. It's much different than what me and my ancestors struggled for," said Jordan, a state senator from Greenwood.

Gay rights groups are hosting daily parties during the convention and well-known homosexuals are on the convention program. Openly lesbian rock singer Melissa Etheridge was to sing a patriotic medley Monday on the opening day of the four-day convention. Rep. Tammy Baldwin, a lesbian from Wisconsin, is to address the convention this week.

There are about 200 openly gay delegates at the convention, but none are Mississippians.

In Mississippi, homosexuals who are open about their orientation fear they will be fired or their businesses would suffer, said Eddie Sandifer of Jackson, director of the Mississippi Gay and Lesbian Alliance.

Sandifer said he expects homosexuals to gain more understanding from

civil rights trailblazers. "They've been there," he said. "They've been

on that trail. They have felt the sting of discrimination." "There are some parallels, although African-Americans suffered much worse

and longer before they won their rights," said David Ingebretsen, director of

the American Civil Liberties Union in Mississippi. "The lesson of the civil rights movement is all people ought to be treated equally and fairly, regardless of race, religion or gender preference."

Mississippi policy-makers have aggressively opposed the gay rights

agenda. In 1997, the Legislature banned gay couples from marrying.
This
year, lawmakers made Mississippi the third state to ban adoptions by gay
people.

At the Republican National Convention, some Texas delegates removed
their
cowboy hats and bowed their heads in prayer when Rep. Jim Kolbe of
Arizona,
an acknowledged homosexual, addressed the convention.

Mississippi delegate Vallena Greer, a college professor from
Jackson,
said that while she would not do anything to make the party look bad,
she
could not condone homosexuality.

Message: 5

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 06:56:07 -0700
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
Subject: Tammy Baldwin Addresses Demo Convention

Capital Times, August 16, 2000
Box 8060, Madison, WI, 53708
(Fax 608-252-6445) (E-MAIL: tetvoice@captimes.madison.com)
(<http://www.madison.com/>)

Baldwin cheered as she pleads for health care for all
By John Nichols The Capital Times

It's not often that a first-term member of the U.S. House is invited
to
address a national political party convention.

But Rep. Tammy Baldwin of Madison got her invitation to the podium
of
the
Democratic National Convention Tuesday, and she seized it to push for
universal health care programs that would go far beyond anything
contained
in
the party platform.

"I ask you: If you are not for health care for all, then who would
you
leave behind?" she asked.

Baldwin delivered a short but intensely personal address in which
she
said, "Like most people, I didn't learn about health care from a policy
manual. I learned about long-term care from a chair next to my
grandmother's

bed."

Noting that 45 million Americans have no health care coverage at all, and that thousands of additional Americans lack adequate coverage, Baldwin told delegates, "There are some cynics who say there are no differences between the parties. Well, I invite those cynics to talk with the people I represent."

After reviewing the case histories of several friends and constituents, Baldwin returned to her core theme: that Democrats need to propose sweeping health care reforms in order to get disenchanted and disengaged voters to the polls.

"Let us help them find their voices," she said. "Al Gore and Joe Lieberman and the Democratic Party will lead the way."

For Baldwin, a fresh face in the party, has been feted by Emily's List, a group that provides campaign funds for women candidates, and numerous gay and lesbian groups.

The first open lesbian elected to the House was greeted by loud cheers not just from the Wisconsin delegation but from delegations throughout the hall.

"We organized everyone to get down here and cheer Tammy," said New Hampshire Sen. Rick Trombly, a leader of the large gay and lesbian contingent at this convention.

A group of Republican National Convention delegates bowed their heads and prayed when openly gay U.S. Rep. Jim Kolbe addressed that event.

"At this convention, everyone is proud of Tammy Baldwin," Trombly said.

"When we heard she was going to speak, we knew we had to be here for her."

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 07:12:32 -0700
From: Brian Polejes <bpolejes@jps.net>
Subject: Gay Contributions Now Major Source of Money to Democrats

Washington Post, August 18, 2000
1150 15th Street NW, Washington, DC, 20071
(E-Mail: letterstoed@washpost.com) (<http://washingtonpost.com/>)
<http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A46806-2000Aug17.html>

Gay Contributions Now Major Source of Money to Democrats

By Ruth Marcus, Washington Post Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES ? ? ? Elizabeth Birch, executive director of the Human Rights

Campaign, had a clear message for the gay and lesbian crowd sipping cocktails around the palm tree-lined pool on the rooftop of the Wyndham Bel Age hotel here Saturday night.

"Please," she exhorted them. "Get out your checkbooks."

In the 2000 campaign, the gay community has written more and bigger checks than ever before, making "pink money," as it is known, one of the

most important financial sources for the Democratic Party.

In all, gays have contributed about \$5 million this election to the Democratic National Committee alone -- a total that puts them among the top tier of Democratic givers, along with unions, trial lawyers, and the Jewish community. Vice President Gore tapped into the gay community to bring another several million dollars into his presidential campaign, making it a significant source of funds among the \$48 million raised for his campaign.

"Gay money has always gone to the Democratic Party in large numbers," said David Smith, communications director for the Human Rights Campaign,

the nation's largest gay and lesbian political organization. "It just has never been identified in a gay wrapping so the party became very clear about how much money is coming from the gay community."

In one concrete manifestation of that change, Vice President Gore invited Birch and her partner, Recording Industry Association of America President Hilary B. Rosen, to sit in his box during his acceptance speech tonight.

Birch also addressed delegates in prime time Tuesday night, the first leader of a gay organization to speak at a national political convention, invoking her partner and the twins they recently adopted.

As recently as 1988, gay money was handled with care, so potentially radioactive that the Michael S. Dukakis presidential campaign spurned an offer from gay leaders to raise \$1 million for his race. But with gays more politically active over issues such as AIDS fundings and domestic partnerships, national Democrats have increasingly embraced their cause -- and chased their dollars.

In 1992, gay rights activist David B. Mixner brought in more than \$3.5 million for the presidential campaign of his old friend, Bill Clinton. "That truly was the first time really that the community gained recognition as a major factor in the funding of campaigns, and that changed everything for us," he recalled. "Chairs were put at the table and they said, 'Join us.'"

Now, gay money has come fully out of the closet. The Democratic National Committee's treasurer, financial writer Andrew Tobias, is gay, and has made fundraising from the community a major focus. The party has an outreach director for gay and lesbian issues, and two full-time staffers devoted to fundraising from gay community.

For the 2000 race, the DNC set up a new Gay and Lesbian Victory Council for those who gave \$10,000 and up. It now has almost 100 donors, and about 13 members of the party's "Jefferson Trust," for \$100,000 givers, are openly gay. One donor, Quark software founder Tim Gill, gave \$250,000. The party has had about seven big-ticket fundraisers aimed at the gay community from Los Angeles to East Hampton, featuring President Clinton, Hillary Rodham Clinton, and Vice President Gore.

Also for the first time this election cycle, the party sent out direct mail fundraising letters explicitly targeting the gay community. "On one issue in particular -- gay and lesbian civil rights -- the contrast between the two parties could hardly be more stark," Tobias wrote. "The Democratic Party has truly 'gotten it.' We are an explicit part of the Democratic vision, a welcome member of the team."

The gay community's political and financial relationship with the Republican Party is far shakier. Gay Republicans say the party's

attitude
has evolved and improved since 1992, when Pat Buchanan launched a
culture
wars assault at the GOP convention in Houston, and since 1996, when GOP
nominee Bob Dole returned a contribution from the Log Cabin Republicans,
a
gay group.

After some back and forth, Texas Gov. George W. Bush last spring
became
the first Republican nominee to meet with a group of gay Republicans,
saying,
"I welcome gay Americans into my campaign."

This year's GOP convention in Philadelphia featured the first-ever
reception for gay politicians, and openly gay Rep. Jim Kolbe addressed
the
convention on trade, though some in the Texas delegation removed their
hats
and bowed their heads in silent protest as he spoke. But the party's
platform committee kept in language opposing civil rights protections
for
those discriminated against for "sexual preference" despite efforts by
the
Bush campaign to remove it.

Financially, support for the GOP from gays has been slow. "On the
money
side it is still hard for us to raise a lot of money in the gay
community
for
Republicans," said Rich Tafel, executive director of the Log Cabin
Republicans, which has 11,000 members. "The calculus in the Republican
party
is different. They're much more worried about the political fallout
from
social conservatives. It's an untapped resource right now."

But Tafel said even GOP politicians are seeing the financial
potential
of
the gay community. "Politicians now look at the gay community as a
donor
community in both parties," he said. "As soon as we have a meeting,
candidates say, 'I'm with you' but it's not long after that they say,
'We
really have to do a fundraiser.' "

The Log Cabin Republicans raised \$40,000 for Arizona Sen. John
McCain's
presidential campaign last year after his campaign manager, Rick Davis,
addressed the group by satellite at fundraisers in Boston, Chicago,
Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York, Seattle and Washington. Tafel said
the
group's political action committee is hoping to raise \$200,000 in
contributions this year, compared with \$56,000 four years ago.

The money on the Democratic side is far bigger. While it is
bipartisan,
the Human Rights Campaign contributed more than \$920,000 to candidates

last election, nearly 90 percent to Democrats, and expects to exceed \$1 million this year. The group, which has also endorsed Gore, will spend another \$2.5 million dispatching 50 field organizers to work full-time on key congressional and Senate races as well as the presidential contest.

In an effort to make sure that gay voters are energized to get to the polls as well as to give, Massachusetts Rep. Barney Frank three years ago founded the National Stonewall Democratic Federation to link gay Democratic groups across the country. "Gay money is fungible," Frank said. "Gay votes are not."

The attention lavished on the gay community at the convention here could not have been more open. Virginia Sen. Charles Robb and New York Rep. Charles Rangel stopped by the Human Rights Campaign event Saturday night. House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt addressed a brunch Sunday morning. Hillary Clinton and vice presidential nominee Joseph I. Lieberman stopped by the gay and lesbian caucus, which includes 213 delegates.

On the convention floor Monday, E-trade President Kathy Levinson, who gave \$100,000 to the DNC, was attending her first convention, wearing an

"It's the Supreme Court, Stupid" pin. "This election," she said, "is probably the most important election of my lifetime thus far and maybe ever."

Message: 7

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 12:14:04 -0400

From: listmgr@ngltf.org

Subject: [NGLTF Press] National Day of Protest against BSA

NATIONAL GAY AND LESBIAN TASK FORCE
PRESS RELEASE

Contact:

David Elliot, Communications Director

202-332-6483 ext. 3303

800-757-6476 pager

delliot@nglhf.org

<http://www.nglhf.org>

1700 Kalorama Road NW, Washington, DC

RALLIES IN 19 STATES PLUS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO PROTEST BOY SCOUTS' DISCRIMINATORY POLICY

Aug. 18, 2000 - Activists will rally in 36 communities in 19 states and Washington, D.C. Monday, Aug. 21 as part of a National Day of Protest against the Boy Scouts of America's (BSA) policy of discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people.

Organized by the national group Scouting For All, the protests come as an increasing number of governmental entities, United Way chapters and private corporations are moving to end sponsorship or funding of local Boy Scout troops because of the national policy of discrimination on the basis of sexual

orientation. According to Scouting For All, the City of Chicago, public school districts in San Francisco and San Diego and United Way chapters in Massachusetts Bay, New Haven, Conn., Portland, ME and Santa Fe, N.M. all have moved to cut funding or end sponsorship. In addition, private corporations such as JP Morgan, Wells Fargo Bank and Levi Strauss have cut funding, and several churches, including the United Methodist Church, the Episcopal Church and the United Church of Christ have called on the Boy Scouts of America to drop its policy and instead model inclusion and respect.

The U.S. Supreme Court earlier this summer in *Dale v. Boy Scouts of America* ruled 5-4 that BSA has a legal right to discriminate. The BSA's refusal to end its discriminatory policy following that ruling led the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force to urge President Clinton to sever his ties with the Boy Scouts of America. BSA's inaction also led U.S. Rep. Lynn Woolsey (D-CA) and others to introduce legislation - known as the Scouting for All Act - that would revoke the Boy Scouts' Congressional charter.

"We commend Scouting For All's efforts to end the Boy Scouts' discriminatory policy," said NGLTF Executive Director Elizabeth Toledo. "Those who value the good things Scouting would have to offer in a positive atmosphere of inclusion must speak up for change. Meanwhile, we can tell the Scouts that if you discriminate, you will not do so with public dollars or public support."

Monday's protests will take place in the states of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Washington and in Bethesda, on the outskirts of Washington, D.C. In most cases, protests will take place at Boy Scouts' local headquarters. For information regarding the site of the protests and local contacts, please visit www.scoutingforall.org and click on the "Action Alert Information

Center,"
then click on the list of protest sites.

Founded in 1973, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force works to eliminate prejudice, violence and injustice against gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people at the local, state and national level. As part of a broader social justice movement for freedom, justice and equality, NGLTF is creating a world that respects and celebrates the diversity of human expression and identity where all people may fully participate in society.

This message was issued by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Communications Department. If you have a question regarding this post, please direct it to the contact at the top of this message.

To reach the NGLTF Communications Department at NGLTF, please call David Elliot, Communications Director, at 202-332-6483 x3303 or pager 800-757-6476 or email delliot@ngltf.org.

If you wish to UNSUBSCRIBE from this list, please send an email message with your request to listmgr@ngltf.org.

Message: 8
Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 16:28:02 -0700
From: LGBT Activists List <doug.case@sdsu.edu>
Subject: Democratic delegates boo the Boy Scouts of America

Washington Times
August 18, 2000
<http://www.washingtontimes.com>

Democratic delegates boo the Boy Scouts of America

By Valerie Richardson
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

LOS ANGELES - When Gloria Johnson learned that a group of Eagle Scouts was about to take the stage at the Democratic National Convention, she immediately went into action.

She and other California delegates grabbed poster board and markers and made signs that read, "We Support Gay Boy Scouts." As the uniformed Scouts took part in the opening ceremony, the delegates, seated in the front of the hall, waved their signs - and booed.

Under normal circumstances, jeering at children is the sort of behavior that might get a delegate sanctioned, if not booted from the convention altogether. But anyone who expected the Democratic leadership to scold the Boy Scouts of America bashers is attending the wrong convention.

Support for homosexual rights has become an integral part of the Democratic orthodoxy, as unassailable as the party's pro-choice or civil rights planks. Since the Supreme Court ruled that the Boy Scouts can ban homosexual leaders, the Democrats have sided squarely with homosexuals in condemning the decision.

Indeed, Democratic National Committee spokesman Rick Hess was careful to avoid criticizing either the Boy Scouts or the delegates, instead stressing that the party is staunchly committed to homosexual rights. "Most Democrats support the work the Boy Scouts do," said Mr. Hess. "At the same time, we want to see gays and lesbians treated with respect. Democrats across the board support equal rights for gays and lesbians and we want to make sure they're not discriminated against."

The Boy Scouts, meanwhile, were shocked by the negative reception. The Los Angeles Council of Boy Scouts sent a half-dozen Eagle Scouts and an adult leader to the event at the request of Democratic organizers, said council spokesman Joey Robinson.

"I think whatever the national policy is, the kids don't set the policy. When you boo the policy, you're booing the kids," said Mr. Robinson.

Fortunately, he said, the Staples Center was so noisy during the Tuesday night ceremony that none of the boys heard the booing, although the adult leader did.

Delegates who participated in protesting the Boy Scouts yesterday said they had nothing against the boys, but wanted to send a message to the Democratic Party for inviting the Scouts.

"Of course, we're not against the kids - it isn't about them," said California delegate Craig Christensen. "But there were groups that could have been picked that haven't been so blatantly discriminatory. . . . It was a thoughtless thing to do."

Alex Mallonee, a California delegate who didn't participate in the demonstration, said he sympathized with the homosexual delegates.

"I think it was odd that they had the Boy Scouts up there, given the situation," he said. "It was pretty insensitive."

This year's convention has almost twice as many homosexual delegates as the 1996 gathering, thanks to recruiting efforts by the national party. Mr. Christensen said there are 212 openly homosexual delegates at this year's convention, up from 125 four years ago.

Delegates give credit to the DNC, which instructed state parties to work on making their delegations reflect their states' minority composition. For many states, that meant setting "targets," which are different from quotas, Democrats insisted.

When states submit their delegation plans, the DNC asks them to have their delegations look as much like their voters as possible," said Mr. Hess. "This is wholly different from quotas - this is Colin Powell-type recruitment."

In California, that meant setting "targets" of 5 percent homosexual men and 5 percent homosexual women. The California delegation ended up with 34 openly homosexual delegates, the largest concentration of any state.

Delegate Jeri Dilno said the state party would have appointed homosexual delegates if the caucuses fell short of those goals. "A friend of mine was appointed that way the last time [in 1996]," she said.

The Georgia delegation also set a goal of 5 percent and met it by electing five openly homosexual delegates out of 105, said delegate Annette

Hatton.

Wisconsin delegate Jane Fee, 73, who was born a man but has been taking female hormones and dressing like a woman for the past dozen years, said he "came as part of the female quota." But since he never had a sex-change operation, he acknowledged he fulfills the Democratic sex quotas all by himself.

"Actually, the diversity that we show in the Democratic Party, whether it's by quota or not, indicates that we really are interested in having all of America represented by the party," said Mr. Fee, a father and grandfather who used to be known as James.

As for the Boy Scouts, Miss Hatton added that she never heard any booing during the ceremony, although other delegates and news accounts reported booing.

Michael Perez, chairman of the National Stonewall Democratic Federation, called the protesters "very supportive of the kids."

"We're 100 percent behind the kids," said Mr. Perez. "We don't agree with what their establishment came up with. There are gay Boy Scouts out there, and we want them to know we support them."

Rep. Jennifer Dunn, Washington Republican, didn't see it that way. "The Boy Scouts are revered by most people," she said. "It's the kind of thing that reflects badly on the Democratic Party."

* Bill Sammon contributed to this report.

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

Message: 9

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 17:49:45 -0500 (CDT)
From: Eva Young <eyoung@biosci.cbs.umn.edu>
Subject: Greens Attack Rep.Barney Frnak (fwd)

Subj: Open Letter to Rep. Barney Frank, re the Nader campaign
Date: 8/17/00 4:40:47 AM Central Daylight Time
From: scottmclarty@yahoo.com (Scott McLarty)

"Mr. Frank, shouldnb
candidate in the debates who supports same-sex
marriage?"

OPEN LETTER to Rep. Barney Frank

TO The Honorable Barney Frank
2210 Rayburn Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

FROM Scott McLarty
Spokesman, DC Statehood Green Party
National Media Co-coordinator, Green Campaign
2000 (Association of State Green Parties)
(202) 518-5624
scottmclarty@yahoo.com

Thursday, August 17, 2000

Dear Mr. Frank,

You've written and spoken quite a bit over the last two months in defense of Vice President Al Gore's record and against Ralph Nader's run, with remarks in The Boston Globe, an AP story on July 18th ("Nader Takes Advantage of Spotlight," by Katherine Pfleger), an "Open Letter" to Mr. Nader (July 21), a letter in The Nation (August 21/28), and a response in The Washington Blade on July 28 to an earlier pro-Nader letter by me.

You've apparently taken on the role of progressive Democrat attack dog against the Nader campaign. It's an ugly job, since you, like many of Mr. Nader's new political detractors, admire the man and his career. Noble of you to volunteer.

"Where is Mr. Nader's record on gay rights and abortion?" you ask over and over. In the Blade letter you warn that Ralph Nader's "supporters are not entitled to retroactively to make him into a champion of issues [such as same-sex marriage rights] that he has steadfastly ignored" before the 2000 election.

But no one has claimed for Mr. Nader a history of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender or pro-choice activism. Some of the strongest criticism of Mr. Nader's 1996 dismissal of "gonadal politics" came from Greens (including me). The 1996 campaign was an admittedly limited effort, a forum for Mr. Nader to raise a few vital topics, especially civic participation and corporate domination of the major parties.

In early 2000, Mr. Nader agreed to run a serious campaign, and he embraced a wide range of issues. Of course, Mr. Nader already has a distinguished human rights resume, with books, testimony, organizing of citizens; groups, articles, and funding for books and articles on racial redlining in the insurance and banking industries, environmental racism, nursing home abuse of senior citizens, the land rights of American Indians, racial bias in application of the death penalty, and, most famously, the rights of consumers at the mercy of unscrupulous corporations.

Mr. Nader's unrelenting efforts on behalf of the victims in these cases argues against your assertion in the AP story that the

ever-compromising Mr. Gore "would be a better supporter of civil rights." Mr. Nader undertook them as a private citizen, choosing them according to his expertise, not as a public official with a record of statements and legislation on everything that crosses his desk.

Mr. Frank, do we not welcome Mr. Nader's willingness to speak out on gay rights, abortion, and other topics? Is his sincerity in question? (Is Mr. Nader less sincere than, say, Sen. Joseph Lieberman abandoning school vouchers upon being named Vice Presidential candidate?) Is same-sex marriage so popular now that endorsing it means jumping on a crowded bandwagon? In 1996, the "gonadal politics" remark was a liability to Mr. Nader's campaign. In 2000, "gonadal politics" is a desperate attempt by terrified Gore supporters to discredit growing competition.

Mr. Nader has done what a progressive presidential candidate should be doing. He's uniting people from many different social justice movements. We'd be lucky to win such an election-year conversion, as you call it, from all our national candidates. Mr. Nader reaffirmed his unequivocal support for gay rights most recently on NBC's Meet the Press (Sunday, August 6) in words we will not hear from Vice President Gore:

Interviewer Tim Russert: "Is [Ralph Nader] for gay marriage?"

Nader: "Yes, civil union, and equal rights, equal responsibility."

Russert: "Gay adoptions?"

Nader: "Yes."

Russert: "So are you closer to Al Gore or George Bush?"

Nader: "Way ahead of Al Gore. The point is, we have to have a basic policy in this country of equal rights and equal responsibility, regardless of race, gender, or sexual preference."

Russert: "So the government should recognize gay marriages."

Nader: "Yes. It's really interesting, gay people want to serve in the military, they want to engage in civil unions, or marriage, and they want to adopt kids. If they weren't gay, people would say, well, that's really good to do."

Can we trust Mr. Gore on these issues? Unlike his boss, who entered politics with progressive aspirations, Mr. Gore began his Congressional tenure on an anti-gay and anti-abortion platform. He called homosexuality "abnormal" in 1976, voted against a bill prohibiting anti-gay bias in the Legal Services Corporation in

1980, and voted to override D.C.'s elimination of an anti-sodomy law in 1981. Mr. Gore consistently voted for Reagan-era efforts to roll back abortion rights, especially for the Hyde Amendment and bans on abortion coverage for federal employees.

If this is ancient history, let's consider some compromises and retreats of the past eight years, on gay rights, AIDS, and related issues:

- * The Defense of Marriage Act, signed by President Clinton late in the 1996 election year, citing "moral" objections to same-sex marriage. Mr. Clinton attempted to run radio ads boasting that he kept queers in check. Sen. Lieberman voted for it. Mr. Gore's 2000 gay rights plank stops short of support for same-sex marriage.

- * The "don't ask, don't tell" policy, which resulted in increased military witchhunts. Mr. Gore seems to have backed off on early campaign promises to end it.

- * The lost chance for the Employee Nondiscrimination Act, and lots of other valuable legislation, after Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gore refused to campaign for Democratic candidates for Congress in 1994 and we entered the Age of Gingrich and Lott. (Mr. Nader's run may win Congress back for the Democrats by motivating former nonvoters who are more likely to vote Democrat in other races.)

- * Mr. Clinton's firing of Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders for speaking frankly about sex education. Mr. Clinton signed, with Mr. Gore's encouragement, the Parental Responsibility Act of 1996, blaming unwed and teenage mothers and their lack of sexual restraint for the nation's economic problems. The extent of Mr. Clinton's hypocrisy became apparent in 1998, when all politics became gonadal.

- * The 1996 Welfare Reform Act, which kicked many HIV-infected men off relief. Mr. Gore was the lone proponent in the Clinton cabinet. (The bill, which Mr. Clinton signed, has been especially devastating to the urban poor, according to a Brookings Institution study released a few weeks ago.)

- * Blocked federal funding for needle exchange, despite research proving that it slows the transmission of HIV without encouraging drug use.

- * Refusal to allow use of medical marijuana by patients seeking relief for serious illnesses, despite medical research proving its value.

- * Puerto Rico Governor Pedro Rossello's nomination by Mr. Gore to lead his campaign in Puerto Rico while Gov. Rossello was under investigation for the misappropriation of \$250,000 in federal AIDS funding.

* Threats of trade sanctions against nonwhite developing nations in Africa, South America, and Asia for making low-cost AIDS drugs available to tens of millions of infected people, with Mr. Gore playing a major role in the threat to South Africa as co-chair of the Binational Commission. The policy, a favor to pharmaceutical firms, was rescinded against sub-Saharan nations in early 2000, after protest from AIDS activists, including Greens, at Mr. Gore's pressure from Mr. Nader himself. The policy is still in effect elsewhere, most recently leveled against Brazil and Argentina. Mr. Gore's close personal advisors and fundraisers have included David Beier (lobbyist for Genentech), Tony Podesta (Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association), Tom Downey (Merck), and Peter Knight (Schering-Plough).

* Despite their stated support for the abortion drug RU-486, no effort by Clinton and Gore during their eight years in office to move it through the FDA for approval.

Human rights, Mr. Frank, covers a lot more than gay rights and freedom of choice. If we examine the whole range of rights, all our freedoms and protections, the Clinton-Gore Administration has been a disaster:

* The War on Drugs, with stiffer penalties for nonviolent offenses (release of violent prisoners to make space for marijuana offenders), incarceration of more young people (especially African American and Latino) and their transformation into hardened criminals, military aggression in places like Colombia, attempts to weaken search and seizure protections, wide racial disparities in crack and powder cocaine sentencing.

* Zero tolerance, mandatory sentencing, weakening of judges' discretion in sentencing, more than double the number of wiretaps over the Reagan-Bush years, and the death penalty: Mr. Gore will not suspend federal executions, despite massive evidence through DNA testing that many death row inmates were wrongly convicted.

* The Anti-terrorism Act, sanctioning trials based on secret evidence, weakening habeas corpus and Fourth Amendment protections, as well as providing a pretext to investigate, infiltrate, and harass peaceful and law-abiding grassroots organizations arbitrarily or falsely connected with terrorist activities.

* Military training of urban police forces. The military tactics faced by recent demonstrators against the WTO, IMF/World Bank, and major party conventions poses a frightening question: what would have happened to ACT UP demonstrators and the access to treatment they fought for if ACT UP had faced the police under Clinton-Gore?

None of us, least of all Ralph Nader, believes that Al Goreb Democratic Party is indistinguishable from Bush and the Republicans. But they've converged or come close on major issues: increased military spending and revival of Reaganb missile defense fraud; military aggression ("forward engagement" in the Democratic Platform); cuts in the social safety net (the same platform guts New Deal and Great Society protections); support for international free-trade cabals and their power to override environmental, labor, and human rights laws; trade with China; the death penalty; the War on Drugs; growth of a private prison industry whose profits require incarceration of more and more Americans; more corporate mergers and further concentration of power; murderous sanctions against Iraq; etc., etc. How Mr. Frank, the distinguished progressive Congressman, must burn with jealousy for the Green Party platform (<http://www.gp.org>)!

Each year we're told, vote for the Democrat or the Republican will win, and the Democratic mainstream slips further under the control of corporate elites. Legislation like the Welfare Reform, Anti-terrorism, and Telecommunications Acts get passed that Democrats would never tolerate under a Republican administration. Clinton, Gore, Lieberman, the Democratic Leadership Council, triangulation, and bipartisanship have made the Green Party a historical imperative.

The great ideas in American history usually emerged through renegade third parties: abolitionism, women's suffrage, resistance to the 19th century banks and railroads, even unions, led by Socialists and Anarchists. What are the Democratic Party's great ideas? National health insurance was one, until President Clinton in 1993 jettisoned the Democratic Party's demand for it since 1948. (Greens support it.)

The Greens have a big historical idea. With the fall of Soviet-bloc communism, the 20th century contest between bureaucratic socialism and free-market capitalism faded. Instead of Francis Fukuyama's "End of History" with capitalism triumphant, we discovered a new paradigm: corporate capitalism vs. local human needs, rights, and freedoms and the health of the earth.

The sands have shifted: the latter camp can include entrepreneurial capitalism: family farms threatened by Monsanto and ADM; Main Street "Mom & Pop" businesses driven under by Walmart strip malls. China has allied itself with corporate capitalism as a provider of cheap labor and eager new markets. (Hence the obsolescence of some sectarian Marxist groups, who don't grasp the new alignment nearly as well as do those obnoxious anarchist kids in Seattle, DC, Philly, and LA. In Seattle a few of them trashed Starbucks but spared the independent coffee shop down the street.)

I call it Corporate Planet vs. We the People. The liberalism of the Democratic Party weighs human and environmental needs against

the demands of its corporate sponsors. The Greens, rejecting corporate money, have emerged as the party of We the People.

But all this is secondary to the big September questions: will Ralph Nader be allowed to participate in the presidential debates? Do American voters have the right to be informed about all the choices theyb
millions of Americans who might agree with Mr. Nader's positions have the right to know he agrees with them, and to hear those positions argued with other candidates?

Mr. Frank, shouldn't we have at least one candidate in the debates who supports same-sex marriage?

Gonadally yours,
Scott McLarty

End of Message 8-B

Message: 10

Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 17:18:25 -0700
From: Doug Case <doug.case@sdsu.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Re: [SDDC-Board] Democratic delegates boo the Boy Scouts of America

>Date: Fri, 18 Aug 2000 20:06:02 EDT
>Subject: Re: [SDDC-Board] Democratic delegates boo the Boy Scouts of America
>
>I was part of the mentioned demonstration and we did not boo! I heard no
>booing, and have given an interview to Phil Lavelle of the SD
Union/Tribune
>that our reaction was designed to be respectful. We held up the signs, "We
>support our Gay Scouts," but did not comment. We held them during the
Pledge
>of Allegiance, which I and others recited.
>
>After the National Anthem, Carol Migden took one of the signs and gave an
>interview to a SF TV station. I don't know where the reporter got her
>information. The quote from me is correct, however she never asked me
>anything about the demonstration.
>
>Maybe, someone was booing us?!
>
>Jeri Dilno
>

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa Ferdinando (CN=Lisa Ferdinando/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-SEP-2000 11:30:48.00

SUBJECT: CNN Crossfire, September 4, 2000

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

TO: Kristen A. Triggs (CN=Kristen A. Triggs/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sean P. O'Shea (CN=Sean P. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Matthew T. Schneider (CN=Matthew T. Schneider/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kimberly S. Anderson (CN=Kimberly S. Anderson/OU=OA/O=EOP@EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP@EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Elliott H. Baer (CN=Elliott H. Baer/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Drew T. Gardiner (CN=Drew T. Gardiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Brian A. Reich (CN=Brian A. Reich/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Rachael F. Goldfarb (CN=Rachael F. Goldfarb/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Michael A. Hammer (CN=Michael A. Hammer/OU=NSC/O=EOP@EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Kristina Wolfe (CN=Kristina Wolfe/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet (gamble-bennett@dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Erin K. Greer (CN=Erin K. Greer/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Daniel R. Wilson (CN=Daniel R. Wilson/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:
CNN Crossfire
Aired September 4, 2000 - 7:30 p.m. ET

Will Republicans Hold Onto the U.S. Senate?

BILL PRESS, CO-HOST: ... and Democrats are determined to seize it. New

York, of course, the most talked-about contest, Rick Lazio running neck-and-neck with first lady Hillary Clinton. But there are lots of other races with less pizzazz and just as much at stake, like Missouri and Florida and New Jersey and Delaware.

Tonight, we'll look at as many states as we can squeeze in to find out, whatever happens to the White House, will Republicans hold onto the U.S. Senate? -- Bob.

ROBERT NOVAK, CO-HOST: Bob Shrum, in New York, Hillary Rodham

Clinton, who everybody knows, is running no better than even in a dead heat with Rick Lazio, who nobody knows. And so what is the first lady doing about it? Let's take a look at a commercial and see.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, HILLARY CLINTON CAMPAIGN AD)

NARRATOR: The end to nursing home standards, the largest education cuts in history, the slashing of Medicare by \$270 billion. Who voted for all this? Rick Lazio.

Four years as Newt Gingrich's deputy whip. You won't see that in his ads.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: All...

BOB SHRUM, DEMOCRATIC STRATEGIST: I guess they know a little bit more about him now.

NOVAK: All Hillary knows how to do is attack, attack, attack. Isn't that stale, calling him Newt Gingrich's aide?

SHRUM: Well, first of all, she has run a lot of positive advertising at this point.

That's an ad that defines him. He's running a negative ad about her, which is very inaccurate and very unfair.

But Bob, your premise with which you started, I think, is entirely wrong. Fred Dicker from "The New York Post," who I think you would concede is not exactly a partisan of Hillary Clinton, said the other day that in the polling she's now approaching 70 percent of the vote in New York City. If she wins that 70 percent of the vote, he said, there's no way she can lose the race.

I think you're going to be sitting here doing CROSSFIRE a year from now very, very, very unhappy because you're going to have Senator Clinton in the U.S. Senate from New York.

NOVAK: Well, you know, you say that she was -- he was doing incorrect or inaccurate spots about the first lady. But let's take a look at one that Rick Lazio's running.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP, LAZIO CAMPAIGN AD)

SEN. JOHN MCCAIN (R), ARIZONA: You know, when Mrs. Clinton said she wouldn't take huge special interest soft-money contributions if her opponent wouldn't, I believed her, but since then she's taken in millions in soft money and used it for attack ads distorting Rick Lazio's record.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

NOVAK: Well, I believe John McCain over the Clintons any day, and I think most New Yorkers...

SHRUM: Bob, did you pick which spots you wanted to run, Bob?

NOVAK: Yes.

SHRUM: You didn't pick the one that they just put on the air that Mike Murphy made that at the end...

NOVAK: What do you think...

SHRUM: Well, I like John McCain. He's out there trying to be a good Republican...

NOVAK: Well, isn't he right? Isn't he right?

SHRUM: ... so that when George Bush loses, John McCain can run for president.

NOVAK: Don't change the subject, Bob. Didn't -- didn't he really tell the truth on that?

SHRUM: You know, Bob, you are so hypocritical on the issue of campaign finance reform it's unbelievable. You don't want Rick Lazio to support the McCain-Feingold bill to ban soft-money, do you? You're for soft money. You're for no campaign limits. You're for no campaign reform.

If people in New York want campaign reform, they ought to vote for Hillary Clinton.

NOVAK: You just evaded the question.

PRESS: Yes. Ed Gillespie, the rest of that spot, if we see the rest of the McCain spot, it says that Rick Lazio is the only one you can trust on campaign reform.

And yet, Hillary Clinton has challenged Rick Lazio to say no soft money in this race, she'll use no soft money in advertising if he agrees, and he refuses. So he's the one who's being a hypocrite, right?

ED GILLESPIE, REPUBLICAN STRATEGIST: Actually, there's zero soft money being taken on the Republican side by Rick Lazio.

(CROSSTALK)

PRESS: ... groups.

GILLESPIE: Bill, Hillary Clinton has four soft-money accounts running right now, running ads against Rick Lazio, and Rick Lazio has zero. Now, where's the hypocrisy there?

PRESS: There are other Republican groups, you know, and Hillary has said no

soft money. He's disagreed. So just your take on the New York race, in the can for Hillary?

GILLESPIE: In the can for Hillary!

(LAUGHTER)

In the toilet for Hillary I think is the problem. The fact is if you're right now Hillary Clinton running even in the state of New York with the Democratic advantage that that registration in that shows, you've got a real problem. And the fact is that Rick Lazio, as people get to see him, the more they see him, the more they like him.

PRESS: Let's go to a neighboring state: New Jersey. Jon Corzine spend \$34 million, or \$35 million to win, or buy, the primary -- whatever you prefer -- up against Bob Franks, a representative.

With that kind of money and Corzine certainly to spend -- certain to spend at least that much if not more, isn't Bob Franks just doing the party a favor by being the sacrificial lamb?

GILLESPIE: Actually, I know a little something about this because I'm from New Jersey, a New Jersey native. I just got back from there, and my family are Franks supporter. My family swings back and forth. They're a good focus group.

The fact is that Corzine, according to "The New York Times" -- no friends of Republicans -- says that Corzine has a socialist streak as wide as Wall Street. He is way to the left of New Jersey voters. Bob Franks is right down the middle, where most New Jersey voters are. It's a swing state, as you know. And the fact is that Franks is likely to win that seat right now.

SHRUM: Can I -- I know your definition of a prescription drug benefit for all seniors under Medicare, but moving step by step toward universal access to health insurance, starting with all children,

registering all guns is socialism.

That's your definition of socialism. I think in New Jersey those are mainstream positions, that Jon Corzine is going to win that race.

GILLESPIE: The fact is, look, Bob -- this is "The New York Times" saying this.

"The New York Times" is to the left me, believe me. When they say socialist, their definition is further than I am.

The fact is that Franks has a record that is completely consistent with New Jersey, and people in New Jersey resent the notion when...

(CROSSTALK)

... and trying to buy a seat. They're not going to sell a Senate seat in New Jersey.

SHRUM: He's lived in New Jersey for 25 years, and they don't like the fact that Bob Franks voted to slash Medicare.

GILLESPIE: Bob Franks never voted to slash Medicare.

SHRUM: He most certainly did.

GILLESPIE: He never did.

NOVAK: Bob, let me -- let me...

(CROSSTALK)

(LAUGHTER)

Let's look at the politics of this. As you know, the polls show that after this big lead that Corzine had to begin with, it's tightening up right now. And you know, your candidate Mr. Corzine is so tongue-tied that he lost "The New York Times" endorsement in the primary when he fouled up in the session with the editorial board. Isn't that why Corzine refuses to debate Bob Franks?

SHRUM: First of all, they had four debates in the primary. He has challenged Bob Franks to have three statewide televised debates, and Franks keeps saying, no, no, no, I want to have 21 debates in 21 counties. Let's have four -- three debates

televised now. Let's schedule them. Let's them go in front of the people.

But let me tell you something, Jon Corzine's argument -- argument to the people of New Jersey, Jon Corzine's argument to the people of New Jersey is that people want a prescription drug benefit, they want a patients' bill of rights...

NOVAK: All right. Well, you made your point...

SHRUM: ... and -- yes, and I'm going to continue to make one other point. The fact is that Bob Franks stood with Newt Gingrich and voted to cut Medicare by \$270 billion. And you guys have double-talk way to try to get out of that.

(CROSSTALK)

GILLESPIE: Bob Shrum, let's (UNINTELLIGIBLE) facts (UNINTELLIGIBLE) on the table. There was not a single year in Congress that Bob Franks voted where the next year's spending on Medicare wasn't going to be higher than the existing year. And you know that's the facts.

SHRUM: But there were -- we had this argument before...

GILLESPIE: You know that's the facts.

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: But that's like...

(CROSSTALK)

No, I'm not moving on. I'm going to say it, because that is a false argument.

GILLESPIE: It is not a false argument.

SHRUM: That is like saying we can have the same budget...

GILLESPIE: It is a fact.

SHRUM: ... we had in 1930 and that wouldn't constitute a cut.

GILLESPIE: It is a fact.

SHRUM: In education spending it would, because there are more kids going to school. More seniors on Medicare.

(CROSSTALK)

NOVAK: We're going to move on to Pennsylvania, where the Republican senator, first-term senator, Rick Santorum is considered very vulnerable. Last poll I saw he's 20 points ahead of Congressman Klink, the Democratic senator.

And what it is -- and I think, Bob, you and I can agree on some of these things. I think you'll agree that because Congressman Klink is pro-life and pro-gun that your people are cutting him in Pennsylvania, and that's what the Democratic Party is, if you don't pass the litmus test...

SHRUM: No. Actually, that's not true, and the truth is that there are major fund-raisers across the country who are involved in raising money for Ron Klink.

You know, you guys keep wanting to talk about poll numbers, not issues. Rick Santorum is going to get in trouble in that race. He's going to get in trouble in that race because he's been against a patients' bill of rights, he's been against a prescription drug benefit under Medicare for seniors.

NOVAK: You...

SHRUM: I know, Bob, I have this disturbing habit of talking about issues.

NOVAK: Well, you -- that's the only issue you want to talk about.

SHRUM: Yes.

GILLESPIE: Let's talk about another issues. Let's talk about...

(CROSSTALK)

... that it was Senator Rick Santorum who led the charge for a Social Security lockbox to keep Bill Clinton and the rest of the Democrats in Congress from raiding the Social Security trust fund for more wasteful

Washington spending.

And for that reason and that reason alone right now,
because of Rick Santorum's
efforts, that we have fenced off Social Security surplus
money from wasteful
Washington spending. That's (UNINTELLIGIBLE) that's a
fact.

SHRUM: Ed, you would cite almost anything. It's Bill
Clinton who proposed a
Social Security lockbox.

GILLESPIE: No, he didn't. No, he did not.

SHRUM: It certainly is.

GILLESPIE: He said he wanted to fence off 65 percent of
it...

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: No, no. No. No, no.

And it's Bill Clinton...

(CROSSTALK)

... who wants to use the surplus for Social Security and
Rick Santorum who
wants to use it in a tax cut for the wealthy that will
wreck the economy.

PRESS: Moving down the Eastern Seaboard to the
Commonwealth of Virginia,
Chuck Robb up in a tough fight. Everybody, I think,
agrees that the -- we would
agree he's maybe the most endangered Democrat. Tough
fight against former
Governor George Allen. But Robb's been underestimated
before.

I remember, everybody said he was going to lose to Ollie
North. If he beat Ollie
North -- if he beat Ollie North, he sure can beat former
Governor George Allen.

GILLESPIE: No, George Allen is a very strong candidate.
He was the architect
of the resurgence of Virginia. He's the one who pretty
much started the notion
that Virginia was going to be a high-tech capital just
like Austin and just like
Silicon Valley. The Dominion -- Silicon Dominion was
partly his doing. And the

fact is that he's very popular with the voters of Virginia. And he is going to win in November. And he's up five points right now, by all accounts.

PRESS: And he's already -- he's already been accused in the "Washington Post" editorial this week of distorting Robb's record on tax spending...

GILLESPIE: "Washington Post"?

PRESS: Yeah -- but...

GILLESPIE: Came out against the Republicans?

PRESS: ... distorting the record on tax cuts...

GILLESPIE: I'm shocked.

PRESS: ... distorting the record on abortion, distorting the record on military pay. And then yesterday, he says: I'm not going to the Senate to push for school vouchers. I mean, he's even turning offer the conservative supporters in that state, isn't he?

GILLESPIE: No -- well, I happen to be one of them who's a conservative. And I'm excited about Allen.

PRESS: Probably pro-voucher.

GILLESPIE: I am pro-voucher. And I'm excited about George Allen.

PRESS: He's not.

GILLESPIE: He's got plenty of things that I'm for that he's for. And I'm going to vote for him. And so are a lot of other people in Northern Virginia, which is supposed to be Chuck Robb's stronghold.

NOVAK: Bob Shrum, you know, he mentioned -- Bill mentioned the Ollie North race. Ollie North was opposed by Nancy Reagan. He was opposed by Senator John Warner. He was opposed by all the establishment people. None of those people are opposing George Allen. Chuck Robb is history, isn't he?

SHRUM: You know, Bob you told me with back in 1994:
There was no way
Chuck Robb could get reelected. You had a set of reasons
then.

NOVAK: Did I tell you that? You got proof of that?

SHRUM: Yeah, you did. I think you told me on this show,
actually. And the fact
of the matter is that Chuck Robb is you one of the best
candidates I've ever seen
in the last couple of months of an election. He's very
good. I think he's going
carry this case and he's going to win.

NOVAK: You think he's Silky Sullivan, huh?

SHRUM: No, I don't think he's Silky Sullivan. I'll tell
you what he is: He's a
terrific senator who represents kind of Virginia values
of fiscal conservatism
while caring about investing in areas like education.

NOVAK: That's -- well, at least you didn't mention
drugs.

We have got to take a...

SHRUM: I know, Bob, because I thought I would give you
one- minute break.

NOVAK: Thank God. Thank God.

SHRUM: Don't worry, I'll come back to it.

NOVAK: We're going to take a -- we are going to take a
break now.

And when we come back, we are going to talk about some
more ferocious
races: in Michigan, Missouri, and the great state of
Delaware, if we have time.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

NOVAK: Welcome back to CROSSFIRE.

We are going over the hottest races for the U.S. Senate
with two of the hottest
politicians in Washington: Democrat Bob Shrum and
Republican Ed Gillespie --
Bill.

PRESS: Let's move on to the battleground state of

Michigan. Freshman Senator
Spencer Abraham trying to get back in against
Representative Debbie Stabenow
-- battleground state also for Gore and Bush -- close
race -- do you think the top
of the ticket is going to determine this Senate race, Ed?

GILLESPIE: I don't think it is. I think the top of the
ticket, we are going to carry
Michigan, but I think that Spence Abraham is going to
determine this race in the
fact that he has been an effective legislator for
Michigan. He's passed 12 bills in
his own name since coming to Congress. And we have in
him someone who has
demonstrated his ability to win in Michigan, whereas
Stabenow has run twice
and lost statewide.

PRESS: But if Gore can really energize labor -- which it
looks like he's doing
more and more -- I mean, this is the Big Labor state.
Doesn't that give the
Stabenow the advantage?

GILLESPIE: It is a Big Labor state, but Spence Abraham
is a very good
campaigner. And he is aggressively going after
rank-and-file union members.
And I think he is going to get his fair share of them in
November.

NOVAK: Bob Shrum, didn't Congresswoman Stabenow make a
serious mistake
when she allied herself with the know-nothing, racist,
anti-immigration forces,
referring to kind of an insult to the very substantial
Arab-American minority of
which Spence Abraham is a part?

SHRUM: What did she do, Bob?

NOVAK: She allied herself with this -- these terrible
ads against him.

GILLESPIE: FAIR.

NOVAK: FAIR ads. SHRUM: Yeah, I think she has a position
on immigration
reform that I don't happen to agree with. But let me...

NOVAK: Well, I'm glad you said that. It was a mistake.

SHRUM: But let me tell you -- let me tell you something,

it's a bigger mistake --
and Bob, you're going to get mad at me -- that Spence
Abraham is wrong on
prescription drugs, wrong on a patients' bill of rights,
and voted to cut \$270
billion from Medicare to finance a \$270 billion tax cut
for the wealthy.

GILLESPIE: But race-painting ads are OK?

SHRUM: The voters of Michigan -- I don't -- I think it
is quite possible to
disagree with the position of FAIR -- the people who
call themselves immigration
reform -- without assuming that the ads are race
painting. I haven't seen the ads.
I don't know what they say.

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: I think it is perfectly legitimate to take a
position I don't agree with,
which is that we should have less immigration in this
country. I don't agree with
that. But it's a legitimate position.

NOVAK: One of the meanest, nastiest, toughest races in
the country is Missouri,
where Governor Mel Carnahan -- supposedly a popular
governor -- according to
the polls, is running no better than even against
Senator John Ashcroft. How is it
possible that this is the outcome in what should be a
Democratic state?

SHRUM: You know, you love celebrating races where it's
sort of even, or you're
only three behind or only 10 behind.

NOVAK: Well, they're not behind at all.

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: I'm talking about the races. I'm talking about
the Corzine, where you're
10 behind.

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: No, he's not.

GILLESPIE: Yes, he is.

SHRUM: No, he's not. He's 10 behind according to the

latest Penn, Schoen poll.

But let me tell you something, Hillary Clinton...

(CROSSTALK)

SHRUM: Mel Carnahan is going to do a very effective job in that state and in that race. And I think he's going to win. And he's going to win because John

Ashcroft is one of the most reactionary members of the U.S. Senate... NOVAK:

He's against prescription drugs.

SHRUM: ... has consistently voted against working families. I'll give you another one. He was against the Department of Education.

NOVAK: So am I.

SHRUM: He would like to close down the Department of -- I know, Bob, and you couldn't get elected in almost any state in America.

NOVAK: Well, you're right no that.

PRESS: OK. Just moving on again, we've got to go to Delaware. Delaware, little state, but we've got a lot of big interest in Delaware, both me and Bob. Bill Roth up for his sixth term, Ed -- sixth term -- he's already 78 -- going to the well just one two many times against Governor Tom Carper in this race?

GILLESPIE: Absolutely not. This is not Tom Carper's time. The fact is that

Senator Roth has a proven track record. Look, everybody knows the guy's name is in the dictionary -- Roth IRAs -- because of his effectiveness as a legislator.

You know what, this -- the United States Senate was made for a state like Delaware.

And they are going to keep the person who is responsible for the Senate Finance

Committee and chairing that, and who's responsible for Medicare allocations, taxes, and policy in terms of trade, which is very important to a state that's on the border like -- that's on the coast like that.

NOVAK: You know, Bob, I'm a voter in Fenwick Island, Delaware, only for

local elections.

SHRUM: You moved?

NOVAK: No, no. I can vote in local elections.

SHRUM: I thought you were a Democrat registered in the District of Columbia so you could mess up the Democratic Party.

NOVAK: In the District of Columbia, yes. But I can vote in the local elections.

PRESS: I think we just got him, he's voting in two places.

(CROSSTALK)

NOVAK: It is legal.

SHRUM: This is Labor Day, but you're voting overtime.

NOVAK: I can't vote...

GILLESPIE: He's registered as a Democrat, I thought it was mandatory.

NOVAK: I can't vote for the Senate, but you know, all my friends in Delaware, people in Delaware told me, don't worry, the old man, Bill Roth is going to win this election, and you know, all the polls showed him so far behind and, you know, like the -- what is the...

PRESS: The Energizer bunny.

NOVAK: The Energizer bunny, he's moving slowly up piece by piece...

PRESS: That's the hare, or the tortoise.

NOVAK: The hare and the tortoise -- the tortoise...

(LAUGHTER)

SHRUM: I was going to say, was he going to put on a pink rabbit suit?

NOVAK: No, the tortoise is moving up. You wouldn't bet against Chairman Roth being -- coming back in -- next year, would you?

SHRUM: Sure I would, Bob. And let me tell you something, I think you invite too

small a sample of people to your house to talk to you about this. I don't think you talked -- and you are also in a neighborhood where there's probably a lot more support for Bill Roth.

PRESS: Quickly, Florida, impeachment manager Bill McCollum up against insurance commissioner Bill Nelson. The impeachment managers have scheduled a fund raiser in Washington on October 4 with Ken Starr as their featured speaker.

Is that the kiss of death for Bill McCollum and all the rest of them?

GILLESPIE: No, not at all. Bill McCollum is a strong candidate with a strong record also in the House of Representatives on crime and on -- in judicial matters. The fact is...

PRESS: How about prescription drugs?

GILLESPIE: Yes, yes. The fact is here's a state where the Democrat, Bill Nelson has already sought statewide office and holds statewide office now. You know what? Both of those candidates are in the 30s right now, and that's bad for Bill Nelson because no one outside his own congressional district knows Bill McCollum, they all know Bill Nelson.

SHRUM: Bill Nelson has a pretty big lead in Florida, I think he'll hold the lead. But you know, Nelson has a record to take into this election that I think working families, middle-class families in Florida really respond to. He became insurance commissioner after Hurricane Andrew basically wiped out the insurance market in that state, he re-established it and he took on big insurance companies to hold down rates. That's exactly what people want in a Florida senator, come up here and get somebody who will say no to the HMOs, no to the pharmaceutical companies, no to big oil.

(CROSSTALK)

NOVAK: And get prescription drugs, and get prescription

drugs.

SHRUM: Absolutely, Bob.

PRESS: All right, we didn't even have time yet for the close race in California.

We'll have to have you back. Ed Gillespie, Bob Shrum, thanks for being here.

SHRUM: Feinstein is going to win.

PRESS: Happy Labor Day.

GILLESPIE: Campbell.

(CROSSTALK)

PRESS: All right, when we come back Bob and I will tell you the truth in our closing comments.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

NOVAK: Bill, theoretically the Democrats can gain control of the Senate, but the cards have to break really in their way at all these very close races, which they usually don't in a -- when the electorate is divided. And I tell you something, I love Bob Shrum, but I don't think that prescription drugs is going to create a landslide for a Democratic takeover of the Senate.

PRESS: Maybe not in every seat, Bob, but maybe in a couple. But like you, I didn't think the Senate was in play until poor Paul Coverdell dies, Zell Miller now, it's down to four. But, Bob, if you look at those four, Florida, Delaware, Missouri, Michigan, maybe Rhode Island, it's doable, Bob.

NOVAK: Yes, but that -- they win -- the Republicans win Nevada, which we didn't talk about, I think they're going to win Virginia. I'd be very surprised -- it's possible, but uphill.

PRESS: If I were Trent Lott, I wouldn't count on it yet.

From the left, I'm Bill Press, good night for CROSSFIRE.

NOVAK: From the right, I'm Robert Novak, and all my fellow laborers, have a

happy Labor Day.

END

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Joe R. Golowka" <joeg@ieee.org> ("Joe R. Golowka" <joeg@ieee.org> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-SEP-2000 23:37:04.00

SUBJECT: [radyouth] FW: Brittanica.com on Marx

TO: Northern Coalition for Peace and Justice <NCFPJ-Discussion@egroups.com> (Northern Coalition for Peace and Justice <NCFPJ-Discussion@egroups.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: libertarian Socialism <libertarian-socialism@egroups.com> (libertarian Socialism <libertarian-socialism@egroups.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Radical Youth <radyouth@egroups.com> (Radical Youth <radyouth@egroups.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: LBO-Talk <lbo-talk@lists.panix.com> (LBO-Talk <lbo-talk@lists.panix.com> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Marxist-Humanist Forum listerv <mhf-list@venus.soci.niu.edu> (Marxist-Humanist Forum listerv <mhf-list@venus.soci.niu.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

Scott Beale (CN=Scott Beale/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->
eGroups eLerts
It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!
http://click.egroups.com/1/9067/9/_/112077/_/968211170/
----- _->

I went to Encyclopedia Britannica's homepage and found this article featured in a prominent place. A .com featuring an article by a Marxist-Humanist, I never thought I'd see the day.

Marx in the Mirror of Globalization
By Peter Hudis, special to Britannica.com

One interesting *some would say surprising *aspect of the ongoing discussions and debates about globalization is the renewed interest being shown in the ideas of Karl Marx, which only recently seemed to have been consigned to the dustbin of history. In the journalistic and academic worlds alike, a number of reappraisals of Marx's work are appearing that identify the 19th-century thinker as "the prophet of globalization" because of his focus on capital's inherent drive for self-expansion and technological innovation on the one

hand and its tendency to exacerbate social inequality and instability on the other. Even some of globalization's most fervent supporters note the importance of Marx's work for anticipating the imbalances and disturbances associated with the unfettered expansion of global capital. As John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, writers for the passionately pro-capitalist magazine *The Economist*, put it in their new book *A Future Perfect: The Challenge and Hidden Promise of Globalization*, "As a prophet of socialism, Marx may be kaput; but as a prophet of 'the universal interdependence of nations,' as he called globalization, he can still seem startlingly relevant...his description of globalization remains as sharp today as it was 150 years ago."

Some may find such talk of Marx a bit odd, given the abject failure of the communist regimes that claimed to rule in his name. Yet as Marx scholars have long pointed out, the communist regimes had little in common with Marx's actual ideas. Marx opposed centralized state control of the economy (he called those who advocated it "crude and unthinking communists"); he passionately defended freedom of the press (he made his debut as a radical journalist espousing it); and he ridiculed the notion that a small "vanguard" of revolutionaries could successfully restructure society without the democratic consent of its citizens. If anything, the collapse of communism seems to have spurred new interest in Marx, since it makes his predictions concerning the global reach of capitalism seem even more timely.

Micklethwait and Wooldridge contend that "one of the things that Marx would recognize immediately about this particular global era is a paradox that he spotted in the last one: The more successful globalization becomes, the more it seems to whip up its own backlash.... The undoing of globalization, in Marx's view, would come not just from losers resenting the success of the winners but also from the winners themselves losing their appetite for the battle." "There is even a suspicion," they go on, "that globalization's psychic energy *the uncertainty that it creates which forces companies, governments, and people to perform better *may have a natural stall point, a movement when people can take no more."

The tone of much of the current discussion of Marx on the part of both supporters and critics of globalization (for a forceful example of the latter, see William Greider's *One World, Ready or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism*) was established by John Cassidy's 1997 *New Yorker* article "The Return of Karl Marx," in which he called Marx "the next big thinker." Cassidy cited a high-placed Wall Street investment banker who told him, "The longer I spend time on Wall Street, the more convinced I am that Marx was right."

What is it about Marx's work that produces such comments? First, though Marx was a severe critic of capitalism, few captured better its inherent drive

for technological and social innovation. As Marx saw it, capitalism is not only about the production of material goods and services but also about the production of value. Labor, in Marx's view, is the source of value. And the magnitude of value, he argued, is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor time it takes to produce a given commodity. Marx held that there is a continual contradiction between these two purposes: producing for material wealth and producing for value. As productivity rises, more goods are produced in the same unit of time, so the value of each commodity falls. The increase in material wealth corresponds with a decline in the magnitude of value *that is, production costs fall and prices tend to fall as a result.

This presents the capitalist with a knotty problem: the relative decline in the value of each commodity risks leaving him short of the funds needed to maintain his level of productive output. He responds by trying to further boost productivity, since the greater the quantity of goods produced, the better the opportunity to realize the value of his initial investment. The best way to increase productivity is to invest in labor-saving devices. The resulting growth in productivity, however, reproduces the initial problem, since the increase in material wealth leads to a further decrease in the relative value of each commodity. Capitalism is thus based on a kind of treadmill effect, in which the system is constantly driven toward technological innovation regardless of its human or environmental cost. The restlessness and drive for innovation that characterize contemporary high-tech capitalism was long ago anticipated by Marx.

Second, Marx held that this process of constant innovation and productive expansion ultimately proceeds with disregard of national borders.

The logic of capital, he held, was to create a world market. National restrictions on the movement of capital would eventually have to be lifted, he argued, because capital must constantly find new markets to absorb its ever-growing productive output.

Third, Marx held that this process inevitably leads to a concentration and centralization of capital at one pole and a relative immiseration of the majority of the population at the other. Since capital is driven to increase

productivity through labor-saving devices, "dead labor" *machines, technology *expands at a faster rate than the need for labor power. Since workers do not own capital, but only their labor power, social wealth gets increasingly concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. Many consider this confirmed by the growing inequities that follow from the globalization process, as indicated by the fact that 225 individuals now control more wealth than half of the world's population.

Marx the Man

The importance of such issues is also addressed in Francis Wheen's *Karl Marx: A Life*, the first English-language Marx biography to appear in almost two decades. In Wheen's portrait Marx the man comes across as embodying in

many respects the dialectic, a concept Marx drew from Hegel, that every unit contains its opposite within itself. Marx came from a family of renowned rabbis, yet showed not the slightest inclination toward religion. He was a loving husband and father whose daughters became important spokeswomen for socialism in their own right, yet he once sighed "blessed be he that hath no family." He preached the virtues of communalism and railed against egotism, yet he was such an individualist himself that when a friend said that she couldn't imagine him living happily in an egalitarian society, he responded: "Neither can I. These times will come, but we must be away by then." He spent more time thinking over the origins, nature, and function of money than perhaps anyone, yet he was continuously unable to earn any himself.

What is most striking from Wheen's portrayal is Marx's gargantuan intellectual appetite. From his earliest writings there appears no subject that was not of interest to him *history, ancient and modern philosophy, economics, art, literature, geology, natural science, ethnology, and mathematics. This surely makes any effort to sum up his contribution far from easy. So formidable was Marx's output that although he published only a handful of books in his lifetime (including one volume of his planned multivolume magnum opus *Das Kapital*), his collected works come to more than 100 volumes, and the work of transcribing and publishing all his writings remains to be completed even today.

Wheen approaches his subject with considerable skepticism, especially concerning Marx's goal of a classless society. A columnist for *The Guardian*, Wheen has never considered himself sympathetic to Marxism. Yet, he writes, "The more I studied Marx, the more astoundingly topical he seemed to be. Today's pundits and politicians who fancy themselves as modern thinkers like to mention the buzzword 'globalization' at every opportunity *without realizing that Marx was already on the case in 1848." Two issues make Marx especially relevant in his view: one, Marx's notion that even in the most propitious economic conditions, the laborer under capitalism is compelled to endure overwork and "the reduction to a machine, the enslavement to capital"; and two, Marx's insistence that once capital becomes the predominant formation in any society, "what is truly human becomes congealed or crystallized into a material force, while dead objects acquire meaning, life and vigor."

None of these recent discussions of Marx can be considered wholesale appropriations of his legacy. The consensus on the part of most commentators is that while Marx may have been right about the nature of capitalism, he was less correct about the practicality of the alternative he envisioned. Yet in light of the way Marx is gaining increased attention from many who only a short time ago thought that history had pronounced his ideas dead, his work may continue to illuminate the quest to understand life under the

"manic logic" of global capitalism. As Marx once put it, "We are firmly convinced that the real danger lies not in practical attempts, but in the theoretical elaboration of communist ideas, for practical attempts, even mass attempts, can be answered by cannon as soon as they become dangerous, whereas ideas, which have conquered our intellect and taken possession of our minds...are demons which human beings can vanquish only by submitting to them."

Peter Hudis is a freelance writer living in Chicago.

Joe R. Golowka
JoeG@ieee.org

"The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure" - Thomas Jefferson

To Post a message, send it to: rad youth@eGroups.com

To Unsubscribe, send a blank message to: rad youth-unsubscribe@eGroups.com

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gilbert S. Gonzalez (CN=Gilbert S. Gonzalez/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-SEP-2000 03:16:02.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Erin K. Greer (CN=Erin K. Greer/OU=OVP/O=EOP@EOP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The New York Times

September 7, 2000

More Indications That Hazards of Tires Were Long Known

By KEITH BRADSHER and MATTHEW L. WALD

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 * Documents released today provided additional evidence that Bridge- stone/Firestone and possibly Ford knew about a pattern of tire failures long before a recall was announced in August, and lawmakers began calling for tighter regulation of the auto and tire industries.

The disclosures came in a long day of hearings on Capitol Hill in which Masatoshi Ono, the chairman and chief executive of Bridgestone/ Firestone, the American unit of Bridgestone of Japan, read apologies in halting English. "I come before you to apologize to you, the American people and especially to the families who have lost loved ones in these terrible rollover accidents," Mr. Ono told senators in the morning, squeezing in a reference to what some tire industry officials describe as an excessive tendency of Ford Explorers to roll over when they lose a tire.

Republicans and Democrats alike refused to accept Firestone's apologies or each company's efforts to blame the other. Members of Congress accused both companies of having at least blithely ignored public safety, and perhaps of conspiring to do so. "Ford and Firestone had at a minimum a moral obligation to make sure that the products they sell to the American public and other people in other countries are safe," said Senator Richard C. Shelby, Republican of Alabama. "And yet they both failed to bring this issue to consumers' and the federal government's attention, at the cost of dozens of lives, I am afraid."

The lawmakers also called for a larger budget for safety regulators and proposed federal criminal penalties for any future cases in which companies might be found to have sold products with lethal defects.

After Mr. Ono's statement, Ford's chief executive, Jacques Nasser, jabbed back at Firestone later in the day, saying, "This is a tire issue, not a vehicle issue."

But the central issue of the hearings was what did each company know and

when. House investigators showed reporters a Firestone financial statement indicating that the tire maker had found a pattern of tire problems earlier than it had acknowledged. In the document, dated Jan. 19, 2000, Firestone's financial managers calculated that \$1.84 million of the \$2.88 million in claims in 1999 against the company for tread separation problems, or 64 percent, was for tires made at just one of its 10 North American factories.

The statement identified Firestone's factory in Decatur, Ill., as making the problem tires. Previously, Firestone said it had not noticed the problems in Decatur until early August, when Ford conducted an analysis of Firestone quality data.

Firestone is now recalling and replacing 6.5 million light truck tires installed mainly on Ford Explorers, including all 15-inch Wilderness tires made in Decatur for the Explorer since 1996. The Firestone data shows that the Decatur plant had its worst quality problems from 1994 through 1996, when hundreds of replacement workers were employed there during a long dispute between Firestone and its unionized workers.

Before the financial statement was disclosed, Gary Crigger, Firestone's executive vice president for business planning, told a Senate panel that Firestone had immediately notified regulators in early August upon becoming aware of a problem.

Representative Heather A. Wilson, Republican of New Mexico, challenged Firestone officials this evening on why their safety officials did not act if the company's financial staff was aware of a problem. "So you looked at it from a financial point of view and not a consumer safety point of view?" she asked.

Mr. Crigger responded, "I'm sorry to say that's the case." Firestone switched production of tires for the Explorer from Decatur to other factories last January for reasons the company has never explained.

Ford also gave House investigators today a complete copy of an internal memorandum from March 1999, describing how the company handled the replacement of problem Firestone tires on Ford Explorers in Saudi Arabia. On Tuesday, Congressional investigators gave reporters a copy of the memo with one section previously blacked out by Ford.

That version showed that Firestone officials had been leery of sending a letter to tire owners in Saudi Arabia for fear that it might have to inform the United States Transportation Department and that it might be banned from the Saudi market. "They feel that the U.S. D.O.T. will have to be notified of the program, since the same product is sold in the U.S.," the Ford memo said.

But in the section of the memo that was previously blacked out by Ford, the memo's author, a Ford official named Chuck Seilnacht, mentioned that a colleague at Ford shared Firestone's worries.

Corey MacGillivray, an official in the general counsel's office at Ford, "was concerned about the implications," as well, the memo said. "He was

going to check with one of his colleagues to get more info."

Mr. Crigger said he had been aware of talks within Firestone's legal department of how to handle tire problems in Saudi Arabia but was not familiar with the details.

Unlike Firestone, Ford sent a letter to owners of Explorers in Saudi Arabia, several months after the memo, that they should get new tires, Mr. Nasser pointed out in testimony tonight. Ford also took out advertisements to promote the tire replacement and covered the program's expense after Firestone refused to do so on the ground that the tires were failing because of customers' misuse.

But Ford did not tell American regulators about the recall after Firestone officials assured the automaker that the tires did not pose a problem in the United States. Both companies still take that position: all tires replaced in Saudi Arabia were 16-inch Wilderness tires, a size that has not been recalled in the United States, though some plaintiffs' lawyers say they should be.

If Ford and Firestone knew of problems and did nothing, federal regulators could impose up to \$925,000 in fines. But the companies and possibly their executives could face criminal charges by state and local prosecutors, who could accuse them of culpability in deaths that occurred after the companies clearly became aware of problems, said Joan Claybrook, who was administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration under President Jimmy Carter and is now the president of Public Citizen, an advocacy group. A prosecutor in Indiana tried to charge Firestone officials with criminal negligence after the company's huge tire recall in 1978 but was unsuccessful, she said.

If the public comes to perceive Ford and Firestone as culpable, that could also help plaintiffs' lawyers win larger punitive damages in lawsuits against the companies. The biggest potential damage to both companies, however, is that their images could be so sullied that customers start shying away from their products. Ford and Firestone both say that their August sales showed little effect from the recall, but some independent tire dealers say that many customers are now avoiding Firestone tires.

Ford officials said today that they had repeatedly asked Firestone over the last two years to check the tires for defects and had been assured every time that any problems had resulted solely from customers' abuse of the tires. But senators and representatives were unsympathetic, saying that Ford had a responsibility to make sure that it put safe tires on vehicles.

"Ford, too, when faced with hundreds of complaints of major tire defects on the Explorer, failed to respond with the sense of urgency that one would expect when the safety of so many people rested on its shoulders," said Representative Thomas J. Bliley Jr., Republican of Virginia.

Mr. Nasser announced tonight that Ford would set up an "early warning" system with the tire industry to identify tire problems as they emerge. He also said Ford would tell United States regulators of all foreign recalls.

Proposals by lawmakers today emphasized harsher punishment for violators of safety rules and closer government monitoring of the auto industry, with little attention to new safety rules for tires. A few of the proposals put forward were so far-reaching that even safety activists spoke against them at the hearings.

Senator Barbara A. Mikulski, Democrat of Maryland, proposed that the Transportation Department assign inspectors to auto factories much as the Agriculture Department assigns inspectors to chicken processors, and that automakers be required to forward their quality-control data to the government. Ms. Claybrook said that regulators did not have the staff necessary for such an ambitious undertaking.

Senator Arlen Specter, Republican of Pennsylvania, said that he planned to introduce legislation as soon as Thursday to establish federal criminal penalties, possibly including second-degree manslaughter, for the executives of companies that knowingly sell defective products that kill consumers. Automakers narrowly turned back a similar measure in 1966, when the nation's auto regulatory system was set up.

Violations of federal auto safety rules are currently punished with a fine of the manufacturer of no more than \$925,000, plus a mandatory recall of the defective vehicle, auto part or tire.

Senator Shelby, who is the chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee for transportation, which held one of today's hearings, said he would consider an immediate increase in the budget of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which is part of the Transportation Department. The agency's budget was cut almost in half at the beginning of the Reagan administration and remains a third lower than it was in the Carter administration, after adjusting for inflation.

For years, auto defects have received little attention on Capitol Hill. Sue Bailey, the safety agency's administrator, pointed out that it recommended on March 24 that Congress enact stiffer laws, including an increase in the limit on civil penalties to at least \$1 million. No member of Congress has yet introduced a bill with these proposals, she added.

The current session of Congress is scheduled to end a month from today, with only 21 more working days. Bills and budget changes introduced this late in a session usually have little chance of passage, but Senators Specter and Shelby said in interviews that Congress and the nation were so interested in the tire issue that legislative action was possible and even probable.

The tire recall appears to have had fairly little effect on sales of sport utility vehicles. S.U.V. sales rose 5.1 percent in August from the level of a year earlier, while the overall auto market was flat. But all of the growth in sport utility sales occurred in small car-based models like the Chrysler PT Cruiser, which the auto industry classifies as sport utilities so as to qualify for the more lenient regulations that cover light trucks.

Sales of larger models like the Ford Explorer, which tend to be based on

pickup designs, fell 0.9 percent in August, partly because the Explorer, the nation's top-selling sport utility, had a drop of 0.8 percent. Sales of pickup-based sport utilities soared in the mid-1990's, but the growth has been slowing since 1997.

"I see it leveling off; I don't see anything drastic happening," said Mark Cornelius, an auto sales analyst in West Olive, Mich.

Senator Herb Kohl, Democrat of Wisconsin, said he would use the Firestone and Ford issue to seek quick passage of legislation barring companies from sealing information relevant to public safety in court settlements of lawsuits. Plaintiffs' lawyers contend that Ford and Firestone have hidden many documents with such secrecy orders.

Helen O. Petruskas, Ford's vice president for safety and environmental issues, said Ford only sealed the amounts of settlements and did not seal engineering information.

Plaintiffs' lawyers said it does not appear that Bridgestone/Firestone has softened its litigation stance the last week, despite the threat of criminal prosecution in Venezuela, pressure from federal regulators to recall additional tires and blistering hearings in Congress.

The heightened scrutiny "has had no effect whatsoever," said Bruce R. Kaster, a plaintiffs' lawyer in Ocala, Fla., who has been a leader in suing Bridgestone/Firestone over tread separation problems. "There's no indication of any willingness on their part to soften their position on discovery or settlements or anything else." Firestone is only settling cases, he said, "when they start getting nervous."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

THE OVERVIEW

Clinton Warns U.N. of a New Age of Civil Wars

By DAVID E. SANGER

UNITED NATIONS, Sept. 6 * President Clinton opened the summit meeting of world leaders at the United Nations today, urging the huge gathering to prepare the institution for a new age in which international forces will have to reach regularly and rapidly inside national boundaries to protect threatened people.

With his own time in the front rank of the 149 world leaders gathered here drawing to an end, Mr. Clinton also used the moment to try to settle some of the disputes that have dogged his presidency, from the Middle East to Russia to Southeast Asia. [Excerpts, Page A16.]

The president met separately into the evening with Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel and then with the Palestinian leader, Yasir Arafat, in hopes of picking up the broken pieces of the peace agreement to which they

came tantalizingly close at Camp David in July. Mr. Clinton had warned earlier in the day that "like all life's chances," the moment for an accord "is fleeting and about to pass."

Tonight, the White House spokesman, Joe Lockhart, gave no indication that the meetings had resulted in any progress on the question of control of Jerusalem or other issues dividing Mr. Arafat and Mr. Barak. He said that as of now no meetings were scheduled this week among the three leaders.

Also today, Mr. Clinton sparred anew with Russia's president, Vladimir V. Putin, who is using the gathering here to propose a ban on military uses of space, another effort to terminate American efforts to develop a national missile defense. Mr. Clinton's aides gave Mr. Putin a summary of American intelligence gathered during the Kursk submarine disaster, which suggests that Mr. Putin's own naval forces may have misled him in the days after the accident.

Mr. Clinton was deliberately vague on the question of when the United Nations should step into civil wars or ethnic and religious disputes * an argument that has come up repeatedly during his presidency. "These conflicts present us with a stark challenge," he said. "Are they part of the scourge the U.N. was established to prevent? If so, we must respect sovereignty and territorial integrity, but still find a way to protect people as well as borders."

Just hours before he spoke, three United Nations relief workers were killed in West Timor, apparently by Indonesian militia forces. The news, underscoring the risks to United Nations workers as they insert themselves into uncontrolled disputes, put a chill on the opening ceremony. As the session began, the United Nations secretary general, Kofi Annan, called for a minute of silence to remember the three international aid workers, as Indonesia's president, Abdurrahman Wahid, struggling with a clear erosion of his authority at home, sat in the hall.

Mr. Clinton clearly relished one of his last hurrahs as president in front of what the United Nations called the largest gathering of world leaders in history. Rarely has he had a chance to talk to both adversaries and allies at the same moment, a group as diverse as President Kim Dae Jung of South Korea and President Fidel Castro of Cuba, who listened to Mr. Clinton but never got close enough to talk to him.

Mr. Clinton stayed in the hall after his speech and, because of an unexpected change in the order of speakers, heard President Mohammad Khatami of Iran, with whom the United States still has no formal dialogue, talk about the clash of Islamic and Western cultures.

As Mr. Clinton and Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright sat listening at the back of the huge hall, Mr. Khatami declared that in coming years the world could no longer be ruled by "monopolies of power and capital," a clear reference to the United States. It was one of several expressions of frustration about America's global power that was a subtext of the gathering.

Shortly after Mr. Clinton spoke of the need to intervene strongly when a

nation's leaders abuse their own people, the president of China, Jiang Zemin, described a very different concept of how the world should operate. "Respect for each other's independence and sovereignty is vital to the maintenance of world peace," he said.

Striking a theme often heard from Chinese leaders who fear that intervention in Kosovo or East Timor could provide the precedent for one day intervening in Tibet or Taiwan, Mr. Jiang added: "Dialogue and cooperation in the field of human rights must be conducted on the basis of respect for state sovereignty. Without sovereignty, there will be no human rights to speak of."

Perhaps because of the growing suspicions about America's use of that power * or perhaps because of the constant conflict between the United Nations and Washington over the payment of dues to the organization * Mr. Clinton did not receive the kind of standing ovation that greeted him in 1998. During his speech, he made an oblique reference to Washington's \$1.7 billion in arrears to the United Nations, saying that as the organization expands its missions, "all these things come with a price tag, and all nations, including the United States, must pay it."

He also took a clear shot at conservative Republicans who have attacked the United Nations, saying, "Those in my country or elsewhere who believe we can do without the United Nations, or impose our will upon it, misread history and misunderstand the future."

Shortly after Mr. Clinton spoke, he met in the United Nations building with the president of Vietnam, Tan Duc Luong. He reassured him that a recent trade accord between the United States and its enemy of three decades ago would remain a top priority for the United States, even though he has decided not to try to win approval of the agreement from Congress this year. The two men also discussed Mr. Clinton's desire to visit Vietnam before the end of his presidency, which would make him the first American president to set foot on Vietnamese soil since the end of the war nearly 30 years ago.

While the White House made no announcement of such plans, senior administration officials say Mr. Clinton is likely to visit Vietnam just before Thanksgiving. He is planning to attend the annual Asian economic summit meeting in Brunei, and would make a symbolic * and highly emotional * visit to Hanoi on the same trip.

Such individual meetings and initiatives always dominate the opening of the United Nations session in September. But the stated purpose of this vast meeting of leaders is much broader: to set new priorities and directions for the United Nations, which at age 55 seems creaky and unprepared for a host of new challenges.

On Friday the leaders are scheduled to sign a millennium declaration, calling for a new peacekeeping structure; a report to Mr. Annan calls for a strengthened corps of commanders in New York, ready to organize peacekeeping operations in a week or two. The declaration also sets goals for reducing poverty and illiteracy during the next 15 years, and contains carefully formulated language about guiding economic globalization so that

it benefits the poor as much as the rich, and small, uncompetitive nations as much as the developed world.

But as with any document that is signed by so many, the language is so watered down that discerning its specific meaning is difficult at best. And it is particularly difficult to pin down the United Nations' role in managing economic globalization and development. More and more, that role has fallen to the institutions that were created at the end of World War II to manage the world economy * the World Bank, which focuses on poverty, and the International Monetary Fund, which seeks to prevent and manage economic crises.

Their growing role leaves the United Nations increasingly on the sidelines when it comes to the crucial questions of economic development * who gets capital and under what conditions * and even their efforts are often overshadowed by the billions in private capital that now slosh through the emerging markets on a daily basis.

In such an environment, the United Nations' role is chiefly hortatory. And exactly because the United Nations does not impose the kind of conditions on its aid that the World Bank and I.M.F. require, from fiscal prudence to Western-style accounting methods * it has become the forum to which many nations want to move the debate over the rules of globalization.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Gore Offers Vision of Better Times For Middle Class

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

CLEVELAND, Sept. 6 * Unveiling a book-length plan that hinges on optimistic fiscal forecasts, Vice President Al Gore today offered his economic vision for the future, painting an image of a prosperous middle class that enjoys higher incomes, with more home ownership, more high-tech jobs and more people going to college.

"My cause is hard-working, middle-class families," he declared at the start of his speech here today at Cleveland State University.

Mr. Gore outlined a series of social and economic goals that he said were attainable given the nation's current prosperity, and he presented a mountain of supporting detail that his campaign hopes will make Gov. George W. Bush's financial plan pale in comparison.

The speech reflected a shift in language and approach for Mr. Gore, who has in recent days replaced the "working families" he courted so assiduously during the Democratic National Convention last month with "middle-class" families.

"The Gore-Lieberman economic plan," he said, "has one guiding purpose: to help the middle-class families who have always been America's purpose and pride, the people who pay the taxes, bear the burdens and live the American dream."

In his convention speech Mr. Gore used the phrase "working families" nine times. In today's speech, , he used "middle-class" 12 times and "working families" only once.

The release of Mr. Gore's economic blueprint reignited a debate with Mr. Bush over whose plan can best manage the projected budget surplus over the next decade without ruining the economy. [News Analysis, Page A26.]

Mr. Bush wasted little time yesterday attacking the plan, saying Mr. Gore had made so many spending promises that he would eat through the surplus.

To deflect such perceptions, Mr. Gore included in his glossy, 191-page plan a pledge to set aside \$300 billion as a hedge against overly optimistic fiscal projections. Aside from the rainy day fund, Mr. Gore's plan is largely a synthesis of many specific programs he has described over the last several months. But today was the first time the vice president had drawn all of these stray threads together into a broader theme.

Mr. Gore said his 10 goals were to: eliminate the debt by 2012; protect the Social Security and Medicare surpluses; double the number of families that have more than \$50,000 in savings; reduce income taxes on the typical family to the lowest level in 50 years; raise family income by a third over the next decade; enable seven in ten families to own their own homes; increase the number of people who go to college; reduce poverty to below 10 percent for the first time since poverty statistics were kept in 1959 (it was 12.7 percent in 1998); cut the gap between wages earned by men and women; and create 10 million new high-tech jobs.

Some aspects of the plan beget others. For example, eliminating the debt by 2012 would reduce interest rates and thus make school loans more affordable so that more people could attend college.

The economic blueprint that Mr. Gore offered today is a road map of middle-class life. It envisions expanded income in continuing boom times, with more people going to college and working in well-paying, high-tech jobs.

Mr. Gore's focus on the middle class is something of a turn away from the more combative populist language he has relied on for weeks. It reflects, in part, the arrival of a new pollster, Stanley Greenberg, who has written extensively about the middle class and helped Bill Clinton capture that broad swath of voters in 1992.

Mr. Gore's advisers said he had deliberately used the phrase "middle class" in this speech because he was also talking about reducing the number of people in poverty and wanted to distinguish between the two.

But the vice president has been using the term "middle class" in speeches

for days now, and has been losing "working families." The plan he distributed today was titled "Prosperity for America's Families."

Frank Luntz, a Republican pollster who at one time advised Newt Gingrich, the former House speaker, on word choice and language, said that Mr. Gore appeared to have moved deliberately away from "working families" to the "middle class" to broaden his reach. Mr. Luntz said that voters perceived "working families" as applying to young couples and excluding people who were retired or about to retire. This is a huge block of voters who are especially important because they tend to go to the polls in larger numbers than younger people.

"The battleground in this election is for the 30-somethings and the near-retirees," Mr. Luntz said.

He said focus groups with voters he has conducted for MSNBC have found that the phrase "working families" was working against Mr. Gore, not only because of its connotations of youth, but also because of its suggestion of class distinctions that Americans are loath to acknowledge.

Mr. Gore's plan, particularly the goal of raising family income by a third over the next decade, assumes an annual growth rate in incomes of 2.9 percent * a fairly ambitious goal, although the most recent figures available show that from 1997 to 1998, median family income grew 3.3 percent, to \$46,737 from \$45,262. Mr. Gore's budget advisers acknowledged that the country had never sustained such growth over a 10-year period.

Mr. Gore told his audience to "read my plan," a pointed reference to the infamous pronouncement by former President George Bush, father of Mr. Gore's current rival, who told voters, "Read my lips: no new taxes."

"My plan wasn't built on cross- your-fingers economics that says we can give more to the people who already have the most and then just hope the benefits trickle down to the middle class," Mr. Gore said, again contrasting himself with the Reagan- Bush era.

To demonstrate a fiscally conservative approach, Mr. Gore said his \$300 billion rainy-day fund would be a hedge against overly optimistic surplus projections.

"If today's economic forecasts fall short, this new reserve fund will guarantee that we will not have to cut education or health care," Mr. Gore said. "And unlike the promises made on the other side, we won't be running deficits and endangering America's prosperity."

Robert D. Reischauer, President Clinton's former director of the Office of Management and Budget * now an analyst with the Urban Institute * said the plan, especially the rainy-day fund, was "fiscally prudent and politically sound."

He said that Mr. Gore's goals would essentially "fall in his lap" if the economy continued its expansion, and that these goals appealed to most voters.

"The vast majority of people view themselves as middle class," he said.
"Those who are not in the middle class have aspirations to be there, and they view those aspirations as realistic, so you don't offend anybody."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

G.O.P. Leaders Fret at Lapses In Bush's Race

By RICHARD L. BERKE and FRANK BRUNI

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 * Prominent Republicans around the country, including several who advise Gov. George W. Bush, say they are worried that his candidacy has floundered in recent weeks, allowing Vice President Al Gore to build on his velocity from the Democratic convention in a way that they never expected.

While none of these Republicans expressed panic and all said that Mr. Bush could reverse the trend, they acknowledged puzzlement, frustration and even some distress about the strides that Mr. Gore has made, a degree of progress that they said went beyond an inevitable tightening in polls.

"There's no doubt about it: There's real worry about the general state of things," said William J. Bennett, the former secretary of education, who has advised Mr. Bush from time to time. "There's nervousness that was not there before."

In interviews during the past several days, leading Republicans on Capitol Hill, at state capitals and even at the Bush headquarters in Austin, Tex., raised concerns beyond poll numbers.

Many of them expressed unease about the way Mr. Bush has handled himself, saying that in the last two and a half weeks there had been too many instances when he seemed either defensive, bumbling, weary, detached or peevish.

And there have been too many missteps, several Republicans said. For starters, some cited Mr. Bush's refusal to go along with the debate schedule proposed by the bipartisan Commission on Presidential Debates, saying his reluctance had made him look timid and was diverting attention from issues that he would be better off discussing.

Others said Mr. Bush was letting himself get dragged too deep by Mr. Gore into the bogs of a policy debate, where the vice president is at his best. Still others said that Mr. Bush's choice of Dick Cheney as a running mate

had produced scant excitement on the campaign trail but significant damage in the news media, manifest in weeks of questions about the financial details of Mr. Cheney's retirement package from Halliburton, the energy services company he served as chief executive.

Several Republican officials said they had serious reservations about the party's tongue-in-cheek TV commercial broadcast last week that challenged Mr. Gore's truthfulness and political consistency.

Representative John R. Kasich of Ohio, chairman of the House Budget Committee, said the campaign was too preoccupied with trying to make everyone happy and not delivering a clear message.

"The biggest mistake we can make is to try to be all things to all people," he said. "We have to be very aggressive and not engage in any reticence about our philosophy or our positions."

Ari Fleischer, a spokesman for the Bush campaign, dismissed the worries about the state of the governor's candidacy, so dominant for most of the year.

"Everybody wants to win in a landslide," he said. "Landslides are rare. We've always known and said this was going to be a close race."

Indeed, to some Republicans, Mr. Bush began the process of correcting his campaign this week. On Tuesday, he moved aggressively to neutralize Mr. Gore's advantage on the critical issue of health care by releasing his own plan to give prescription drug benefits to the elderly. And Mr. Bush has engaged Mr. Gore much more forcefully in his comments and oratory.

But Republicans said that the combination of Mr. Gore's surge and Mr. Bush's stumbles had made Mr. Gore, for perhaps the first time in the 2000 presidential race, the front runner.

Many said they were unnerved by voter surveys showing that Mr. Gore * who for months trailed in the polls * had pulled even or ahead of Mr. Bush nationally and in some important states like Florida, Pennsylvania and Missouri, where campaign officials had long predicted victories.

"Everybody expected a bounce, but not nearly as much as this," said Representative Fred Upton, a Michigan Republican, referring to Mr. Gore. And, he said, it had significantly altered the mood of Republicans in his state, a crucial battleground.

"There is a lot of chatter at the grass-roots level about how they're scared of these new numbers," he said. "This has shocked the system from what looked like a slam dunk."

Gov. Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania, who has campaigned with Mr. Bush in his state for the past three days, said: "I'm at a loss to explain the rather significant change in the polling numbers."

While Mr. Ridge said he was confident Mr. Bush would recover, he said, "We've got to go a little bit more on the offensive." He added of Mr. Gore, "This guy's tough."

In fact, in the nearly three weeks since the end of the Democratic convention, Mr. Gore has been constantly on the offensive. First he declared himself the candidate of the little guy and portrayed Mr. Bush and Mr. Cheney as beholden to big oil and drug companies; then he relentlessly attacked Mr. Bush over tax policy and health care.

At the same time, Mr. Gore has managed to use the favorable attention he received during the convention * even the much publicized kiss he planted on his wife, Tipper, before his acceptance speech * to give life and personality to his stiff and uninteresting stereotype.

A Republican official closely involved in the Bush campaign said that Mr. Bush's aides had readjusted their expectations for a spate of new polls that are to be released in the next few days.

As recently as two weeks ago, the official said, Mr. Bush's aides were forecasting that these polls would show the race in a dead heat. But there was now a feeling inside the Bush camp that Mr. Gore might have, on average, a 3-to-5-point advantage, the official said.

A Washington-based adviser to the Bush campaign said: "Today, I think anybody forced to wager on the race would have to bet on Gore."

An official of the Republican National Committee said, "You're always on the defensive when your lead evaporates."

In the interviews, Republicans of all ideological stripes were hardly unified in dispensing advice for Mr. Bush, or in gauging the health of his candidacy. Several said that Mr. Bush was merely being buffeted by cyclical forces, which might change several times again before Election Day. Others said that Mr. Bush's position on debates made at least as much sense to voters as Mr. Gore's.

But some concerns about Mr. Bush's campaign were mentioned time and again.

For example, several Republicans said that Mr. Bush still needed to be more aggressive in explaining his proposal for a tax cut of \$1.3 trillion over 10 years, more than double the size of the cut planned by Mr. Gore.

"People get very worried about that kind of a tax cut with the speculative nature of the surplus," said Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Specter and other Republicans said it was a mistake for the Bush campaign to sign off on a Republican Party commercial that poked fun at Mr. Gore for appearing at a Buddhist temple fund-raiser.

"I don't think it's wise to do a 'tongue-in-cheek,' " Mr. Specter said. "It's got to be treated very seriously and in a factual way with no apologies * but not tongue in cheek."

Some people close to the campaign even said that Republican National Committee officials warned that the commercial was inappropriate because it moved the discourse away from issues.

Mr. Cheney was also cited by many Republicans as a disappointing choice for Mr. Bush's running mate, especially compared with Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut, who has helped energize the Democratic ticket.

"He can recover, but he's not gotten off the dime," Mr. Upton said of Mr. Cheney. "The focus, rather than on his solid record of achievement, particularly as the secretary of defense, and then in the private sector, has been totally eclipsed by personal finances."

Mr. Bennett put it this way: "The Lieberman pick looks pretty solid. He's a happy camper out there."

Some Republicans also said that despite his proposal for debates this week, Mr. Bush was unwise to make an issue of the format for his televised encounters with Mr. Gore. "He is proposing debates that will arguably reach fewer people," said a Bush adviser. "You can't sell a Chevy and say it's a Cadillac."

In addition, several Republicans said, Mr. Bush has at times failed to muster the sunny geniality and bravado that have always been his strongest suits.

He has fumbled with his mathematical figures and his words. In an interview late last week, at a time when he might be expected to be as pumped up by the gathering frenzy as ever, Mr. Bush instead grew prematurely reflective and slightly teary as he mulled over what he said was the greatness of American democracy.

At a news conference on Sunday, as he showed snippets of videotape to support his accusation that Mr. Gore was backing out of an agreement to debate anytime and anywhere, he tapped his foot and occasionally pursed his lips.

The next day, Mr. Bush, who prides himself on discipline, was caught uttering a vulgarity to describe a reporter into a microphone. While many political analysts said that the incident would cause no major damage, others said it could feed into perceptions of Mr. Bush as insufficiently experienced or mature for the task at hand.

"He's still a relative rookie at the national level," said Bruce Buchanan, a government professor at the University of Texas in Austin, "and that's showing right now."

Despite their concerns, some Republicans said that while they were sobered by the situation, they were not scared.

"There was a period right before and during the Republican convention where it looked like Bush would sail away with this," said Senator Peter Fitzgerald of Illinois. "We've all come back to reality."

Representative Joe Scarborough of Florida said: "The campaign actually started yesterday in earnest. If Bush was going to have a problem, he picked the right time to have it."

Bill Paxton, a former House member who is an adviser to the campaign, said Republicans who expected Mr. Bush to be ahead now were guilty of "Alice in Wonderland" thinking.

"I believe that it's going to be a tight race to the finish," he said.
"But I am as confident of victory as I was six months ago. George W. Bush is going to be the next president."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

New Data Suggests Some Cannibalism By Ancient Indians

By JOHN NOBLE WILFORD

Scientists have found what they say is the first direct evidence of cannibalism among prehistoric Indians in the American Southwest, belying the image of these people as steadfastly peaceful farmers.

The finding may well reignite a long-smoldering controversy over whether ancestral Indians ever made it a practice to eat human flesh, a conclusion deeply resented by their descendants.

The latest evidence sprang from the site of an ancient Anasazi settlement near Mesa Verde in southwestern Colorado, where archaeologists came upon butchered human bones and stone cutting tools stained with human blood. A ceramic cooking pot held residues of human tissues. But the most telling of the evidence was found in human feces: biochemical tests revealed clear traces of digested human muscle protein in the dried coprolite, or preserved prehistoric feces.

"Analysis of the coprolite and associated remains at last provides definitive evidence for sporadic cannibalism in the Southwest," Dr. Brian R. Billman, an archaeologist at the University of North Carolina, said yesterday in an announcement of the discovery.

The biochemist who conducted the tests, Dr. Richard A. Marlar of the University of Colorado School of Medicine in Denver, said the only way this particular human protein, myoglobin, would be present in the feces was if the person had eaten human flesh. The tests and other research were repeated many times over the last two years.

"We felt we had to be absolutely sure on such a sensitive and controversial issue," Dr. Marlar said in an interview. "I have no doubt about this data."

The research team * Dr. Marlar, Dr. Billman and colleagues * described and interpreted the findings in a report being published in today's issue of the journal Nature. In an accompanying commentary, Dr. Jared M. Diamond, an anthropologist at the University of California at Los Angeles, called

the research "compelling evidence" of the practice of cannibalism by some ancestral Indians.

The chief descendants of the Anasazi are the Hopi and Zuni tribes, which have never practiced cannibalism and object to archaeologists' inferences of cannibalism by their prehistoric ancestors.

But Dr. Donald Grayson, an anthropologist at the University of Washington who specializes in prehistoric people in the American West, said in an interview that he was not surprised by the biochemical finding. "I was already convinced by the evidence of butchering marks and bones from archaeological sites" elsewhere, he said.

Archaeologists think that cannibalism among people in the American Southwest occurred between A.D. 900 and 1150 but was then fairly rare, probably occurring when the community was faced with starvation. After that, for about 50 years, the evidence suggests, there was an outbreak of what is known among anthropologists as "customary cannibalism." Dr. Diamond described this consumption of human flesh, from either deceased relatives or slain enemies, as a nonemergency practice and not just what a group might resort to in the face of starvation as the Donner party of American pioneers did in the winter of 1846-47.

The new findings are hardly the first indication of cannibalism among the Anasazi. Butchered human bones and other mounting evidence were described by Dr. Christy Turner 2d, an anthropologist at Arizona State University, in his book, "Man Corn: Cannibalism and Violence in the Prehistoric American Southwest." Dr. Turner is on an expedition to Siberia and could not be reached for comment on the new findings.

But the evidence is still disputed by some anthropologists and especially by modern American Indians. Archaeologists who previously reported suspected cannibalism said they were sometimes accused of contributing to racism and genocide; some early European colonists used stories of Indian cannibalism as justification for their conquests of the land.

The debate, now decades old, intensified in 1979 when Dr. William Arens, an anthropologist at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, argued in an influential book, "The Man-Eating Myth," that there had been no reliable firsthand accounts of cannibalism. So he doubted the very existence of the practice, except perhaps in circumstances of near-starvation.

Efforts to reach Dr. Arens for comment yesterday were unsuccessful. But in a 1998 article in The New Yorker, he was quoted as having apparently changed his mind. Asked about Dr. Turner's research, Dr. Arens said cannibalism was a "possible interpretation, even a good interpretation."

But all previous evidence of occasional Indian cannibalism, though increasingly persuasive, was still circumstantial. The discovery of the human feces, in an ancient dwelling in Colorado, opened the way to gathering direct evidence through biochemical analysis.

The prehistoric feces were found as a result of a preservation effort by the Ute tribe. When archaeological sites in the foothills of Sleeping Ute

Mountain were about to be destroyed by newly irrigated agricultural fields, the Utes called in Soil Systems Inc., an archaeological excavation company in Phoenix. Dr. Billman, who worked for the company then, led the investigation of a community of 70 to 125 people that existed there between A.D. 1130 and 1150.

It was a time of severe drought, one of the worst in the American West in the last 2,000 years, and this provoked conflicts between farmers who had settled there and intruders from surrounding areas.

"We believe the entire community was extinguished in a single episode of violence and terroristic cannibalism during a period of social chaos brought on by the drought," Dr. Billman said.

The raiders responsible for the killing may have considered the local farmers themselves to be intruders on withered farming land who had to be driven away. After killing, cooking and eating seven people in that one dwelling, one of the raiders squatted over the cold ashes of the hearth and defecated, a parting sign of contempt.

When Dr. Billman gave that account at an archaeological meeting, Dr. Marlar, an amateur archaeologist as well as a biochemist, offered to try to develop a technique for testing the feces for any traces of human tissues. Biochemical assay techniques had been used before to identify animal meat residues in cooking pots at archaeological sites. And the presence of the human myoglobin, the headline on Nature's commentary said, was "Incontrovertible Evidence of Cannibalism."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Teenagers Accused of Killing for a Free Meal

By DAVID BARSTOW and SARAH KERSHAW

It looked at first like a botched robbery: the owner of a Chinese takeout restaurant was lured late Friday night to a dark dead-end street in Queens, where he was jumped and bludgeoned to death. The killers left him with \$600.

But investigators said yesterday that the real motive was heartbreakingly mundane: he had been killed by a group of teenagers who wanted a free meal.

Five teenagers were under arrest yesterday and were arraigned last night. They had no criminal records and were mostly from solidly middle-class families. Prosecutors said they were hungry and wanted to eat without paying, so they used a cell phone to call in their \$60 order * General Tso's chicken, shrimp egg foo yong, chicken with broccoli and shrimp lo mein * to a vacant house on 176th Street in Springfield Gardens, Queens.

When the restaurant owner, Jin- Sheng Liu, 44, arrived shortly before

midnight with the food delivery, he was jumped from behind, covered with a bedsheet and pummeled to death with repeated head blows from fists and at least one brick.

As police officers converged on the scene, the group * four boys and a girl, none older than 17 * fled with a bag of food to one of the boys' homes to eat, officials said.

In a matter of days, the police, who cracked the case by tracing the call to the restaurant on the cell phone, began zeroing in on a group of teenagers who lived in the neighborhood around the vacant house at 130-19 176th Street. The youngest, a skinny 14-year-old karate enthusiast named Robert Savage, was arrested Tuesday as he was riding his bicycle outside his parents' neatly kept home on 130th Avenue.

Based on statements from the teenagers, investigators say they believe it was Mr. Savage who struck the most serious blows, smashing the skull of Mr. Liu with a brick. Mr. Liu, the owner of the Golden Wok at 192- 15 Linden Boulevard in St. Albans, Queens, was dead at the scene.

Robert Eilam, 20, who lives across the street from Mr. Savage, said that on Tuesday afternoon, a few hours before Mr. Savage was arrested, the boy had started to cry for no apparent reason. "He was just acting as if he were so sorry about something," Mr. Eilam said.

Mr. Savage and the other teenagers are being prosecuted as adults. Each faces multiple charges of second-degree murder, robbery and criminal possession of a weapon.

"Mr. Liu was a hard-working immigrant who leaves behind a wife and two children," said Richard A. Brown, the Queens district attorney. "He was killed without provocation and without reason. It was a shocking crime, which leaves us all shaking our heads and wondering why these kids would do what they did."

The authorities identified the other teenagers as James Stone, 16, of 176-31 130th Avenue; Jamel Murphy, 17, of 219-05 131st Avenue; Darryl Tyson, 17, of 132-07 178th Street, all of Springfield Gardens; and Stacy Royster, 17, of 257-52 148th Drive in Rosedale. Because of his age, Mr. Savage faces a maximum sentence of nine years to life in prison, prosecutors said. The other four face up to 25 years to life.

The teenagers were arraigned last night and ordered held without bail. They did not enter pleas. Later, their lawyers told reporters that detectives obtained statements improperly, and they disputed the authorities' account of the attack.

Most notably, Mr. Savage's lawyer, Rudy Hirschheimer, disputed the prosecution's contention that his client had acknowledged striking Mr. Liu with a brick. "My client said he didn't hit anyone with a brick," he said, joining with other defense lawyers in suggesting that a sixth teenage boy may have been involved.

Neville Reed, a lawyer for Mr. Tyson, said that police officers repeatedly assured Mr. Tyson's parents that their son did not need a lawyer during

questioning. "The so-called statement they obtained from my client was in my opinion in violation of his constitutional rights to have counsel," he said.

Relatives of Mr. Savage, Mr. Stone and Mr. Tyson either would not comment or did not respond to messages.

A man who would not give his name but identified himself as the father of Jamel Murphy trembled during a brief interview yesterday in front of his house. "I really don't have any words to describe how I feel right now," he said. He said he would not attend the arraignment of his son, who is known to his friends as Trigger. "For me to go and show support for something I don't support would be hypocritical."

Ms. Royster's grandmother, Anastasia Brown, said in an interview yesterday that her granddaughter had struggled in recent years with mental illness that at times made her "aggressive and out of control."

Ms. Brown, who raised Ms. Royster after the girl's mother died about eight years ago, said that in recent months Ms. Royster had seemed to get her life back on track. Only last week, Ms. Brown said, she signed up for classes at Queensborough Community College.

Investigators described Mr. Liu's death as the senseless outcome of an amateurish scheme. The group had already eaten once on Friday from another Chinese restaurant, but they decided they wanted seconds. Only this time, they came up with a plan to avoid paying, investigators said. The idea, officials said the teenagers told the police, was for Ms. Royster to place an order at the Golden Wok with her cell phone. Then, investigators said, Ms. Royster was to wait on the front steps of the vacant house. The teenagers later told investigators that they chose Ms. Royster because they figured that she would be perceived as less of a threat, the officials said.

When the deliveryman arrived, the boys were supposed to jump out of nearby bushes, cover him with the sheet and then flee with the food, investigators said. But they also were armed with a couple of bricks taken from one of their homes. They told investigators that they intended to throw the bricks if he struggled.

According to the authorities, the scheme unfolded as planned about 11 p.m. on Friday when Ms. Royster called the Golden Wok. Ms. Royster barely knew most of the boys. She had become involved with the group through her friendship with Mr. Tyson, whom she had known from the 11th grade at Christ the King High School in Queens. She keeps a photograph of Mr. Tyson by her bedroom mirror, not far from her posters of Snoop Doggy Dog and Mariah Carey and her collection of stuffed animals.

"You couldn't find a nicer guy," Ms. Brown said of Mr. Tyson.

According to Ms. Brown, her granddaughter had been at home much of Friday, listening to CD's * hip hop and Spanish music * writing e-mail messages, watching television. About 5 p.m. she told her grandmother she was going over to Mr. Tyson's house, in Springfield Gardens several miles away, and

said she would not be out late.

Ms. Brown said that about 9 p.m., she beeped her granddaughter, who called her back on the cell phone Ms. Brown had bought for her a few months ago. Ms. Brown said she told her not to stay out late, but Ms. Royster did not come home until about 2 a.m., and she was agitated and nervous, staying up until 3:30 a.m. and acting "hyper."

By then, Mr. Liu was already dead. Plans for a simple robbery of food had spiraled out of control, investigators said, when Robert Savage used one of the bricks to begin hitting Mr. Liu. An autopsy found that he had been struck in the skull at least three times, and pieces of brick were recovered at the scene.

Mr. Liu had operated the Golden Wok for at least 10 years. It is a modest storefront operation. There are no tables for dining, and Mr. Liu, a Chinese immigrant who spoke little English, made most of the deliveries himself. He worked long days side by side with his wife, a son and a daughter, and they lived in an apartment fashioned from partitions and bunk beds at the rear of the restaurant, the former property manager for the restaurant said. Yesterday, the Golden Wok remained closed and the Liu family remained in seclusion.

In the days after Mr. Liu's death, the teenagers carried on as if all were normal. They went to a nearby mall. Mr. Savage showed off a new melody he had composed on his keyboard. On Tuesday, Ms. Royster went to her first day of classes at Queensborough, and while she was at the college a detective showed up at the house with questions about the cell phone call to the restaurant.

Ms. Royster had told her grandmother over the weekend that she had lost the phone, but when confronted, she quickly admitted to calling the restaurant and then described the attack, Ms. Brown said. Several people who live in the neighborhood said Ms. Royster was seen riding in an unmarked police car pointing out some of the boys.

"Stacy had nothing to do with that man being killed," Ms. Brown said, beginning to cry.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

38 Charged in Control of Building Projects by Mafia and Unions

By WILLIAM K. RASHBAUM

The Manhattan district attorney charged 38 union officials, contractors and reputed mobsters yesterday with bribery, bid-rigging or other racketeering schemes that he said siphoned millions of dollars from public and private building projects in the last two years.

It is the most significant case focusing on organized crime's role in the construction industry in a decade, the authorities said.

Among those named in a 57-count indictment unsealed yesterday were the acting boss of the Lucchese crime family, Steven L. Crea, 53, who prosecutors say has played a role in construction racketeering schemes for decades, and two of his senior aides, identified as Lucchese captains. All were charged with enterprise corruption, restraint of trade and other crimes.

The indictment also charged 11 union officials, including Michael Forde, who heads both the District Council of Carpenters in New York City and the carpenters' union Local 608, organizations long tainted by mob influence. Mr. Forde's father headed the local and was convicted of taking bribes in 1990.

Robert M. Morgenthau, Manhattan district attorney, said the racketeering systematically siphoned millions of dollars from construction projects throughout the city and diverted it to the Lucchese family and its partners, corrupt union officials and contractors.

"Despite law enforcement successes over the years, today's indictment demonstrates that the fight against organized crime is far from over," Mr. Morgenthau said. "The mob's influence in construction industry, although not as pervasive as it once was, still exacts a tremendous cost from the city."

Mr. Morgenthau said the victims included union trade workers deprived of jobs by their union leaders; nonunion workers who replaced them and were paid far below union wage and received no benefits; and honest contractors frozen out of the bidding by the mob's corrupt alliance, which allowed their chosen companies to underbid other firms.

Because the Lucchese family insinuated itself into the construction of three schools and several road and bridge repair projects, taxpayers fell victim to the schemes as well, which levied a 5 percent "mob tax" on construction jobs around the city. One prosecutor said that the money stolen from the \$32 million that went to build modular classrooms in two schools in Queens and new construction at a school in the Bronx could have paid for more classrooms.

The indictment, the result of a three-year investigation by detectives from the Police Department's Organized Crime Investigative Division and Mr. Morgenthau's office, was announced at a news conference with Mr. Morgenthau and Bernard B. Kerik, the new police commissioner.

The investigation used court-ordered wiretaps on 38 telephones and 24 pagers, and police detectives and the district attorney's investigators executed 46 search warrants, poring over thousands of documents detailing the finances of the companies and local unions.

It focused on two Lucchese crews and their representatives on a special crime family panel devoted to dividing the spoils of the construction industry. Mr. Morgenthau called the panel the Lucchese Construction Group,

and yesterday, his aides declared it dead.

"The Lucchese Construction Group no longer exists," said Daniel J. Castleman, the chief of Mr. Morgenthau's Investigation Division, who oversaw the case. "To the extent that they no longer exist, it has put a pretty big dent in organized crime's ability to control these types of job sites."

In addition to Mr. Crea and two men named as captains, Dominic Truscello, 66, and Joseph Tangorra, 51, five named as Lucchese soldiers, including Joseph Datello, 49, and three as associates were also charged.

Union officials accused included Santo Lanzafame, 68, the president of Local 1 of the Builders and Allied Craftsmen, which represents New York area bricklayers; and three business agents and three shop stewards from the union. It also named officials from Laborers International Union Local 20, which represents cement and concrete workers.

"I think this sends a message to the legitimate construction people out there that want to compete in the bidding process, that want to compete on different projects, that somebody is there looking out for your interests," Mr. Kerik said.

The indictment also charges 11 companies and 16 people who owned or worked for them, including Lawrence Wecker, who prosecutors identified as a Lucchese family associate and construction racketeer.

Mr. Wecker, who was an unindicted co-conspirator in a 1986 case that struck at the mob's role in the concrete industry, was called "a walking A.T.M. machine" by one mob boss for his money-laundering prowess. Mr. Wecker, who was convicted of federal tax evasion in 1997 in connection with one of the companies named in yesterday's indictment, is one of three defendants in the current case who have not yet been arrested. He is on parole and prosecutors said they thought he had fled to Malta, in the Mediterranean.

Also charged in the case was Joseph Martinelli and his company, the North Berry Corporation, which did work on the Trump South development on the Upper West Side and on several other major projects.

Mr. Martinelli has been involved in the construction business for more than three decades, and has been identified as an associate of the Lucchese family and of Mr. Crea's since 1990, according to Federal Bureau of Investigation reports. The documents show that 10 years ago, Mr. Martinelli, a wealthy, successful contractor, received medical benefits through a Teamsters union local controlled by Mr. Crea. Prosecutors also said that in the current case, six organized crime figures or associates were collecting benefits as part of the current schemes.

Mr. Martinelli was charged with 16 counts of falsifying business records in the first degree, a felony, in the filing of false reports to the Cement and Concrete Workers District Council Benefit Funds.

One man was named as a Lucchese associate but not charged. Investigators said the man, Sean Richard, 35, had cooperated with the authorities since

late last year and was under police protection.

All of the men taken into custody yesterday were arraigned at State Supreme Court in Manhattan, where they were herded into the jury box to await their appearance before Justice Jeffrey Atlas. Mr. Crea, his lips pursed, stood with his hands clasped behind him and uttered only two words, "Not guilty."

Mr. Tangorra, in a brown sweat suit with his hair slicked back, was unshaven and looked tired. His wife tried to hand him a piece of chewing gum, but was stopped by a court officer. "Oh my God, I need a smoke," she said, as the prosecutors rolled in boxes of documents outlining the case against the men.

Justice Atlas freed all but two of the men, Mr. Crea and Mr. Tuscillo, on bail, which he set at \$20,000 to \$200,000. As the released defendants left the courtroom, many said they were angered by the authorities' decision to arrest them in raids rather than simply ordering them to report for court appearances.

In an unusual move, federal prosecutors in Manhattan unsealed indictments yesterday charging six Lucchese soldiers and associates, five of whom were charged in the state case, with conspiracy. Marvin Smilon, a spokesman for the United States attorney, Mary Jo White, said federal prosecutors were aware of Mr. Morgenthau's investigation, and the F.B.I. assisted in the arrests.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

THE MIDEAST
Clinton Talks With Barak And Arafat: No Progress

By JANE PERLEZ

UNITED NATIONS, Sept. 6 * In back-to-back sessions this evening, President Clinton met with the Israeli prime minister, Ehud Barak, and then the Palestinian leader, Yasir Arafat, to salvage the progress made in peace talks last month, but afterward the White House said there was little movement.

The president's spokesman, Joe Lockhart, said that, as expected, "no breakthrough" was achieved. "But the process is not broken down, it is ongoing," he said.

The mood was downbeat, after Mr. Clinton met with the leaders in the upper floors of the Waldorf-Astoria in a kind of hasty urban reprise of the bucolic Camp David talks six weeks ago. To build pressure on the leaders, the secretary of state, Madeleine K. Albright, met with Mr. Arafat as he waited for Mr. Barak to finish with the president, and she also met with

Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia before he sat down with Mr. Clinton.

Mr. Lockhart said the president had reviewed possible compromises with the leaders on the main issues, including the future status of Jerusalem and the fate of Palestinian refugees, but he declined to give details. The session with Mr. Barak lasted less than an hour, and the meeting with Mr. Arafat, with whom the Americans feel they need to do the most work, lasted about 90 minutes.

Mr. Lockhart said there were no proposals tonight for the next steps in the process. "I don't want to say there is no hope for next steps * I don't know what it is," he said.

Last week, administration officials said that once today's highly anticipated meetings were over, the president would be assessing whether it would be worthwhile to bring the leaders together again in another meeting in the manner of the Camp David meeting. They said this would be done only if the leaders were close to signing an agreement.

With a full array of world leaders in town, the White House seemed to be seeking out Arab leaders in particular in their effort to convince Mr. Arafat that time was running out for a peace agreement. Mr. Clinton met with Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia after his session with Mr. Arafat, and earlier Dr. Albright spoke with the Egyptian foreign minister, Amr Moussa.

At the United Nations, both Mr. Barak and Mr. Arafat spoke from the rostrum of the General Assembly, stating fairly familiar positions that included more generous terms than in the past. Mr. Barak called Jerusalem "the eternal capital of Israel" and then went on to say, "We recognize that Jerusalem is also sacred to Muslims and Christians the world over, and cherished by our Palestinian neighbors." He also stressed the short timetable, which the United States believes is framed by the return of the Israeli Parliament at the end of October. Mr. Barak has only a one- vote majority in the Parliament and faces the likelihood of having to call an election. Without a peace agreement, it would be an election he could well lose. "History will judge what we do in the next days and weeks," Mr. Barak said.

For his part, Mr. Arafat said, "We remain committed to our national rights over East Jerusalem, capital of our state and shelter of our sacred sites, as well as our rights on the Christian and Islamic holy sites, maintaining that the city should be accessible to all, and open onto its western side."

In a reflection of the touch-and-go dynamics of the peace effort, a senior administration official said before Mr. Clinton's meetings today that the positions of the parties had slipped some since Camp David.

There had been some "forward movement" in some areas, but in other areas, "I would say that they haven't necessarily stayed exactly where they were," he said.

The Clinton administration said that at Camp David considerable headway

had been made on subjects that had been taboo, particularly the future of Jerusalem.

But the senior administration official said that "it's been hard to build on the advances that were made."

A senior Palestinian official, Saeb Erekat, who had been quite optimistic after Camp David, said that more than two dozen meetings between the two sides in the last six weeks had produced little.

White House officials said they expected Mr. Arafat to return home this weekend to meet with the Palestinian Central Council, where a decision would be made on whether to declare a Palestinian state. Palestinian officials have indicated that rather than declare a state on Sept. 13, as they had pledged, November or even later might be set as a new date. Some European and Islamic nations have encouraged Mr. Arafat to delay his declaration of a state and concentrate on a peace settlement with Israel.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Text: Clinton, at the U.N.: 'Aspirations Pile High'

UNITED NATIONS, Sept. 6 * Following is a transcript of the address given today by President Clinton at the United Nations, as provided by the White House:

Madam President, Mr. Secretary General, my fellow leaders, let me begin by saying it is a great honor to have this unprecedented gathering of world leaders in the United States.

We come together not just at a remarkable moment on the calendar, but at the dawn of a new era in human affairs, when globalization and the revolution in information technology have brought us closer together than ever before. To an extent unimaginable just a few years ago, we reach across geographical and cultural divides. We know what is going on in each other's countries. We share experiences, triumphs, tragedies, aspirations.

Our growing interdependence includes the opportunity to explore and reap the benefits of the far frontiers of science and the increasingly interconnected economy. And as the Secretary General just reminded us, it also includes shared responsibilities to free humanity from poverty, disease, environmental destruction and war. That responsibility, in turn, requires us to make sure the United Nations is up for the job.

Fifty-five years ago, the U.N. was formed to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. Today there are more people in this room with the power to achieve that goal than have ever been gathered in one place. We find today fewer wars between nations, but more wars within them. Such internal conflicts, often driven by ethnic and religious differences, took five million lives in the last decade, most of them completely innocent victims.

These conflicts present us with a stark challenge. Are they part of the scourge the U.N. was established to prevent? If so, we must respect sovereignty and territorial integrity, but still find a way to protect people, as well as borders.

The last century taught us that there are times when the international community must take a side, not merely stand between the sides or on the sidelines. We faced such a test and met it when Mr. Milosevic tried to close the last century with the final chapter of ethnic cleansing and slaughter. We have faced such a test for 10 years in Iraq, where the U.N. has approved a fair blueprint spelling out what must be done. It is consistent with our resolutions and our values, and it must be enforced.

We face another test today in Burma, where a brave and popular leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, once again has been confined * with her supporters in prisons and her country in distress * in defiance of repeated U.N. resolutions.

But most conflicts and disputes are not so clear-cut. Legitimate grievances and aspirations pile high on both sides. Here there is no alternative to principled compromise, in giving up old grudges in order to get on with life.

Right now, from the Middle East to Burundi to the Congo to South Asia, leaders are facing this kind of choice, between confrontation and compromise.

Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Barak are with us here today. They have promised to resolve the final differences between them this year, finally completing the Oslo process embodied in the Declaration of Principles signed seven years ago this month at the White House.

To those who have supported the right of Israel to live in security and peace, to those who have championed the Palestinian cause these many years, let me say to all of you: They need your support now, more than ever, to take the hard risks for peace. They have the chance to do it.

But like all life's chances, it is fleeting and about to pass. There is not a moment to lose.

When leaders do seize this chance for peace, we must help them. Increasingly, the United Nations has been called into situations where brave people seek reconciliation, but where the enemies of peace seek to undermine it. In East Timor, had the United Nations not engaged, the people would have lost the chance to control their future.

Today I was deeply saddened to learn of the brutal murder of the three U.N. relief workers there by the militia in West Timor, and I urge the Indonesian authorities to put a stop to these abuses.

In Sierra Leone, had the United Nations not engaged, countless children now living would be dead. But in both cases, the U.N. did not have the tools to finish the job. We must provide those tools * with peacekeepers

that can be rapidly deployed with the right training and equipment, missions well defined and well led, with the necessary civilian police.

And we must work, as well, to prevent conflict; to get more children in school; to relieve more debt in developing countries; to do more to fight malaria, tuberculosis and AIDS, which cause a quarter of all the deaths in the world; to do more to provoke prevention and to stimulate the development and affordable access to drugs and vaccines; to do more to curb the trade in items which generate money that make conflict more profitable than peace, whether diamonds in Africa or drugs in Colombia.

All these things come with a price tag. And all nations, including the United States, must pay it.

These prices must be fairly apportioned, and the U.N. structure of finances must be fairly reformed so the organization can do its job. But those in my country or elsewhere who believe we can do without the U.N. or impose our will upon it misread history and misunderstand the future.

Let me say to all of you, this is the last opportunity I will have as president to address this General Assembly. It is the most august gathering we have ever had, because so many of you have come from so far away. If I have learned anything in these last eight years, it is, whether we like it or not, we are growing more interdependent. We must look for more solutions in which all sides can claim a measure of victory and move away from choices in which someone is required to accept complete defeat. That will require us to develop greater sensitivity to our diverse political, cultural and religious claims. But it will require us to develop even greater respect for our common humanity.

The leaders here assembled can rewrite human history in the new millennium. If we have learned the lessons of the past, we can leave a very different legacy for our children. But we must believe the simple things * that everywhere in every land, people in every station matter. Everyone counts, everyone has a role to play, and we all do better when we help each other.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

LABOR ENDORSEMENT
Teamsters Said to Be Behind Gore

By STEVEN GREENHOUSE

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the most powerful union to withhold a presidential endorsement, will vote today to support Vice President Al Gore, several Teamster officials said yesterday.

The officials, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said the union's

24-member board would vote in Washington to endorse Mr. Gore, despite the union's often-expressed anger at the vice president over his support for the China trade bill.

The Teamsters officials said their union's president, James P. Hoffa, was pleased about Mr. Gore's populist turn, his pledge to do more to help the nation's working families and his promise to negotiate worker protections in future trade agreements. Mr. Hoffa, these officials said, is also happy that Mr. Gore is increasingly talking about the importance of making it easier for unions to organize additional members.

"It's because Gore moved at the convention and since the convention to have a more pro-working class kind of agenda," one Teamster official said. "He's become increasingly believable as someone who cares about these issues."

For the Gore campaign, the Teamsters' endorsement is expected to be especially important in the swing states of the Midwest, where the Teamsters were founded and where they still have a powerful presence.

One Teamsters official said Mr. Gore would speak on Sept. 17 at a meeting of the union's political action coordinators in Las Vegas.

After the United Auto Workers endorsed Mr. Gore last month, the Teamsters, with 1.4 million members, was the one large union still on the sidelines, often giving the impression that it would remain neutral. Mr. Hoffa lavished praise on Ralph Nader, the Green Party candidate, for his criticism of growing corporate power and unfettered global trade. Mr. Hoffa also seemed happy to be wooed by the Republican Party.

One Teamster official said the executive board had decided to endorse Mr. Gore after an internal poll showed that 90 percent of the union's leaders across the country preferred Mr. Gore, while only 10 percent backed the other presidential candidates. Several officials said internal polls of the rank and file also showed solid majority backing for Mr. Gore.

One Teamster leader said the general view among the union's officials was that Mr. Gore, despite his position on China, was far closer to Mr. Hoffa and the union's positions on the minimum wage, Social Security, the right to organize and other issues than was Gov. George W. Bush, the Republican presidential nominee.

Douglas Hattaway, a Gore campaign spokesman, said, "Of course, we'd like their endorsement, but we haven't heard word of anything."

Ari Fleischer, a Bush campaign spokesman, said, "Regardless of whatever the official endorsement is, we're confident the governor will enjoy the support of many of the rank- and-file workers."

Mr. Hoffa has sought to persuade the federal government to end its decade-long supervision of the Teamsters, intended to root out corruption from what had been one of the nation's most mob-infested unions. Mr. Hoffa has said that the union is largely cleaned up and that he has put in place strong internal mechanisms to keep it clean.

Teamster officials said Mr. Gore had made no promise whatsoever about ending the supervision in exchange for the Teamsters' backing.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

THE TEXAS GOVERNOR

Bush Says That the Bottom Line on Gore's Proposals Would Consume the Surplus

By ALISON MITCHELL

INDIANAPOLIS, Sept. 6 * Gov. George W. Bush opened a new line of attack against his Democratic rival today, accusing Vice President Al Gore of making so many promises in this campaign that he would devour the entire \$4.6 trillion federal surplus projected for the next decade.

Mr. Bush chose to fight on the economy and fiscal policy on a day when Mr. Gore unveiled an ambitious and detailed economic blueprint and called for the creation of a \$300 billion rainy day fund to be set aside as an emergency source of money if the economy slows down.

The Bush campaign took out a full page advertisement in some regional editions of USA Today quoting six Nobel laureates and nearly 300 other economists praising Mr. Bush's approach to fiscal policy. The Texas governor also seized on an analysis released by Republicans on the Senate Budget Committee, who said the cost of the vice president's programs could be as high as \$906 billion more than he has estimated.

"I want America to add up all the promises my opponent has made," Mr. Bush told a crowd at an early morning airport rally in Scranton, Pa. "All the promises over the course of this campaign. He has the easy style of campaigning. Go to one community and make a promise here, go to another community. When you add it all up, he's spent the entire surplus on bigger government. He won't admit it."

Mr. Bush stood before a large blowup poster of the USA Today advertisement and used it to contrast his economic plan with Mr. Gore's.

"My plan has been endorsed by these Nobel prize winners and leading economists," Mr. Bush said. "His plan has been endorsed by Bill Clinton."

Mr. Bush's accusations were a mirror image of the Gore campaign's own assertions that it is the Republican candidate who is threatening the surplus because of his proposal to enact a \$1.3 trillion tax cut over 10 years, and his spending programs. When Mr. Bush unveiled a \$198 billion plan on Tuesday to change the Medicare system, Mr. Gore said, "There is no money to pay for it if you give away all of the surplus in the form of a giant tax cut for the wealthy."

At every campaign rally Mr. Bush is now featuring blue-collar families who

he says would receive large reductions under his tax cut plan but would get little to nothing from Mr. Gore's proposals for smaller, more targeted tax cuts for such expenses as college education or home health care.

"We trust you with your money," Mr. Bush told crowds today as he promoted his tax cut in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Indiana. "We trust you to make decisions with your lives. We don't trust bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. We don't believe in planners and deciders making decisions on behalf of America."

At another airport rally here he appropriated Mr. Gore's theme of helping "working families" and thundered, "Guess which plan is on the side of the working people? It's our plan. It's our plan."

Mr. Bush's turn to economic themes today was echoed by his running mate, Dick Cheney, who campaigned before a chamber of commerce in Wilmington, Del. Mr. Cheney said he believed that the economic policies of President Ronald Reagan should get a strong measure of credit for the booming economy of the last eight years.

Answering a question from a member of the audience, Mr. Cheney compared Mr. Bush's tax cut proposal to Reagan's own income tax cuts of two decades ago, saying it was "exactly what we did to get this prosperity begun in the first place, back in the early 80's under President Reagan."

Later, speaking to reporters, Mr. Cheney said that the boom was created by 20 years of strong leadership of the Federal Reserve Board, reductions in military spending after the cold war and the tax policies of President Reagan and even those of President George Bush.

"My analysis would be a 20-year look at the economy and policy, not just the last eight years," he said.

Still later in the day, an aide said Mr. Cheney wanted to clarify that he also gave a measure of credit to President Clinton for "reluctantly signing" fiscal measures approved by the Republican Congress,

The argument over surpluses and deficits is a muddy one because accounts of how much each candidate will spend depends on estimates and projections.

The Senate Republican analysis found, for example, that Mr. Gore's proposals would overshoot the available surplus by as little as \$27 billion over 10 years if the costs of Mr. Gore's spending plans are assumed to be at the low end of credible estimates.

If the costs of the spending plans are assumed to be at the high end of estimates, Mr. Gore's budget would be in the red by as much as \$906 billion over 10 years, the report said. For example, the report noted that Mr. Gore says his plan to increase retirement savings would cost \$200 billion over 10 years, while other estimates put the cost at as much as \$750 billion. The Gore campaign dismissed the report as partisan.

The Bush campaign says that the governor's own plan leaves a \$265 billion

surplus. But John Cogan, an economics adviser to Mr. Bush, acknowledged today as he briefed reporters on Mr. Gore's spending, that the Bush figures do not account for the costs of deploying a missile defense system, but only for research and development. Mr. Bush has called for a far more robust system than the one that President Clinton had been contemplating at a cost of \$60 billion.

Mr. Cogan argued that Mr. Bush could offset the cost with other military spending savings.

Mr. Bush also appeared today before the national convention of the American Legion, where he repeated calls for better military preparedness and better health care for veterans. Before he spoke, Alan Lance, the national commander, told the veterans' group that Mr. Gore had declined to appear before it because of a scheduling conflict.

Mr. Lance said the vice president had offered a substitute, but was turned down because it "is Al Gore Jr. who is running for president of the United States, not a substitute."

To applause, he added, "I believe you deserve better than that and America deserves better than that."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

The Ad Campaign: Attacking Gore Over Debates

By JAMES DAO

Gov. George W. Bush's campaign announced yesterday that it would begin running a new commercial attacking Vice President Al Gore's credibility on the issue of debates. The 30-second spot is to run in select markets in some, but not all, of the 17 closely contested states where the Bush campaign is already running commercials. But campaign officials declined to name the states.

PRODUCER Maverick Media

ON THE SCREEN Video footage of Mr. Bush seated comfortably in a chair, looking relaxed in a blue shirt with an open collar. Cut to shots of Mr. Gore appearing more tense as he is being interviewed on two television shows. Closes with the words, "If we can't trust Al Gore on debates, why should we trust him on anything," superimposed on a black screen.

SCRIPT Female announcer: "Labor Day weekend, Governor Bush accepts a record five national debates. March 14, Al Gore says he'd debate on CNN. July 16, Al Gore said he'd debate on NBC. When it was politically convenient, Gore said he'd debate 'anytime, anyplace, anywhere.' Now that Governor Bush has accepted, Gore says 'unacceptable.' Does Al Gore now mean debates depend on his meaning of 'anytime, anywhere?' If we can't

trust Al Gore on debates, why should we trust him on anything?"

ACCURACY The spot ignores the broader context of the debate over debates, and in many ways distorts it. Mr. Gore has agreed to all three of the 90-minute, prime-time debates organized by the Commission on Presidential Debates, a bipartisan group that has been running debates since 1988. Mr. Bush has agreed to appear in only one commission debate and proposed joint appearances with Mr. Gore on "Meet the Press" on NBC and on CNN's "Larry King Live." Both of those appearances would be 60 minutes long and, unlike the commission debates, would not be covered by all three networks. Mr. Gore contends that Mr. Bush is trying to reduce the number of people who can watch the debates and says he will not appear in any of Mr. Bush's proposed forums until the governor agrees to the three commission debates. But Mr. Bush contends that the vice president has backed away from his pledge to debate Mr. Bush "anytime, anywhere."

SCORECARD Mr. Bush's campaign is trying to fit the scuffle over debates into his broader attack on Mr. Gore's character and honesty. The line about "his meaning of anytime, anywhere," is a sly reference to President Clinton's defense regarding his relationship with a White House intern: "It depends on what the definition of is is." But this commercial could also remind voters that Mr. Bush, not Mr. Gore, is the one trying to sidestep the commission debates, and in that way underscore Democratic contentions that he is afraid to go one-on-one with the vice president before the largest possible national audience.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Robert Kennedy Jr. Endorses Hillary Clinton

By RANDAL C. ARCHIBOLD

Robert F. Kennedy Jr. endorsed Hillary Rodham Clinton's Senate candidacy yesterday, declaring that she would show leadership on environmental concerns he champions and would overcome the "carpetbagger" tag that also threatened his father's bid for a Senate seat from New York in 1964.

Mr. Kennedy, an environmental lawyer in Westchester County who had considered running for the seat Mrs. Clinton is seeking, stood at her side at the 79th Street Boat Basin in Manhattan and delivered her second endorsement on environmental issues in two days. On Tuesday, she was endorsed by the Sierra Club.

Mr. Kennedy credited Mrs. Clinton with exerting influence on the Clinton administration to take steps to protect the lands around New York City's upstate drinking water supplies, a battle Mr. Kennedy has waged for several years. He said that during a "seminar" he conducted for Mrs. Clinton this year, she had demonstrated a strong interest in that problem and in such other issues as cleaning up chemical contamination from the Hudson River.

Mr. Kennedy acknowledged that Mrs. Clinton's opponent, Representative Rick A. Lazio, had agreed to write a letter to the Army Corps of Engineers urging further protection of the watershed, but he faulted him for not taking the initiative on protecting the environment.

Mr. Kennedy adopted the favored Clinton campaign tactic of linking Mr. Lazio to his former ally, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, who Mr. Kennedy said was vehemently against the environment.

Speaking of Mr. Lazio, Mr. Kennedy said: "You can't point * and Rick Lazio can't point * to a single instance in which he has ever demonstrated environmental leadership on any environmental issue. He walked in lockstep with the Gingrich Congress."

Mr. Kennedy also addressed an assertion that Mr. Lazio has constantly repeated: that Mrs. Clinton is a "carpetbagger" who moved here in January only to establish residency for her Senate bid. The same charge was leveled against Robert F. Kennedy Sr., who moved from Massachusetts to New York City in 1964 for a Senate run that he won by a narrow margin.

Mr. Kennedy, who was 10 when his father ran, said: "The passions against my father were equal to or exceeded what I have seen. This is the question that was asked about my father: Is somebody who is not born in this state capable of putting in or offering leadership to this state? And my answer to that is resoundingly, yes, they are. New Yorkers come from everywhere. We have the most cosmopolitan community in North America and maybe one of the most cosmopolitan in the world."

Dan McLagan, a spokesman for Mr. Lazio, dismissed Mr. Kennedy's assertions as partisan rhetoric. He said the congressman had a solid environmental record that included supporting the cleanup of Long Island Sound and more closely regulating mining practices believed threatening to the environment.

"I think New Yorkers are more impressed by Rick Lazio's real record on the environment," Mr. McLagan said, "than by Mrs. Clinton's empty promises and partisan endorsements."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

THE DEBATES
Bush Vows He Will Stick To His Debating Schedule

By PETER MARKS

The wrangling over the presidential debates intensified yesterday, as Vice President Al Gore continued to insist that Gov. George W. Bush accept an independent commission's schedule of debates, while Mr. Bush vowed to show up next week for a television debate he helped to set up regardless of whether Mr. Gore was there.

"I'm going to Washington, you bet," Mr. Bush said on NBC's "Today" show, in response to a question about his proposed debate on "Meet the Press" with Tim Russert on Tuesday at 10 p.m. Eastern daylight time. "It's on my schedule. And I hope he's there. After all, it was on Mr. Russert's show, where he clearly said that he would show up if I showed up, and I'm showing up."

But NBC officials said there would be no edition of "Meet the Press" on Tuesday if Mr. Gore was not on hand.

"Our offer of a debate has always been contingent upon acceptance by both candidates," said Barbara Levin, an NBC spokeswoman. "We have no interest in favoring one candidate or another."

All the maneuvering has left the staging of any debates up in the air. The Commission on Presidential Debates, a bipartisan group that has been running the candidate showdowns since 1988, has a longstanding invitation to both contenders to appear in three debates on college campuses in October, an offer Mr. Gore accepted months ago. On Sunday, Mr. Bush countered with his own plan, which included one of the 90-minute commission debates but replaced the others with one-hour forums on NBC's "Meet the Press" next week and CNN's "Larry King Live" on Oct. 3.

The commission has invited the campaigns to meet to settle their differences, but thus far only the Gore campaign has agreed to.

Mr. Gore, who denounced Mr. Bush's offer as an effort to duck the commission debates because he was trying to limit the viewers, has said he is amenable to debating on the two programs. But he added that Mr. Bush must first consent to the commission's debates, which traditionally are broadcast live across the spectrum of major broadcast and cable news networks.

But Mr. Bush's plan would make it impossible for the candidates to adhere to the commission's schedule, because the date for the proposed encounter on Mr. King's program * Oct. 3 * is the same as the first commission debate, at the University of Massachusetts in Boston. Aides to Mr. Bush last week had expressed particular opposition to that debate, because of the university's proximity to the John F. Kennedy Library, an institution honoring a Democratic president.

Asked whether CNN had been made a party, perhaps unwittingly, to efforts to scuttle the Boston debate, CNN said that it was the candidates who had the power over the schedule and that the Bush campaign itself chose the Oct. 3 date.

"They are in control of when and where they debate," said Christa Robinson, a CNN spokeswoman. "What CNN did was put an offer on the table that did not have a specific date on it." But, she added that no debate would occur without Mr. Gore's participation.

The degree to which Mr. Bush is pushing his counterproposal was underscored yesterday, when the Bush campaign introduced a new commercial

taunting the vice president for not accepting Mr. Bush's debate plan.

"When it was politically convenient, Gore said he'd debate 'anytime, anyplace, anywhere,' " an announcer says, concluding, "If we can't trust Al Gore on debates, why should we trust him on anything?"

The commercial drew an immediate condemnation from the Gore campaign, which contended that it was Mr. Bush who was practicing debate avoidance.

"It's just the latest act of political chicanery," said Chris Lehane, the Gore campaign press secretary. "The bottom line is, he's bobbing and weaving and dodging by not putting the debates before the largest number of people possible."

Mr. Bush's alternative plan drew complaints from other corners. Ralph Nader, the Green Party nominee for president, sent letters to all the major cable and broadcast networks yesterday, asking that he be included in any debates they show. Mr. Nader wrote that the inclusion of him and the Reform Party candidate Patrick J. Buchanan would, among other things, make the debates more entertaining.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Corzine Gains Endorsement, But Not Without a Stumble

By DAVID KOCIENIEWSKI

TRENTON, Sept. 6 * Jon S. Corzine, the Democratic candidate for United States Senate, stopped by the New Jersey State House today for what looked like an easy afternoon's work: accepting the endorsement of the state's largest environmental group, the Sierra Club.

But the audience he encountered was salted with campaign workers for his Republican opponent, and Mr. Corzine ended up talking himself into an embarrassing gaffe involving his spotty record as a voter.

Before Mr. Corzine arrived, campaign workers for Representative Robert D. Franks, the Republican candidate, handed out news releases, which noted that Mr. Corzine had not voted during several recent elections when open-space bond issues were on the ballot and questioned his commitment to the environment.

When reporters asked Mr. Corzine about those elections, he insisted that Mr. Franks was wrong. He said he had voted in 1998 and supported Gov. Christine Todd Whitman's initiative to issue bonds to preserve a million acres of open space.

But voting records at the Union County Board of Elections indicate that Mr. Corzine did not vote in 1998, and when confronted with those records several hours later, his campaign retracted his statement.

"Jon misspoke," said Tom Shea, Mr. Corzine's spokesman. "He didn't vote in 1998."

While Mr. Corzine's memory and the 1998 open space initiative are unlikely to emerge as enduring issues this fall, the encounter offers an early glimpse of what the next nine weeks may look like. Mr. Corzine, a political newcomer who is financing his run with his \$400 million fortune, is expected to rely far more on his expensive television ads than on his wobbly performance as a public speaker.

Mr. Corzine began running television commercials on Monday and is likely to spend at least \$1 million a week on ads between now and Nov. 7, Election Day.

Mr. Franks, who has raised slightly more than \$1 million since the primaries ended in June, is unlikely to go on the air until sometime in October. Mr. Franks, who has held elective office for nearly 20 years, is in the improbable position of running an insurgent's campaign, scrambling for creative ways to gain free media exposure and goad Mr. Corzine into making rookie political mistakes.

Already, the Franks campaign has established a Web site mocking Mr. Corzine's call for such expensive social programs as universal preschool and universal access to health care (www.mruniversal.com). Mr. Franks has been so eager for television exposure that he spent part of this afternoon filming a segment for Nickelodeon, a network created to appeal to viewers who will not be old enough to vote for a decade.

Mr. Franks sent his campaign manager to the Corzine ceremony today, along with a spokeswoman and a campaign lawyer. They were accompanied by the chairman of the New Jersey Republican Party, Chuck Haytaian.

Charlie Smith, campaign manager for Mr. Franks, was at first coy when he was asked whether he and his surrogates would dog Mr. Corzine on the campaign trail this fall.

"We just wanted to see if he's the same guy who's in all the TV commercials," he said.

But when pressed, Mr. Smith argued that it was appropriate for Mr. Franks's staff to offer instant rebuttal at Mr. Corzine's press events because Mr. Corzine had made infrequent public appearances over the summer and had not yet agreed to a schedule of televised debates.

"It seems likely that every appearance, Jon Corzine will make a misstatement or misstep, and our campaign finds it important to document these and point them out to the voters," Mr. Smith said.

Mr. Corzine's aides predict that such aggressive tactics could backfire. "Jon was trying to have a civil discourse with the voters of New Jersey, and I think it's unfortunate that Bob Franks's campaign had to resort to this sophomoric attack," Mr. Shea said. "All they do is attack, attack, attack. But you notice that they couldn't find any way to defend Bob

Franks' environmental record."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

BEHIND THE NUMBERS Debating Plans for Hypothetical Money

By RICHARD W. STEVENSON

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 * In releasing a detailed economic blueprint today, Vice President Al Gore reignited a debate with Gov. George W. Bush about who can better apportion the projected federal budget surplus without driving the government back into the red and running the good economy off the rails.

By making selective assumptions about which tax and spending proposals to include and how to put a price on them, both presidential campaigns can produce bottom lines suggesting that theirs is the path of fiscal prudence and their opponent's the first step toward economic ruin.

The money the two sides are playing with is only hypothetical at this point, and for all the numbers flying back and forth, the issue is not really arithmetic. What matters is the clear difference in approach to economic management and use of the surplus between the two parties and their candidates.

Mr. Bush for the most part represents conservative orthodoxy, with a heavy emphasis on tax cuts, keeping politicians from getting their hands on too much money and relying on individuals and markets to solve problems and strengthen the economy.

In his view, tax cuts are a powerful way to improve the chance that the economy will continue to grow over the long term. Reducing the national debt, while an important goal, is not a singular priority.

After spending much of the past several months campaigning as a corporation-bashing populist fighting for working families, Mr. Gore presented himself today as the embodiment of fiscal responsibility, brushing aside the Bush camp's accusations that he is a recklessly big-spending liberal.

Mr. Gore emphasized his willingness to take some money out of contention for either tax cuts or additional spending, vowing to set aside \$300 billion of the projected surplus over the next 10 years in case the surplus does not materialize as projected.

If the money materializes, it would go to additional debt reduction; if it does not, it would not have been promised for any particular use and thus would not be contributing to any new deficit.

The 191-page document released today by Mr. Gore was written largely by

economic advisers closely associated with the Clinton administration's emphasis on keeping the budget balanced and paying off the national debt. They included Robert E. Rubin, the former treasury secretary, who colleagues said has sometimes been uncomfortable with Mr. Gore's recent populist emphasis; Gene Sperling, the White House economic policy adviser; Erskine B. Bowles, the former White House chief of staff; and Laura D'Andrea Tyson, a former White House chief economist and policy adviser.

Those advisers generally see the strong economy as Mr. Gore's best weapon, and reducing the debt as the best way of keeping interest rates low and stimulating the investment the economy needs to remain the world's most competitive.

Yet even as he presented himself as a man of economic prudence, Mr. Gore sketched a vision of an activist government willing to take on big problems. The document he released today sought to spell out for voters, with considerable specificity, how Mr. Gore would seek to harness continued prosperity on their behalf.

Incomes would rise by a third, Mr. Gore promised. The poverty level would decline to less than 10 percent, from 12.7 percent. College attendance and graduation rates would increase. Income-tax rates on families making the median income would fall. The disparity between what men and women earn would be reduced by 50 percent.

Mr. Gore described not just the goals, but the programs and policies he said would be necessary to achieve them, from paying off the national debt to spending \$115 billion more on education in the next decade and establishing a new retirement savings program at a cost of at least \$200 billion.

Whether the goals are achievable is largely a matter of how well the economy does in coming years, a variable mostly outside the control of any president.

The current business expansion is already the longest the nation has ever enjoyed. Should the combination of healthy growth, low unemployment and higher productivity continue for another eight years * by no means a certainty, even if the president, Congress and the Federal Reserve make all the right choices * many if not all of Mr. Gore's goals could be within reach.

Should the economy hit the rocks, they could come back to haunt a President Gore.

The entire exercise was striking for the degree of detail it involved.

Eight years ago, Bill Clinton offered an economic policy agenda titled "Putting People First." It was praised for, if nothing else, being detailed and concrete about his plans and priorities. In its original form, it was a few dozen pages long, an airy pamphlet alongside Mr. Gore's chart-laden presentation.

Mr. Bush has not pulled his proposals together in a comprehensive

document. But his campaign released a detailed accounting of his tax and spending plans today, right down to his proposed spending increase for aid to historically black colleges and universities (\$900 million over 10 years).

Mr. Bush counterpunched hard, citing support for his approach from conservative, Nobel Prize-winning economists like Milton Friedman, and asserting that Mr. Gore's long list of initiatives would blow a hole in the budget.

But Mr. Gore's camp is happy to have the campaign fought over economic management issues, seeing that as ground on which Mr. Gore is both comfortable and right.

It remains unclear how much credit voters will give to the vice president for the current prosperity * whether, as is traditionally the case, the good times will lead voters to think hard before throwing the incumbent party out of the White House.

Mr. Gore left little doubt about how he wants to put prosperity to work, but some of his more ambitious goals were vaguely defined.

He said he would seek to create 10 million "high-tech, high-skill" jobs during the next decade. But he did not define how those jobs would differ from other jobs, or how much better they would presumably pay than flipping hamburgers.

And his prescription for creating them encompassed such broad initiatives as improving education and training and continuing to open new foreign markets to American goods and services.

He said he would work to raise family incomes by a third over 10 years, largely by fostering continued improvement in the growth rate of productivity, the basic measure of economic efficiency. As productivity increases, wages and profits can rise without setting off inflation, and much of the economy's recent strength can be traced to productivity improvements.

But there is no simple recipe for nurturing productivity.

Productivity dropped sharply in the early 1970's for reasons that economists still do not fully understand, and has rebounded only in the past few years. The spread of computers and other information technology has obviously played a role, but no one knows for sure how long the improvement will last.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

THE VIEWERS
Debates Picked by Bush Would Draw Small Audiences

By BILL CARTER

If the presidential debates were held on the networks and days chosen by George W. Bush, the Republican candidate, they would almost surely be seen by the fewest number of people ever to have watched them.

The shows and networks chosen by Mr. Bush have never reached even half as many viewers as the least- watched previous debate. That took place four years ago, when the second Clinton-Dole debate * carried by the three major networks and CNN * reached a total of 36.3 million viewers. The ratings were diminished by the competition from the Fox network, which that night chose to broadcast a Major League Baseball playoff game.

Still, that audience represents more than twice the viewers of CNN's "Larry King Live" the night in 1993 when Al Gore debated Ross Perot about the North American Free Trade Agreement. That debate reached 16 million viewers, by far the most-watched night ever for the program.

It is also about nine times as many people who saw Mr. Gore debate Bill Bradley on NBC's "Meet the Press" last December, which reached 4.71 million viewers, the most-watched political event for that program in this election season.

Mr. Bush has chosen those programs as substitutes for two debates set by the Commission on Presidential Debates, which would have been broadcast by all the networks.

If the CNN and NBC debates take place, they would be the first in a presidential election not carried by more than one network. ABC and CBS have said they would not broadcast debates conducted as part of programs on another network.

Paul Taylor, the executive director of the Alliance for Better Campaigns, a group arguing for a rise in free media time devoted to the presidential race, called the system of debates covered by every network, "something that needs to be defended for the sake of the democracy." He did not fault the news organizations for proposing more debates, but said that "jockeying by candidates is imperiling the debates that can be seen by the entire country."

Mr. Taylor questioned how a debate limited to coverage on a cable network like CNN could substitute for a debate covered by every network. "You should not have to pay a subscription fee to have a front-row seat at democracy," he said.

It was only in the past two presidential elections that debates were not broadcast live by every major network. Contracts with Major League Baseball compelled CBS in 1992 and the Fox network in 1996 to broadcast playoff games rather than presidential debates.

The result was a drop in the number of viewers for the debates. But the drop was much more significant in 1996, when ratings for the two debates that year hit a historical low. They averaged 40.6 million people, down from an average of 66 million for the three debates in 1992.

In 1988, two Bush-Dukakis debates reached 65.1 million and 67.3 million viewers. The most-watched debate of all time was the only debate of the 1980 campaign, between Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter, which reached more than 80 million people.

NBC offered to move "Meet the Press" to prime time Tuesday, replacing the 10 p.m. program, "Dateline NBC." That program averages about 11 million viewers a week. CNN and the Fox News cable network have said they would carry the debate, as would the NBC-owned cable channels MSNBC and CNBC. But that might add only two million to three million more viewers.

NBC has not committed to broadcasting the debate agreed to by CNN on Oct. 3 because it has a commitment to a baseball playoff game.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

U.S. Urges OPEC to Increase Oil Production

By CHRISTOPHER MARQUIS

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 * With oil prices surging to their highest level in a decade, Energy Secretary Bill Richardson called on oil- exporting nations today to increase their production.

"My hope is that OPEC seriously considers increasing production," Mr. Richardson said, referring to the 11-member Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

As crude oil prices rose to \$34.90 a barrel in New York today * the highest level since the 1990 military buildup before the Persian Gulf war * Mr. Richardson said that energy costs were "unacceptably high." American officials voiced concerns that home heating oil prices this winter could be 30 percent more than they were last year.

In remarks to reporters, Mr. Richardson said OPEC should increase production enough to reduce prices to \$20 to \$25 a barrel or risk further disrupting the world economy. OPEC ministers are scheduled to meet in Vienna on Sunday.

World markets "are very clearly insisting that there's not enough oil on the market to bring stability," Mr. Richardson said.

The Clinton administration is under increasing pressure to do something about oil prices. The White House has prepared a contingency plan to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, although it has not yet acceded to demands from some lawmakers to do so.

On a trip in February to the Middle East, Mr. Richardson secured a promise

from Saudi Arabia to raise its output. The Saudi oil minister reported today that his nation had increased production by an additional 600,000 barrels a day since July, a 7 percent increase.

American officials have so far declined to say exactly how much additional production they are seeking from OPEC nations.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

U.S. and Europeans Raising the Stakes in Trade Impasse

By ELIZABETH OLSON

GENEVA, Sept. 6 * The European Union and the United States are holding fast in several trade disputes, their continued standoff threatening a more punishing confrontation between the two trading blocs, the world's biggest.

The European Union has rejected the United States' attempt to overhaul a tax benefit that saves American companies millions of dollars a year. The move comes at a time when Washington is drawing up a list of more than \$300 million in tariffs on European goods, mainly food, after the Europeans refused to alter their restrictions on banana imports and on hormone-treated beef.

Earlier this year, a panel of the World Trade Organization, based here, ruled that the United States must change a law that allowed companies * including General Motors, Microsoft and Boeing * to avoid paying taxes on some overseas sales by channeling them through offshore subsidiaries. Under the trade forum's rules, Washington has until Oct. 1 to revise the law, which the panel called an illegal export subsidy.

In a letter made public late last week, the European Union trade commissioner, Pascal Lamy, asserted that American changes still retain export subsidies in violation of W.T.O. rules, and enable the subsidies to exist beyond the October deadline. "The only way for a U.S.- based manufacturer to benefit from the new regime is by exporting," said a European summary of the letter to Stuart E. Eizenstat, the deputy secretary of the Treasury.

An attempt in May to reach a compromise failed, and Mr. Eizenstat warned in July that "a major trade war" could follow.

The new system for offshore sales was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee late in July, and awaits approval by the House and Senate. Clinton administration officials indicate they intend to press for Congressional approval of the modified law.

Although the European letter was not made public, Mr. Lamy is understood to have argued that the only real change in the American tax breaks was eliminating a requirement that a paper company be set up offshore. Some

5,000 such offshore tax havens exist, most of them based in the Caribbean region.

European officials in Brussels say they are willing to continue negotiations. "There is one month before the Oct. 1 deadline, and we believe there is still time for a solution," said Hervé Jouanjean of the European Commission, the year-round administrative arm.

Without a compromise, Brussels is expected to seek W.T.O. permission to impose retaliatory sanctions on American exports in amounts that dwarf previous trade disputes. Such sanctions are meant to be based on the amount of harm suffered in the international marketplace. Using that measure, the Europeans are likely to seek 100 percent tariffs on \$4 billion in American exports.

If Congress passes the proposed legislation before Oct. 1, trade experts said, the European Union would most likely have to file a new challenge to the law. A ruling, which is delivered by a three-judge panel, could take months.

In the dispute over bananas and beef, the Clinton administration is preparing a list of European products that would be subject to tariffs. Britain is lobbying for the exemption of Scottish cashmere from the list.

The European Union's initial effort to modify its banana-import rules, which gave preferential treatment to former European colonies in Africa and the Caribbean, was rebuffed by the United States as insufficient. Brussels officials are now trying to work out agreement on a new alternative among the European nations and their banana-exporting partners.

The Europeans and the United States also remain at odds over how to replace Brussels' ban on hormone- treated beef, which was struck down at the W.T.O. Currently, the Europeans are banning one hormone and temporarily excluding four others while scientific studies evaluate their effect on human health. The United States maintains that the growth-inducing hormones are safe.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

2 Cigarette Makers Are Said to Discuss Settling All Smokers' Suits

By BARRY MEIER

Two of the nation's major cigarette companies have been engaged in preliminary talks with plaintiffs' lawyers as part of a bid to reach a nationwide settlement of all smokers' claims against the tobacco industry, lawyers involved with the talks said yesterday.

Spokesmen for the two companies, Lorillard Tobacco and the Liggett Group, declined to comment. Other cigarette makers said they had no intention of

settling.

The disclosure was made as a federal judge in Brooklyn issued an order yesterday that could provide a mechanism for reaching a global settlement of claims by smokers.

Judge Jack B. Weinstein of Federal District Court told the parties to come to court Monday prepared to consider a suggestion by plaintiffs' lawyers to spin off claims for punitive damages against cigarette makers into a nationwide class- action suit, with separate trials for claims for compensatory damages.

Such a division would be unique. Plaintiffs' lawyers, in pressing for a separate punitive damages suit, are apparently seeking to play on the companies' biggest concern.

Earlier this year, a state jury in Florida issued a \$144.8 billion punitive award to members of a class- action lawsuit brought on behalf of all Florida residents who had been made sick by smoking. The companies have appealed that verdict.

Months ago, Judge Weinstein made a bid to create a class action for all claims, but the companies rejected his suggestions. Spokesmen for the nation's three biggest cigarette makers * the Philip Morris Companies, J. R. Reynolds Tobacco and the Brown & Williamson Tobacco Company * also criticized the latest plan.

"We have no intention whatsoever of settling these lawsuits and we are not discussing settlement with plaintiffs' attorneys or anyone else," said Mark Smith, a spokesman for Brown & Williamson, a unit of British American Tobacco P.L.C.

William S. Ohlemeyer, associate general counsel for Philip Morris, rejected the proposal, saying "we intend to vigorously oppose any attempts by this federal court to consolidate these cases."

In recent years, tobacco companies agreed to pay \$246 billion to settle suits brought by state attorneys general. But that settlement did not foreclose claims by individual smokers, as in Florida.

A spokesman for Liggett, a unit of the Vector Group that is the smallest of the major cigarette makers, declined to comment. Liggett has previously sought to settle litigation against it.

But the apparent interest of Lorillard Tobacco, a unit of the Loews Corporation, in settlement talks comes as a surprise. A Lorillard spokesman said it was not company practice to comment on litigation or potential litigation.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

New DNA Tests Are Seen As Key to Virginia Case

By FRANCIS X. CLINES

RICHMOND, Va., Sept. 6 * Lawyers for Earl Washington Jr., a model prisoner with the mental development of a 10-year-old, filed a petition today for a full pardon after 17 years in prison, 6 years after a DNA test raised strong doubts about his conviction in a rape and homicide.

Even as the petition was filed, the lawyers were awaiting results of a more definitive DNA test that they said in the petition they were certain would clear Mr. Washington of the crimes.

The new DNA test was ordered by the governor in the spring. Though Mr. Washington's lawyers maintain that the test usually takes a month or less to complete, a spokesman for the governor said the test was not concluded.

His lawyers, who specialize in the increasingly successful DNA challenges of criminal convictions, describe Mr. Washington as an amiable, passive farmhand with an I.Q. of 69 who has a weakness for agreeing with authority figures. They maintain his case is a summary of the main problems prompting the rising national concern about fairness in capital convictions: race, mental incapacity, prosecutions based solely on confessions, appeal limitations and the inevitable pressures of politics.

Mr. Washington was only days from execution in 1994 when his death sentence was commuted to life by former Gov. L. Douglas Wilder, a Democrat, after the initial DNA test. That test raised the possibility that someone else might have been involved in the crime, but state officials insisted it was not conclusive. Mr. Washington accepted the offer of life without parole, but a battery of lawyers has continued to fight to overturn his conviction.

"Earl's case has it all, beginning with bad lawyering and a false confession," said Barry C. Scheck, a professor at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University, who is co-director of the Innocence Project, a pro bono DNA defense program.

Defense lawyers expressed concern that Gov. James S. Gilmore III, a Republican close to Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, the Republican presidential candidate, might choose to "split the baby" politically and keep Mr. Washington in prison as part of a 30-year sentence in an assault case not connected to the murder. Typically, the assault conviction by itself would have merited parole by now, they noted.

"That's a ridiculous and unsubstantiated thing to say," Governor Gilmore's spokesman, Mark A. Miner, said in rejecting any suggestion that politics was a factor in the case. He noted that Mr. Gilmore had ordered the new DNA test in the first place. "The governor takes each petition very seriously and personally reviews the details," Mr. Miner said.

Mr. Washington was convicted of raping and murdering Rebecca L. Williams, a 19-year-old mother of two, in Culpeper, Va., in 1982. During years of legal criticism, police and prosecutors have defended their methods,

noting that a federal appeals court upheld the conviction in 1991. The court did so while finding that Mr. Washington was "easily led" by the police and that the prosecution evidence * the confession * presented "difficulties for any fair-minded jury."

The Culpeper police chief, C. B. Jones, who headed the Williams investigation, emphasized that it was a jury, not the police, who found Mr. Washington guilty. "Even if he didn't do the rape, there's still a possibility he did the other," Mr. Jones said when asked about the latest DNA appeal.

The police began questioning Mr. Washington about the unsolved murder and three other sexual assaults when he was arrested in 1983 after a drunken family dispute in which he assaulted a neighbor. Agreeing to waive his right to a lawyer, Mr. Washington initially confessed to all four unsolved crimes, but three of the inquiries were later dropped when evidence and witnesses contradicted his confessions.

"I guess I told them what they wanted to hear," Mr. Washington said in an interview this summer at Keen Mountain Correctional Center in southern Virginia. "I didn't commit the murder," he added. When asked why he confessed, Mr. Washington was almost inaudible as he answered with a smile and a shrug, "I don't know."

His conviction was based on a confession constructed of one-word "yes" answers to a series of leading questions. The transcript showed detectives repeatedly correcting, if not coaching, Mr. Washington when he offered erroneous details, such as misidentifying the crime scene, confessing at first to stabbing the victim twice when her body bore 38 wounds, and identifying the victim as black.

Mr. Washington, a 40-year-old black man, quickly corrected himself when contradicted. "Well that's wrong, Earl, she was white," a detective informed him about the victim after one crucial answer, according to the interrogation transcript that appeal lawyers underlined after his conviction.

"Oh, she was white," Mr. Washington amended.

"You can get Earl Washington to agree he shot President Kennedy or did just about anything else," said Eric M. Freedman, a professor at Hofstra University. He has helped Mr. Washington across 15 years of court and executive appeals, arguing that his retardation was exploited repeatedly in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Washington's original defense did not challenge the confession or bring to light serology evidence that no trace of the defendant was found on a blanket used in the rape and homicide. The lawyers who later took up his cause emphasized that their task was greatly burdened by the fact that Virginia has one of the most restrictive appeal procedures in the nation, allowing only 21 days after sentencing to present new evidence. In contrast, the most liberal states set no time limit.

"This necessarily politicizes the appeal process by leaving it solely in the governor's hands," said Peter Neufeld, co-director of the Innocence

Project. Mr. Neufeld conceded that part of the reason for making the pardon petition public was to openly press the governor to reject keeping Mr. Washington in prison solely for an assault conviction.

The new DNA test is more sophisticated than the original in being able to check at least 13 genetic markers for a possible match rather than the single marker studied six years ago.

In the last nine years, there have been 67 DNA exonerations of inmates across the country. Of these, one in 5 involved convictions based solely on confessions, said the Innocence Project, which was involved in 41 of the 67 exonerations.

Before DNA was used as an appeals tool, Virginia was the first state in the nation to use genetic technology in creating a DNA identity bank to which state felons are required to provide blood samples. The decade-old program contains more than 120,000 samples and has been used to find suspects who matched DNA evidence in about 30 killings and more than 150 other crimes.

In their optimism, Mr. Washington's lawyers have speculated that the DNA bank might be powerful enough now to identify another party as Mrs. Williams's murderer, providing Mr. Gilmore with a dramatic outcome for the Washington case.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

School Board, Facing Suit, Agrees to Recognize Gay Club

By BARBARA WHITAKER

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 6 * A suburban Los Angeles school district has reached an agreement to recognize a group of gay students and their supporters. The decision would settle a federal lawsuit challenging the district's refusal to allow it to meet as a student club.

The Orange Unified Board of Education in Orange is expected to complete the agreement on Thursday to allow the meetings at El Modena High School, which had been taking place under court order since February. The planned settlement comes after the Salt Lake City School District voted on Tuesday to end a four- year ban on noncurricular clubs that had been instituted after a gay tolerance group tried to form at a high school there. Salt Lake schools had also been sued over their ban.

The Orange board approved the settlement by a 5-to-2 vote at a closed session in August. On Thursday, the board plans to adopt changes in policies involving clubs that will allow the agreement to take effect.

"This settlement agreement would allow us to bring this to closure and move ahead with the business of the district, which is offering quality

education to the children of Orange Unified," said Judy Frutig, director of communications, for the district.

Commenting on the parallel decisions in Orange and Salt Lake City, Jon W. Davidson, a supervising lawyer with the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, which represented students in both districts, said, "I think the message of both of these districts is it's a losing battle for school districts to try and prevent students from forming the clubs they want, including gay-straight alliances."

In voting last year to deny the Gay- Straight Alliance's application to meet, the Orange board cited the state education code, which it said strictly defined how sex education and related courses were to be taught. The board maintained that it would be inappropriate for students to lead discussions on sexuality and sexual conduct.

A federal lawsuit filed in behalf of the club and a student organizer, Anthony Colin, accused the district of violating the Equal Access Act, a federal law prohibiting schools from selectively denying noncurricular clubs on the basis of content. The suit also contended that the board's denial violated students' constitutional rights to free speech and equal protection.

"We have basically won, no matter what's said," Mr. Colin said. "The gay and lesbian community now knows the board has made the right decision to welcome this club onto their campus. It sets a precedent for organizations all over the country, California and the rest of the nation." Mr. Davidson of the legal defense fund said it remained uncertain whether the change in Salt Lake City would mean that the gay-straight alliance would be allowed to meet.

"The lawyers for the school district have suggested that it would," he said. "However, there are a number of requirements in policy they adopted that we find troubling."

Among those were stipulations that any club can be denied authorization if it advocated or approved of sexual activity outside marriage or violated state laws regarding sex education. The policy also stipulates that the district can disapprove club names and requires parental consent for membership in clubs.

John Robson, a lawyer representing the Salt Lake City School District, said he expected that the lifting of the ban on noncurricular clubs would result in a gay-straight alliance being allowed to meet.

In Orange, the board stopped short of banning all noncurricular clubs in February following a preliminary injunction ordering the district to allow the Gay-Straight Alliance, which had about 50 members, to meet at El Modena High School. Instead, the board voted to restrict clubs at elementary and middle schools to those related to studies.

Under the settlement announced on Tuesday, Orange Unified will continue to allow the group to meet, but will change some rules regarding non-curricular clubs. The new rules will include a restriction on

discussions of sexual activities and will provide parents with an opportunity to prevent their children from participating in specified clubs.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

F.B.I. Lists Caution Signs For Violence In Classroom

By THE NEW YORK TIMES

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 (Reuters) * The F.B.I. responded to a spate of deadly school shootings today by giving educators a report with a list of warning signs that includes obsession with violence and access to guns at home.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation emphasized that the report did not contain a profile of school gunmen or a checklist of danger signs that could identify a student likely to commit an act of lethal violence.

"At this time, there is no research that has identified traits and characteristics that can reliably distinguish school shooters from other students," the report said.

Nonetheless, the report provided a list of more than 40 signs for school officials to check once a threat of violence had been discovered. The list covers the student's personality and family, as well as school and social dynamics.

Some examples of warning signs in the report included recurrent themes of destruction or violence in a student's writing or artwork, resentment over real or perceived injustices, a fascination with violent entertainment and weapons in the home. In one case cited by the F.B.I., a student in a home economics class baked a cake in the shape of a gun and used recurrent themes of violence in his writing.

The report resulted from a two- year study that examined 18 school shooting cases. Although the incidents were not identified, the report said the April 1999 shootings that left 15 people dead at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colo., added urgency to the research efforts.

Attorney General Janet Reno said in the report that the F.B.I.'s threat assessment model must be used judiciously to avoid "the risk of unfairly labeling and stigmatizing children."

Among things to look for in assessing threats are hopelessness, despair, hatred, isolation, loneliness, nihilism or an "end-of-the-world" philosophy and a preoccupation with themes of violence, the report said.

The report also mentioned students who are easily angered, who have had a failed relationship, who have an attitude of superiority and who are rigid and opinionated.

At a news conference at F.B.I. headquarters, Deputy Director Thomas Pickard said the report would help school officials "identify and deal with high-risk threats that are a major concern."
Mary Ellen O'Toole, an F.B.I. agent who wrote the report, said school violence was difficult to predict, but, she added, "There are observable signs along the way."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Court to Consider Bail for Scientist In Secrets Case

By JAMES STERNGOLD

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 6 * An appeals court announced today that it would hold a hearing on Monday on whether Wen Ho Lee, the former Los Alamos scientist accused of mishandling nuclear weapons secrets, could be released from prison on bail pending trial.

The announcement comes after prosecutors last week persuaded the court to block a federal judge's decision granting Dr. Lee bail after more than eight months in prison.

The three-judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit, in Denver, ordered the hearing closed to the public because it may involve the discussion of classified material.

The court has told the lawyers for the two sides that they should be prepared to make 15-minute presentations. It was unclear when the judges might then render a decision.

Dr. Lee was arrested and indicted last December on charges that he illegally downloaded a complete library of nuclear secrets to portable computer tapes with the intent of harming the United States. James A. Parker, a federal judge in Albuquerque, where the case is being heard, ruled at that time that he could not be released on bail because of government charges that he posed a grave threat to national security.

But at a hearing last month, an F.B.I. agent admitted that he had provided misleading testimony about Dr. Lee in December, and several experts disputed government assertions that the information Dr. Lee downloaded amounted to the "crown jewels" of the nuclear program. Judge Parker ordered Dr. Lee released to a highly restrictive form of home detention on \$1 million bail. Prosecutors appealed and sought a stay of the bail decision until the appeal was heard.

The appeals court granted the government a temporary stay on Friday. If the appeals court lifts that stay, Dr. Lee would be released to home detention while the appeal of the bail order worked its way through the

legal process, which can take months. Dr. Lee's trial is scheduled to begin on Nov. 6.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Launching of Shuttle Will Inaugurate Push to Complete an Outpost in Space

By WARREN E. LEARY

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 * The space shuttle Atlantis is set to head for the International Space Station on Friday, beginning an intense push to finish the long-delayed orbital research outpost.

The Atlantis and its seven-member crew are to blast off at 8:45 a.m. Eastern time, beginning an 11-day mission to outfit the growing station for the arrival of its first permanent residents in November. The flight begins a surge of 15 station-related missions by American and Russian rockets during the coming year, which will greatly increase the station's size and functions.

Officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration said today that no major problems stood in the way of the launching, though there were some weather concerns.

Shuttle managers are giving the shuttle only two and one-half minutes to lift off, starting at 8:45 a.m., about half the time usually allotted for missions to the space station.

Officials said that launching when the shuttle's ground position is aligned perfectly with the space station's orbit could save fuel normally used to steer the shuttle toward its moving target. Having more fuel will make it easier for the shuttle to deal with any thrust shortfalls in its main engines, they said. It also makes it more likely that the spacecraft could return to an American landing strip if engine problems develop.

NASA officials said the flurry of flights, after more than two years of delays in building the station, would be one of the most intense periods of human space flight ever.

Ron Dittmore, the space agency's shuttle program manager, said, "This mission begins a series of station-assembly flights aboard the shuttle during the next year that will be as complex as anything NASA has ever done, including landing a man on the moon."

The Atlantis's mission, hauling equipment and supplies to the station and getting the living quarters ready for occupancy, will be followed in October by a flight of the shuttle Discovery to haul up the first segment of a scaffoldlike truss on which other segments will be built. The shuttle Endeavour is to go up in November with the first segment of American solar power panels, after the arrival of a Russian Soyuz ship carrying the first

crew.

Eight shuttle flights are scheduled for 2001, starting with delivery of the American science laboratory Destiny. The last time NASA flew eight shuttles in one year was in 1997, and a record of nine went up in 1985, the year before the Challenger explosion, which resulted in cutting back the ambitious shuttle program.

Because of studies raising safety concerns about launching so many flights, NASA began hiring hundreds of new people, particularly safety engineers. And space shuttle contractors have added hundreds more.

The Atlantis crew of five American and two Russian astronauts will start this renewed activity by unloading its two tons of supplies and equipment and 1,300 pounds of material from an unmanned Russian Progress cargo ship, which docked with the station last month, to outfit the service module, Zvezda.

The shuttle, commanded by Col. Terrence Wilcutt of the Marines on his fourth trip into space, and piloted by Cmdr. Scott D. Altman of the Navy on his second shuttle flight, will dock with the station on the third day of the mission. The crew will wait almost two days before entering the station, first conducting a critical space walk to connect segments of the outpost electronically.

An American astronaut, Edward T. Lu, and a Russian counterpart, Yuri I. Malenchenko, are to spend six and one-half hours scaling 110 feet of the 140-foot-tall station to connect nine communication and power cables, on the most distant space walk ever from a shuttle.

The shuttle is to return to the Kennedy Space Center on Sept. 19.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Senate Panel Alleges HUD Used Program to Jab Mayor

By BRUCE LAMBERT

A Senate subcommittee report yesterday accused the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development of playing politics with programs for the homeless in New York City to harass the Giuliani administration.

HUD officials denied the charges and countered that the Republican subcommittee chairman was the one playing politics to embarrass the Democratic Clinton administration and to help Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, a fellow Republican.

The report said that HUD violated its procedures last year when it barred the city from its traditional role of ranking applications from private agencies seeking federal aid for homeless programs. The report also

accused HUD of withholding facts that could have ended a suit over the funds.

"The record shows that HUD leaders abused positions of authority for political purposes," said Senator Christopher S. Bond of Missouri, who issued the report in Washington as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Veterans Administration, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies. "HUD not only abused the law; HUD also abused the courts." He called for formal investigations and sanctions against the agency.

But a HUD spokeswoman, Lisa MacSpadden, said that the report was inaccurate. "Senator Bond is playing election-year politics by creating a smokescreen to camouflage the baseless nature of his previous criticism of HUD's action in this matter," she said. "The General Accounting Office reviewed these matters at the request of Senator Bond and found no wrong-doing, thus forcing the senator to turn to his own political staff to produce this political report," she said.

The dispute stems from complaints from two advocacy groups, Housing Works and the Coalition for the Homeless, that their applications for millions of dollars in program grants had been rejected in retaliation for their criticism of the city. Housing Works sued and won an injunction last December from Judge Allen G. Schwartz of Federal District Court in Manhattan, who found "a clear showing of a pattern of antagonism by the Giuliani administration toward the plaintiff."

Based on that ruling, Andrew M. Cuomo, the secretary of HUD, revoked the city's role as an intermediary in funneling federal aid for the homeless. But city officials insisted that they would continue review the grant applications. Eventually the city revamped its procedures to the satisfaction of the nonprofit groups and HUD, and it resumed its role. Both the Coalition for the Homeless and Housing Works won their grants, and the lawsuit was settled with the city paying \$90,000 in lawyers' fees to Housing Works. HUD officials said they were obligated to act against the city after Judge Schwartz's ruling. The co-executive director of Housing Works, Charles King, called Senator Bond one-sided in issuing the report, a 77- page document with 39 attachments that did not include the judge's findings.

In another criticism, Senator Bond contended that HUD prolonged the Housing Works suit by withholding from the court that the group's application would be approved regardless of the city's rankings.

But the agency's officials said that revealing such information would have violated their rules on premature disclosure and that because HUD was not involved in the suit at that point, it had no obligation to the court. Mr. King said that even had his group known that it would receive the funds, the suit claiming that the city violated its First Amendment rights would not have ended.

Mayor Giuliani said yesterday that he agreed with Senator Bond's view of the dispute, adding that his Senate campaign against Hillary Rodham Clinton * who considers Mr. Cuomo a major backer * played a part in HUD's actions.

"It seems to me it was only part of the way the federal government was being used to try to help Hillary Clinton's campaign," he said. "It was an absolutely incorrect way to use a federal agency."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Possible F.T.C. Meeting on Merger

A pair of U.S. senators have requested a rare closed meeting with Federal Trade Commission officials to discuss possible conditions on the proposed merger of America Online and Time Warner.

Sens. Barbara Boxer, D-Calif., and Conrad Burns, R-Mont., sent a private letter to the FTC today requesting a meeting Friday to voice their concerns about the merger and to be briefed about the scope of the agency's investigation. The senators will also push FTC officials to take a closer look at issues involving AOL's dominance in instant messaging and the potential for a combined AOL and Time Warner to discriminate against content from rivals on its Internet services.

The senator would like to get a briefing on what the issues are that (the FTC is) looking at, said David Sandretti, a spokesman for Boxer. Sandretti added that both Boxer and Burns have written letters expressing concerns about the merger's implications.

Sandretti was not aware that other senators would be present. However, staff members from other Senate offices are expected to attend, according to Senate sources.

We're going to find out what they're looking at and how the whole framework looks, and raise concerns of our own, said one Senate staff member who requested anonymity.

It is uncommon for legislators to request a private briefing with regulators in advance of a decision on a merger, and some experts wonder whether regulatory independence would be breached by increased scrutiny of the deal by the Senate.

Questioning federal regulators could undermine the integrity of the regulatory process, said one federal regulator who worked on a large merger from the corporate side.

But meeting with senators could allow the FTC to gauge political support for arguments against the merger.

Suppose for sake of argument that the FTC did have a legal antitrust case, said Robert Lande, a professor at the University of Baltimore Law School. If they know they'll get a friendly reception on Capitol Hill, they may be less likely to get their budget slashed. It is important to have political

support.

At least a dozen senators from both sides of the aisle have written letters to the FTC and the Federal Communications Commission asking regulators to carefully examine the merger's implications. Those raising concerns include Senate leaders Jesse Helms, R-N.C., Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., and Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, as well as Boxer and Burns.

Today's meeting request is the latest bump in the road for the merger, coming as the FTC begins to take a harder stance on a combination that would bring together the world's largest media and Internet companies. The FTC, which has the authority to strike down the merger if it deems it harmful to consumers and competitors, may require divestitures and force the companies to allow open access to its high-speed cable network, according to reports.

Despite assurances that the merged company would permit competing Internet service providers on its cable networks, the FTC believes the promises are not sufficient, according to a report by Reuters.

The FTC, along with the FCC and the European Union, has the power to approve or deny the merger.

AOL declined to comment on the proposed Senate-FTC meeting.

Our conversations with the agencies reviewing our merger are proceeding well and have been constructive, said AOL spokeswoman Kathy McKiernan. We are confident that we will successfully address all the issues that have been raised in our review, and we're on track to close in the fall.

bAOL lobbyists turn up the heat/b br AOL has also targeted senators, focusing on the core group who wrote negative letters to regulators about the Time Warner deal.

AOL has aggressively pursued these senators to submit follow-up letters expressing support for the merger, according to Senate staffers who requested anonymity. AOL lobbyists--and on occasion AOL CEO Steve Case--have been meeting with senators and staffers to persuade them to voice support to regulatory bodies, sources said.

They're trying to have members of Congress write inoculating follow-up letters, said one Senate Democratic source.

Senate sources have added that AOL's tactics have been perceived negatively in certain offices. Sources have complained that AOL's lobbying efforts have been heavy-handed and potentially damaging to its cause among Congressional members and their staff.

You certainly draw more flies with honey than vinegar, said one Republican Senate source. The more vinegar that you put out has more long-term effects with a corporation's ability to do work with Congress.

AOL spokeswoman Tricia Primrose said in an interview last week that the company's activities on the Hill are commonplace.

We're constantly working to educate members of Congress about the tremendous benefits of this merger for consumers, Primrose said.

Primrose declined to comment on other details surrounding AOL's lobbying strategies and objectives. She also declined to comment on specifics in AOL's efforts on Capitol Hill in relation to the letters.

AOL's lobbyists have a reputation for being strong-willed and highly effective, according to people familiar with their efforts. More than any other company, AOL is looked up to by members of Congress as the authority on Internet matters. Sources added that the effectiveness of the lobbyists' efforts has also reflected their growing influence as the torchbearers of the Internet on Capitol Hill.

AOL is a very savvy and tough political opponent, said Jeff Chester, executive director at the Center for Media Education. They certainly know how to work the Hill, when to bring Steve out, and when to bring out the bells and whistles.

Quieting the chorus of critics/b br AOL and Time Warner have taken steps to quell the ongoing scrutiny of their business combination. Notably on the open-access issue, the companies have issued a Memorandum of Understanding promising that consumers will be able to subscribe to any ISP on Time Warner's cable lines. Furthermore, the company will not limit how many ISPs can enter into agreements for carriage on the cable network.

In addition, AOL and Time Warner executives have reassured the FCC that its cable network will offer rival ISP services. Furthermore, AOL's president of interactive services, Barry Schuler, said the company is building technology to allow its instant messaging servers to interoperate with outside servers. He said it would take about a year to build the technology and security to protect its consumers.

Time Warner last month announced that ISP Juno Online Services has signed a letter of intent to become the first outside ISP to be carried on Time Warner's cable system. AOL this week also disclosed in a filing to the FCC that it plans to offer its online service on ATT's cable network in Boulder, Colo.

Those moves have not mollified opponents of the deal, some of whom believe a combined AOL-Time Warner will seek to block competitors from distributing content over its cable network.

Senators such as Hatch have drafted letters raising concerns about AOL and Time Warner's promises for open access to their cable lines. In a letter to FTC chairman Robert Pitofsky, Hatch urged the FTC to examine the possibility that AOL and Time Warner would use discriminatory pricing to effectively deny 'open access' to competitors.

According to Reuters, an FTC official has indicated that the agency is prepared to block the merger on those grounds.

In addition, regulators, consumer groups and competitors such as Disney

have voiced concerns over the combined company's influence in instant messaging, its control of the nation's second largest cable operator, and whether it will discriminate against rival companies who wish to offer content on these networks.

Consumer groups have also sounded off on requiring concessions for the merger. In April, the Consumers Union, the publisher of IConsumer Reports/I magazine; the Center for Media Education; the Consumer Federation of America; and the Media Access Project jointly filed demands for a series of divestitures to the FCC. The groups want AOL-Time Warner and ATT to open their cable lines to rival Internet service providers. In addition, they asked for divestitures in ATT's stake in Time Warner, Time Warner's Road Runner Internet cable holdings, and AOL's investment in Hughes Electronics' DirecTV.

A coalition of competitors--including CMGI, Microsoft, ATT, and Excite@Home--have also urged senators to demand a unified standard for instant messaging, regarded by the industry as a powerful technology, which lets users send instant text messages to each other. Competitors argue that AOL should open its systems to all technologies.

However, its considered unlikely that the FTC will require AOL to open its instant messaging technology as condition to the merger's approval, according to sources close to the matter. Since instant messaging is a free service, there's no commercial market to regulate, the source indicated in a previous report.

Currently, AOL controls 90 percent of the instant messaging market with its own AOL Instant Messenger and ICQ. A number of senators have raised concerns claiming AOL has dragged its feet in opening its instant messaging network to rival technologies.

INews.com's Patrick Ross and Reuters contributed to this report./I

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

INDONESIA RAMPAGE

3 U.N. Aid Workers Killed in Attack in West Timor

By CHRISTOPHER S. WREN

UNITED NATIONS, Sept. 6 * A mob led by militiamen brandishing automatic rifles and homemade firearms attacked a United Nations refugee office in West Timor today, killing three staff members, including a person from Puerto Rico, and possibly another aid worker. The attack prompted outrage halfway around the world at a summit meeting of world leaders here.

The 149 leaders included Indonesia's president, Abdurrahman Wahid, who, embarrassed by the failure of his army and police based on the troubled island to prevent the rampage, attributed it on grieving supporters of a local militia leader who died under mysterious circumstances on Tuesday.

Mr. Wahid promised to send two battalions of troops to reassert control, but it did not placate the fury at the United Nations, which has seen 193 of its peacekeepers and civilian workers killed in the line of duty since 1992.

Secretary General Kofi Annan, who was to have met with Mr. Wahid later this week, instead confronted him at a meeting today. Mr. Annan condemned the attack and told Mr. Wahid that the security situation in West Timor was unacceptable.

Earlier, addressing the opening of the summit meeting, Mr. Annan said: "This tragedy underlines once again the dangers faced by unarmed humanitarian workers serving the United Nations in conflict or post-conflict situations. The Security Council, and I myself, have repeatedly expressed concern about the safety of United Nations personnel in the field, both military and civilian."

The refugee agency identified the dead as Carlos C ceres-Collazo from Puerto Rico, Sampson Areghegn from Ethiopia and Pero Simundza from Croatia. A statement issued later by the Security Council referred to the possible death of a fourth international aid worker but did not give any details.

The Council was briefed on the attack by Bernard Miyet, the head of United Nations peacekeeping operations, and Sadako Ogata, the United Nations high commissioner for refugees. Mrs. Ogata read to the Council an e-mail message that Mr. C ceres- Collazo had tapped out shortly before he was killed. According to a diplomat present, it said in part:

"You should see this office. Plywood on the windows, staff peering out through openings in the curtains hastily installed a few minutes ago. We are waiting for this enemy. We sit here like bait, unarmed, waiting for wave to hit."

"I am glad to be leaving this island for three weeks," Mr. C ceres-Collazo wrote. "I just hope I will be able to leave tomorrow."

Mrs. Ogata ordered the evacuation of the refugee agency's workers in West Timor, in effect suspending aid to more than 100,000 refugees in the region. Barely suppressing her anger at a briefing for journalists, she called the rampage the worst security incident that her office had seen.

Mrs. Ogata said she protested the attack in "an encounter" with President Wahid today. She reported that he had expressed feelings of mourning for the slain refugee workers, and had told her that one of the two promised battalions was already on its way to West Timor.

But after the strained meeting, Mrs. Ogata said: "I would like to insist that the president of Indonesia implement security measures. Words are not enough anymore. I want facts."

Violence has ravaged the divided island of Timor since last year, when militias opposed to independence from Indonesia attacked residents of East Timor who had voted for secession, killing or wounding many of them and

razing some villages. Nearly 300,000 East Timorese fled for safety to the western part of the island. An estimated 170,000 of the refugees have since returned home, but up to 125,000 remain in West Timor, where militias have continued to prey on them, despite appeals by the United Nations and others for the Indonesian government to intervene.

"It's not something that happened all of a sudden," Mrs. Ogata said of today's rampage. "It's just expressed in the worst possible way."

According to her staff, the attack on the refugee office in the impoverished town of Atambua was prompted by a funeral for Olivio Mendonca, a militia leader also known as Moruk.

"The man killed was the head of one of the most notorious and criminal militia groups of East Timor," Mr. Ceres-Collazo wrote in his e-mail. "These guys act without thinking and can kill a human as easily (and painlessly) as I kill mosquitoes in my room."

Shortly thereafter, dozens of militants from the funeral procession of more than 1,000 mourners stormed and trashed the refugee office, beat Mr. Ceres-Collazo and his two colleagues to death, set fire to their vehicles and stole equipment, including radios needed for contact with other United Nations offices on the island.

United Nations officials said the refugee agency suspended operations for six days in West Timor last month after several employees were badly beaten but resumed work on Aug. 29 following assurances of security from the Indonesian authorities.

By this evening, 14 United Nations employees and 30 workers for other relief organizations, including some local employees in Atambua, were plucked out by helicopter and flown to Dili, the capital of East Timor. Others were reported still hiding from the mob. Frederic Eckhard, the secretary general's spokesman, declined to give details to avoid putting their lives at risk.

The United Nations has more than 8,000 military peacekeepers deployed in East Timor, but their mandate restricts them to providing security and supporting reconstruction in that territory in preparation for formal independence from Indonesia, probably next year. Two peacekeepers were killed in a clash with militiamen this summer.

Mrs. Ogata said her agency's employees still in West Timor, including about 50 in its capital, Kupang, would be pulled out on Thursday, and would not go back until their security was guaranteed.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

A Rights Advocate Who's Also Britain's First Lady

By SARAH LYALL

Cherie Booth, the wife of the British prime minister, strode purposefully into a thicket of criticism last month when she publicly praised Britain's Human Rights Act, a central element of her husband's legislative program and the basis for much of her work as a high-powered international lawyer.

Yesterday in Manhattan she demonstrated that even the Conservative opposition's provocative efforts to compare her to Hillary Clinton and Lady Macbeth * in the same breath, and not as a compliment * had not dissuaded her from pursuing what has become an increasingly outspoken role.

At a forum sponsored by New York University School of Law, she joined a panel of lawyers from Britain and the United States in discussing the revolution taking place in English courts as the country prepares to incorporate the European convention on human rights into British law, effectively giving ordinary Britons their first domestic bill of rights.

She was breaking new ground by discussing anything at all. No prime minister's spouse * including Sir Denis Thatcher, Margaret Thatcher's discreet and sporting husband * has ever opened his or her mouth in public before in anything but the most innocuous way.

Norma Major, John Major's wife, was best known for her expertise on the opera. Sir Denis, who tended to walk demurely behind his wife, once observed that "she runs the country; I run the family."

Byron Shafer, the Andrew Mellon professor of American government at Oxford University, said: "Before Cherie Blair, in some sense the role model for the prime minister's spouse would have been someone like Lady Bird Johnson. They could have public causes * saving species and beautifying highways * things that no one could criticize."

But Ms. Booth, 45, who until recently has deliberately avoided politics and who never speaks to reporters, has taken a leading role in what, for Britain, is a decidedly controversial cause: human rights law in an increasingly Europeanized England.

"As the world merges together, and at a time when we're at the Millennium Summit of the United Nations, we're seeing the emergence of a body of jurisprudence that is truly international and that provides extraordinary opportunities," she said yesterday.

"We're going to live in a very interesting time in which our judges can take part in the community of nations and rule on the application of international law," she said.

Just how politically fraught such comments can be became clear last month when Ms. Booth and a colleague, Rabinder Singh, wrote an article for The Daily Telegraph saying that the new human rights law, which takes effect on Oct. 2, would "bring rights home."

"The Human Rights Act forms an integral part of the government's program

of constitutional reform, which has the aim of modernizing Britain to make it a strong and confident democracy in the 21st century," the two wrote.

But the article provoked an outpouring of sniping from conservative-minded Britons who believe that the new law will produce a deluge of lawsuits and upend many of England's traditions by setting individual rights * of gays, criminal suspects and the like * above the rights of the state.

John Bercow, a home affairs spokesman for the Conservative Party and a man known for his pungent metaphors, was dispatched to lead the party's attack. Accusing Ms. Booth of suffering from "Hillary syndrome," Mr. Bercow said that "people in Britain will not put up with anyone who thinks she can be an unaccountable cross between first lady and Lady Macbeth."

Leaving Lady Macbeth out of it, Ms. Booth has gone further than Mrs. Clinton in pursuing her own career, even as her husband pursues his. Sometimes the two courses seem almost contradictory. As a lawyer specializing in employment law, she is often called on to challenge laws enacted by the government or decisions made by public authorities.

"In a sense, hers is the more radical departure," Mr. Shafer of Oxford said. "She's said, 'I'm having a life of my own, and it's a public life, and it's going to go on.' "

In the end, the attack seemed to backfire, as even some Conservatives bristled at Mr. Bercow's insinuation that perhaps Ms. Booth should not have a job at all. But even so, said Ann McElvoy, a columnist for The Independent in London, Ms. Booth put herself in a newly vulnerable position by inserting herself so publicly into such an explosive issue.

"Cherie is a very political person," Ms. McElvoy said. "Where there's perhaps a bit of a conflict is that she was very deliberately using Blairite language to describe what the human rights law will achieve. It's very hard, as Hillary Clinton found out, to go back into the shadows once you've come out."

But Ms. Booth, who temporarily slipped out of the conference yesterday, colleagues said, to breast-feed her three-month-old baby, has proved remarkably unperturbed by the fuss.

"She is very tough, Cherie," said Nick Martin, chief executive of Matrix, the human-rights-minded law firm set up in a blaze of publicity by Ms. Booth and an number of other high-profile lawyers last spring. "She wants to get on with it and do her job. Her only worry would be that her partners would feel that it distracted from Matrix's work."

The Tories also picked on Ms. Booth when it emerged that she had held legal meetings with clients in the Blair family apartment above No. 11 Downing Street.

"The taxpayer pays for Downing Street as a place to live and work for the prime minister," sniffed John Redwood, a top-ranking Conservative. "A member of the prime minister's family should not be using No. 10 or No. 11 for business purposes. It's as simple as that."

But Ms. Booth * who spoke recently during a case involving parental leave about the "culture of discrimination" forcing women "to struggle with the balance of work and family life" * was on maternity leave at the time, a Downing Street spokesman said.

"Downing Street is Mrs. Blair's home," the spokesman said. "As a mother with a small baby, it is not unreasonable for her to work from home."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Rwandan Pleads for Quicker Intervention in World's Hot Spots

By BARBARA CROSSETTE

UNITED NATIONS, Sept. 6 * Less than two weeks after experts told the United Nations that it needed an in-house policy center to work on areas of tension before they turn into international crises, President Paul Kagame of Rwanda came along this week with a case in point.

More than six years after a frenzy of ethnic killing tore his small African country apart, armed militia and former soldiers thought to be guilty of some of the killings are still roaming free in neighboring Congo. A plan to deal with them should have been worked out long ago by United Nations officials drawing on their collective skills, Mr. Kagame said in an interview. To him, they are the reason there is a war in Congo.

In New York for the summit meeting of world leaders, Mr. Kagame said that until the Hutu responsible for killing Tutsi and their moderate Hutu allies are disarmed and resettled somewhere in peace, Rwandan troops will stay in Congo. The presence of foreign troops * from Rwanda, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Angola and Namibia * is also a major impediment to dispatching a United Nations peacekeeping operation.

"The U.N. has enough resources and expertise * and even experience from other situations * to come up with a proposal," Mr. Kagame said. Breaking the cycle of blame and counter-blame between Rwanda and the Congolese government would mean separating fewer than 10,000 Rwandans who, he said, are mixed with troops from Congo and its allies.

"There are many ways of dealing with the problem," he said. "One is working together to see that these people don't get support from other governments. Let's put them into camps and disarm them. Let's repatriate them to Rwanda or take them elsewhere. I don't see why the U.N. can fail to do that.

"They keep coming to us and asking us what we feel they should do, but this is simply trying to run away from the problem."

Tens of thousands of exiles have returned voluntarily, he added.

Mr. Kagame said the costly business of keeping Rwandan troops in Congo to seal the border burdens the reconstruction of Rwanda, a country of about 7.5 million people.

He said that Rwanda, like Cambodia, will suffer for a long time from the loss of much of its middle class in the killings. The events of 1994 left up to 800,000 Rwandans dead and led several months later to the overthrow of a Hutu-led government by Tutsi-led rebels whom Mr. Kagame commanded. He has been the central power figure in Rwanda ever since, although he did not assume the presidency until this year.

The middle-class professionals lost to Rwanda came from both ethnic groups. Mr. Kagame said that in addition to those who were killed, many of the 120,000 Rwandans charged in the attacks and still in jail are also middle class: priests, civil servants, local political leaders.

Mr. Kagame, who has tempered the fury he first expressed at the failure of the United Nations and its leading members, including the United States and France, to prevent or end the massacres, now focuses his criticism on what he sees as an international failure to recognize that a country so profoundly wounded cannot be treated like just any place.

"My country has to be treated as a special case," he said.

He rejected suggestions that the Hutu majority and Tutsi minority will never be reconciled.

"There has been nothing in the past to demonstrate that they can't live together," he said, "but I do see a solution in the better political, economic and social management of the country."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

In Sharp Debate on Freedoms, Top Hong Kong Educators Resign

By MARK LANDLER

HONG KONG, Sept. 6 * Two top officials at Hong Kong University resigned today after an investigation found that they and an adviser to the territory's chief executive, Tung Chee-hwa, had pressed a prominent pollster not to publish surveys critical of Mr. Tung.

The university's vice chancellor, Cheng Yiu-chung, and his deputy, Wong Siu-lung, are the first casualties of a dispute that has become a referendum on whether Hong Kong's government has sought to stifle academic freedom since the British colony reverted to China in 1997.

The two men said they rejected the findings of the investigation, which had been ordered by the university after the pollster, Robert Chung, made

the allegations in July. But they said they would step down to avoid damage to the institution.

The report also implicated Mr. Tung's senior special adviser, Andrew Lo. He refused to step down, saying he had not sought to intimidate Mr. Chung. Mr. Lo has been stoutly defended by Mr. Tung, but with the drumbeat of opposition, Mr. Tung may be forced to jettison Mr. Lo, one of his most trusted advisers.

The dispute has injected a combustible element into Hong Kong's legislative elections, which will be held Sunday. In the first post-colonial ballot, in 1998, voters were driven by fears that China would curtail Hong Kong's freedoms. This time, people are likely to signal their dissatisfaction with their own Beijing-appointed leaders.

"The scandal damages the credibility and image of the local government," said Tsang Yok-sing, the chairman of the main pro-Beijing party, the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong. "We are seen as close to Mr. Tung, so we will suffer."

Mr. Tsang predicted that his party would lose at least one of the 24 seats in the Legislative Council that are chosen through direct elections. The other 36 seats are filled by indirect means that favor pro-Beijing interests.

"Hong Kong voters are not electing a government," said Martin Lee, chairman of the Democratic Party. "They are electing legislators, who are always going to be in opposition."

Mr. Chung's allegation * that the university had threatened to "dry up" his funding if he did not end polls on Mr. Tung's popularity * prompted a blizzard of criticism.

The university appointed an independent panel to investigate the allegations. After 11 days of hearings, broadcast live on television, the panel issued a damning report last week.

It said that after a meeting between the vice chancellor and Mr. Tung's aide, the deputy vice chancellor delivered a message to Mr. Chung "which was calculated to inhibit his right to academic freedom." The panel described Mr. Tung's adviser, Mr. Lo, as a "poor and untruthful witness."

The panel found no evidence that Mr. Tung ordered Mr. Lo to stop the polls. Mr. Tung himself declined to testify. But Mr. Chung and many others say the chief executive signaled his displeasure with the surveys * which led Mr. Lo to take matters into his own hands.

"One of the issues in Hong Kong after the handover has been the lack of accountability," said Michael DeGolyer, head of the Hong Kong Transition Project, which measures post-colonial attitudes. For that reason, he added, the public airing of the dispute would have a salutary effect. Given Hong Kong's awkward political situation as a semi-democratic oasis in a Communist country, he said, people here should be highly alert to any threats.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

U.S. Is Reported to Hand Russia Secret Details on Sub That Sank

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 * President Clinton's national security adviser, Samuel R. Berger, has provided his Russian counterpart with a written summary of what American naval and intelligence officials believe caused the nuclear-powered submarine Kursk to sink last month in the Barents Sea, officials said today.

The summary, based on acoustic recordings and other information gathered by two American submarines and a surface vessel in the Barents at the time, included evidence that American officials have said contradicts assertions by some Russian officials that the Kursk sank after a collision with another sub or a World War II-era mine.

Mr. Berger provided the information, at the Russians' request, in a meeting on Monday with Sergei Ivanov, head of the Russian Security Council and a close aide to President Vladimir V. Putin.

The information could help Mr. Putin's government sort out which of several accounts was the most likely explanation for the sinking on Aug. 12, which killed all 118 crew members.

"In response to a request from the Russian government, Mr. Berger provided some information to Mr. Ivanov on our knowledge regarding the tragedy," said P. J. Crowley, a spokesman for the National Security Council.

Mr. Clinton opened his meeting with Mr. Putin today in New York with a discussion of the Kursk's sinking. The men were at the world leaders' meeting at the United Nations.

"President Clinton expressed his regret and his sympathies to the families, of course," Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott said afterward. "And President Putin talked a bit about the episode itself and what it revealed and how he had coped with it. There was some further discussion on that."

The decision to share information on the Kursk was unusual, given that it was gathered by one of the most secretive parts of the American military, the submarine fleet. Mr. Crowley declined to discuss what information was shared, except to say that it was in an unclassified form.

But Itar-Tass, the Russian news agency, quoted Mr. Ivanov as saying the information included technical details on "the exact times, to the second, of two explosions" that wrecked the Kursk.

American officials have said the explosions * recorded by the Memphis, another American sub reported to be the Toledo and a surveillance ship, the Loyal * strongly suggest that the Kursk sank after a catastrophic accident in its hull and not because of a collision.

Following that theory, a rocket- propelled torpedo being loaded or launched as part of an exercise misfired, with its engine or its fuel exploding. Two minutes and 15 seconds later, a larger explosion of the torpedo warhead tore a gaping hole in the sub's bow.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

BRASÖLIA JOURNAL
Crusading Prosecutor Delights and Amazes Many

By LARRY ROHTER

BRASÖLIA, Sept. 1 * To his enemies, whose numbers seem to be growing by the day, Luiz Francisco de Souza is "the Torquemada of Brasília," a reincarnation of the fanatic priest who commanded the Spanish Inquisition.

But Mr. de Souza is a federal prosecutor, not a cleric, and he bristles at the suggestion that he is engaged in anything other than a crusade to bring honesty, openness and accountability to government here.

"The more the truth is hidden, the easier it becomes for iniquity to reign," he said in an interview. "There is a lot of corruption in Brazil, and many things to be ashamed of, but we also have a Constitution that clearly spells out the functions and powers of a prosecutor, and those are to defend the democratic order and morality in administration."

Mr. de Souza owes his controversial image and sudden prominence primarily to an investigation he is leading into the whereabouts of nearly \$150 million that vanished during the still unfinished construction of a federal courthouse in SÆo Paulo.

As a result of his efforts, a senator was recently expelled from office for corruption and the chief labor court judge in SÆo Paulo is now a fugitive, with his bank accounts frozen and posters seeking his arrest on display at every airport.

But even before that case put him in the national spotlight, Mr. de Souza, 38, led a separate inquiry that forced the lower house of the Brazilian Congress to banish one of its members, a former state police chief, now imprisoned for his part in the murders of dozens of opponents and criminals, some of whom were butchered with chain saws and thrown into acid baths.

And after prosecutors found that cabinet ministers and other top officials were flying to beach resorts on air force planes at taxpayer expense, a law was passed banning that practice.

Perhaps most astonishing of all to Brazilians, who are accustomed to seeing favoritism and nepotism at high levels go unpunished, is that Mr. de Souza and his team have not hesitated to make their own colleagues targets when malfeasance is suspected. After a prosecutor in SÆo Paulo, for example, was recently found to have received a \$51,000 check from a figure involved in the courthouse case, they ordered an investigation opened against him, too.

As might be expected, the targets of Mr. de Souza's prosecutorial zeal are none too happy these days.

One exasperated bureaucrat last month labeled the federal prosecutor's office here "a judicial loony bin." And with municipal elections scheduled for October, members of Congress have accused Mr. de Souza of trying to advance his own career and the interests of opposition parties at their expense.

"What you are doing wounds the sensibilities of many people," Senator Pedro Simϑn, a prominent member of the government coalition, complained at a recent congressional hearing. "A prosecutor sends some mayor from a town in the interior off to jail and he becomes a star on television."

But Mr. de Souza's efforts seem to delight and amaze the average Brazilian. On the streets, he is recognized with increasing frequency, and is often greeted with pats on the back, thumbs-up signs, honks from car horns or shouts of encouragement.

"Let the scoundrels squirm," Evandro Vieira Milhomem, a waiter here, said approvingly of those who have been caught up in Mr. de Souza's investigative web. "It's about time that somebody called the rich and powerful to account and made them understand that the law applies to them, too, and not just to us poor folks."

Part of Mr. de Souza's appeal is the novelty of the crusading prosecutor, a figure who, while quite familiar in the United States, is not common here. In fact, until the ratification of the Constitution drawn up after the fall of a military dictatorship in 1985, one of the main duties of the Public Ministry, as the prosecutor's office is known, was to defend the federal government against lawsuits and provide legal counsel to the executive branch.

But the current Constitution, dating from 1988, not only set up a separate advocate general's post to fill those functions, but it gave prosecutors a whole gamut of new powers to ferret out wrongdoing.

Today, their responsibilities include the "defense of the judicial order, the democratic regime and of social and individual interests," ranging from the environment and monitoring the behavior of police forces to assuring Indian and consumer rights.

"I think what they are doing is wonderful," said David Fleischer, president of the Brazilian chapter of Transparency International, an anti-corruption group. "They are filling a void, playing a role like that of the Government Accounting Office or the inspector general" in the United

States and "doing what the executive and legislative branches really ought to be doing themselves but are not."

At first glance Mr. de Souza would seem an unlikely candidate for the role of the defiant defender of the public interest. He is mild-mannered in the extreme, even timid, is gawky and slightly hunchbacked, tends to mumble in a childlike voice when confronted by a battery of cameras or reporters and has ascetic personal habits that the newsmagazine *Veja* describes as eccentric.

But in a society used to seeing the rules bent, it is precisely Mr. de Souza's rectitude that seems to have made him a celebrity. A former Jesuit seminarian who reluctantly gave up his religious vocation because of health reasons, he lives with his parents in a modest house here, drives a battered old Volkswagen Beetle, donates part of his \$4,500-a-month salary to charity and has only one known extravagance: a personal library of some 7,000 books.

"Like those possessed by divine fire, Luiz Francisco is austere and simple," *Veja* reported in a profile last month. "He has two sports jackets, one single pair of shoes, and his few shirts are all identical and white."

Ingenuous or not, Mr. de Souza and his colleagues have so irritated the government that a "gag law" proposal to prohibit prosecutors, judges and the police from making any public comment on pending cases, and punish violations with fines of up to \$125,000 and three years in prison, has been revived and sent to Congress. Mr. de Souza's response is that what Brazil needs is more publicity about official misbehavior, not less.

"That court building was only able to get so much money from the government because for years the work of the auditors who were investigating it was held under lock and key," he said. The National Association of Prosecutors has also condemned the initiative, arguing that it would hobble the work of public officials who "work tirelessly to fulfill their constitutional duty to defend the public patrimony."

"The function of all the great biblical prophets was to go to those who rule and say, 'You cannot do this,' to denounce illicit actions even at the cost of their own lives," Mr. de Souza said. "It is amazing that we are now in a new millennium and we still have people who are trying to silence those who dare to open their mouths against infamy."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
The State of the World, and the World to Be, in 149 Chapters

By BARBARA CROSSETTE

UNITED NATIONS, Sept. 6 * The question hangs out there: Why would 149

world leaders leave their not- always-stable governments unattended to come to New York and make five-minute speeches, mostly to each other and the television cameras from back home?

Secretary General Kofi Annan had an answer today as he lifted his glass to the biggest power lunch in history.

"You," he said, looking out over the world's political elite, "have the authority to speak for, and the ability to transform, the lives of six billion people."

This "millennium summit" was a gamble, organized not to celebrate a new page on the calendar but to look ahead at what kind of a global society the leaders hope to achieve in this century, if not the millennium to come.

But from the start, everyone knew that it would go beyond that, and would probably be remembered more for the private meetings in hotel suites and diplomatic offices around town than for anything said in the cavernous hall of the General Assembly.

There was a kind of easy camaraderie born of the unusual event, with back-slapping, hugs, kisses and the puzzled faces of interpreters trying to keep up with the in-jokes.

President Clinton, for one, could not resist telling President Jiang Zemin of China, as they sat down to lunch, what a softball interview the Chinese leader had with CBS's "60 Minutes." "Mike Wallace is so mean to us," Mr. Clinton complained to his lunch-table buddies, "and he was purring in front of him."

President Fidel Castro of Cuba, whose reputation for long-winded speeches is legendary, brought laughter to the Assembly late in the afternoon when he took out a white handkerchief and covered the timer on the lectern. But he stayed within the allotted time * and waved triumphantly before retaking his seat.

For an hour early this morning, many of the world's most familiar faces passed by the knot of protocol officers waiting at the canopied delegates' entrance to United Nations headquarters. As speeches began * they are expected to go on well into Friday evening * the stock-taking that emerged was not so much of the world the leaders hoped to see, but of the stark realities out there.

"The statistics of poverty and inequality in our world are shocking and shameful," said Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland. "Half the world's population struggling on less than \$2 a day, over half a billion on less than \$1. A quarter of a billion children of 14 and under working, sometimes in terrible conditions. Death from preventable and treatable diseases * 10 people will die of malaria in the five minutes I take to address you."

President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria * who shared a lunch table with Mr. Clinton, Mr. Annan, Mr. Jiang, Prime Minister Tony Blair of Britain, two kings and several others * is currently chairman of the Group of 77, a

forum for developing nations. In an interview on Monday, when Mr. Obasanjo had more than five minutes to explain what the third world was seeking at these meetings, he said:

"The wishes of the developing world are simple. We are all living in the same house, whether you are developed or not developed. What we are saying is that some of us in this house are living in superluxurious rooms; others are living in something not better than an unkempt kitchen where pipes are leaking and there is no toilet. We are saying, 'Look, in the interest of all of us, let us living in the superluxurious rooms pay a bit of attention to those who are living where the pipes are leaking, or we'll all be badly affected.'

"That's the message."

There were repeated warnings to heed the dark side of globalization, the technology and health gaps as well as the unbalanced use of natural resources. There were also calls for a more democratic United Nations, with a Security Council more reflective of a membership that has changed profoundly since the organization's founding in 1945.

"If we want this United Nations organization to fulfill its lofty goals, indeed if we want it to remain relevant in the 21st century," Prime Minister Said W. Musa of Belize said in his speech, "we must remake it into an organization that takes global governance away from the self-appointed few and brings greater democracy to all its operations."

A number of speakers took the opportunity to float their own international initiatives.

President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia proposed a project in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency to destroy radioactive materials and exclude them from civilian energy use. He also suggested that the 40th anniversary next spring of the first manned space flight * by a Russian * be commemorated by an international conference on the prevention of the military uses of space.

Both Mr. Putin and President Jiang were robbed of their biggest arms-control target, the proposed American nuclear missile defense, when Mr. Clinton delayed deployment last week. Mr. Putin did reaffirm the importance that Russia attaches to the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty, which many nations say would be directly threatened by a new American system.

The angriest speaker of this first day of the summit meeting was probably Prime Minister Lester B. Bird of Antigua, who went on the attack against the Group of 7 industrialized nations and the larger Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development for their efforts to tighten or close down tax havens.

"While the spin doctors of the O.E.C.D. have attempted to cloak their position in moral rectitude with references to the evils of money laundering," he said, "harmful tax competition has nothing to do with money laundering." He said the campaign was a ploy by "what amounts to a

high-tax cartel" of rich nations.

His passion illustrated the difficulties in selling international financial regulation to those countries that believe they can only stand to lose when rules are tightened.

There were some overtones of sadness and poignancy in many of today's 60-plus speeches. Starting with Secretary General Annan, there were condemnations of the killings of three international aid workers, and perhaps a fourth, in West Timor by rampaging Indonesian militias. Indonesia's president, Abdurrahman Wahid, whose nation's army and police patrol the island to prevent trouble, sat impassively in the hall. (He speaks on Thursday.)

President Clinton and Prime Minister Blair called attention to the plight of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Burmese democracy leader, who is enduring a new round of repression under a military junta that robbed her of an election victory a decade ago.

"I do not wish to leave the U.N. without saying this," Mr. Blair said. "The treatment of Aung San Suu Kyi by the Burmese regime is a disgrace. I call on the Burmese government to let her go free, and I call on fellow world leaders to back that call."

It was left to President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom of the Maldives to plumb the existential depths, as he spoke for those island nations threatened with extinction in rising seas caused by global warming. "When the U.N. meets to usher in yet another century," he said, "will the Maldives and other low-lying nations be represented here?"

As his five minutes ended, he added: "My time at the podium is up. But I pray that that of my country is not."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Elections Near, Rivalries Split Opposition to Milosevic

By STEVEN ERLANGER

BELGRADE, Serbia, Sept. 4 * A split in the opposition to President Slobodan Milosevic is putting at risk its main achievement so far: its control over Serbia's major cities, including radio and television stations.

American officials are pressing opposition politicians to settle their differences to present a united slate of candidates for the local elections on Sept. 24, but so far without success. Otherwise, they fear, Mr. Milosevic can regain lost ground and win back some cities.

This could happen even though the opposition is probably more united and popular now than it has been since its victory in the last local

elections, in 1996.

In the race for president of Yugoslavia, Mr. Milosevic is trailing the main opposition candidate, Vojislav Kostunica, in opinion polls. The polls indicate that a large majority of Serbs want change in the elections, which are for the federal presidency, the federal Parliament and municipal governments.

But a game of mutual blackmail over the presidential race is blocking opposition unity on the local level, much to the confusion of ordinary voters and to the distress of local government officials, who do not share the rivalries of their national party bosses.

Some senior opposition politicians, who expect Mr. Milosevic to try to retain the presidency through vote fraud or other means, say one of his main goals is to take back some cities before vital Serbian elections, which are due next year. Serbia, long Mr. Milosevic's power base, dominates Montenegro, the other republic remaining in Yugoslavia.

Opposition control over major cities like Kragujevac, Kraljevo and Uzice is at stake, with even Belgrade, the capital, at risk, say both opposition officials and members of the governing coalition.

"I think Milosevic called these elections more to win back some cities than for any other reason," said Goran Svilanovic, leader of the Civil Alliance, part of the united opposition backing Mr. Kostunica. "This is the real fight."

Mr. Svilanovic said the opposition must be realistic.

"I know how many people want to wake up one day and find Milosevic gone, but it's a step-by-step fight," he said. "We need to take pieces of his power and enlarge the number of cities we control. And if we lose some of these cities, these parties may not exist in a year, when we're facing Serbian elections."

A united opposition could win cities currently controlled by the government he said.

Milan Milosevic, a political analyst with the magazine Vreme (and no relation to the president), said that President Milosevic's coalition will win the federal elections because of a boycott by Montenegro, and that his coalition badly wants victories in the local races.

"President Milosevic solves one problem at a time, the one in front of him," the commentator said. "These elections will start the real game, which will go on for the next year. He's a fighter, and he'll continue to fight."

President Milosevic has ruled by dividing the opposition. After his losses in 1996, he won Serbian elections handily in 1997 when one part of the opposition, led by Zoran Djindjic of the Democratic Party, boycotted the election. Another part, led by Mr. Djindjic's archrival, Vuk Draskovic of the Serbian Renewal Movement, did not boycott the vote.

Regardless of the national rivalry, the two groups continue to cooperate in many city governments.

The mercurial Mr. Draskovic, who lives in Montenegro, is keeping aloof from the rest of the opposition, which has banded together to support Mr. Kostunica. By doing so, Mr. Draskovic seems to be harming his own party, which had been the largest and best organized opposition group.

Mr. Draskovic insisted on running his own candidate for the presidency * Vojislav Mihailovic, the mayor of Belgrade * and on running his own candidates for the federal Parliament. While he is facing great pressure from his party to unite with the rest of the opposition on the local level, it is Mr. Kostunica, backed by Mr. Djindjic, who is playing hardball.

Mr. Draskovic now wants joint slates on the local level. But Mr. Kostunica and Mr. Djindjic insist that Mr. Draskovic and his party first withdraw Mr. Mihailovic, who has no chance of winning.

Some experts and American officials say Mr. Kostunica, and especially Mr. Djindjic, also see this as a chance to finish off the difficult Mr. Draskovic as a serious opposition leader.

"The old personal rivalries and suspicions between Djindjic and Draskovic are a factor," one official said. "Djindjic smells Draskovic's blood in the water."

In interviews, both Mr. Kostunica and Mr. Djindjic deny any such motivation, saying it is Mr. Draskovic who is hurting the opposition by remaining aloof and running Mr. Mihailovic as a spoiler.

"Mr. Milosevic is happy that Mihailovic is running, and this makes me careful," Mr. Djindjic said. "On the presidential level, we need a black-and-white race to win a million more votes than Milosevic. We can't afford to be confused on the local level and be attacked by our coalition partners."

The difficulty stems from changes in the local elections made last year by Mr. Milosevic's government * to a winner-take-all system, eliminating a second-round runoff between the two top finishers. So a divided opposition could be beaten by a determined member of the ruling coalition.

Under such a system, Mr. Milosevic would have done well in the 1996 local elections, rather than losing them in the second round. Even so, it took months of daily demonstrations and marches for him to acknowledge his defeat in those local elections.

But now, after the NATO bombing last year and the increased repression of dissent, it is not clear that Serbs have the energy or optimism to demonstrate again or to confront the regime openly, even if the voting seem to be manipulated.

Mr. Kostunica and Mr. Djindjic say there is no chance now for a united opposition slate on the local level, but American officials continue to

push, as do Mr. Draskovic's aides, pressed by local officials. One of their main arguments is that even if Mr. Mihailovic stays in the presidential race, he will not win enough votes to make much of a difference in the results, since many members of Mr. Draskovic's party will vote for Mr. Kostunica anyway.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

ENFORCEMENT

Iraq Reportedly Gives Contracts to Nations That Want to End Sanctions

By JUDITH MILLER

The Central Intelligence Agency says Iraq has consistently used the United Nations' oil-for-food program to reward countries that call for ending economic sanctions against Iraq, and to punish those that oppose lifting the embargo, administration officials familiar with the findings have said.

The officials said the C.I.A. stated in a new report that President Saddam Hussein of Iraq has given the bulk of contracts in the program to China, France and Russia, as well as to other vocal champions of lifting the sanctions. The Security Council imposed the sanctions after Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990 to force Iraq to give up weapons of mass destruction.

The Council instituted the oil-for-food program in 1996 to let Iraq sell some of its oil to help ease the suffering of ordinary Iraqis reportedly caused by the sanctions. But the C.I.A. study shows that Iraq has also used the program as a lever to pry open the sanctions by rewarding allies with contracts, especially those on the 15-member Security Council. The Council can vote to lift the sanctions, and to punish its foes.

"Over the life of the program, Baghdad has awarded one-third of the contracts to France, Russia and China," the report states. "Besides these Security Council members and neighbors, Iraq has given substantial oil-for-food business to others that deliver antisandctions rhetoric."

Iraq has even denied contracts to traditional suppliers who have not called for an end to sanctions. The report notes that Japan and Germany, Iraq's two largest suppliers before the gulf war, have each received "only 1 percent of total contracts."

The two-page report is accompanied by charts and graphs that demonstrate the strong correlation between support for lifting sanctions and the awarding of contracts under the program, which is now in what the United Nations accounting system calls Phase 8. Each phase corresponds to a period of 180 days.

Copies of several of the graphs and charts were provided to The New York Times, and sections of the report were read to a reporter by officials who

had read the report and thought that its conclusions should be more widely known.

The report, which was completed last month and is secret, is little surprise to the Clinton administration, Iraq's most vocal critic on the Security Council and the chief advocate of continuing the sanctions until Iraq proves that it has abandoned its programs for nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. But the report is quite likely to reinforce administration frustration over the mounting pressure among nations and aid organizations to lift the sanctions on the ground that they inflict undue hardship on the Iraqi people.

In response to such pressures last year, the Security Council lifted the ceiling on how much oil Baghdad could sell. As a result, United Nations records show, Iraqi oil exports have soared, as have the contracts for food, medicine and other social programs. In the part of Phase 8 from June 9 to Aug. 25, Iraq earned \$3.8 billion in oil revenues.

Iraq is pumping two million barrels of oil a day.

Based on United Nations statistics, the C.I.A. determined that contacts to Vietnam, for instance, began rising sharply in January 1998, after Vietnamese cabinet ministers endorsed an end to the sanctions, climbing from \$50 million in 1998 to \$170 million three phases later. Contracts to Lebanon jumped on two occasions, after Beirut denounced a four-day bombing series against Iraq, and after Lebanon sent an aide for commercial liaison to Baghdad.

Although 40 percent of Iraqi oil exports eventually wind up in the United States, Washington, not surprisingly, has sold almost nothing to Baghdad under the program.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Turkish Police Bar Gay Americans From Visiting Aegean Port

By CHRISTOPHER MARQUIS

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 * The Turkish police barred several hundred gay Americans today from visiting tourist sites near an Aegean port, Kusadasi, and ordered them back aboard their cruise ship, prompting complaints from the State Department, officials said.

Most of the tourists, who are on what travel operators say is the largest gay cruise to visit Turkey, were rounded up from locations ashore, ordered to board their buses and escorted by the police back to the ship, according to State Department and White House officials, as well as people who spoke with passengers.

Other passengers were prevented from leaving the area where their ship, the Olympic Voyager, was docked. About 800 gay tourists are on the cruise.

American diplomats protested to the Turkish Foreign Ministry and raised the concern that the Americans were being mistreated because of their sexual orientation.

"We asked that the tourists be allowed to continue their tour of Turkey unencumbered," said Philip Reeker, a spokesman for the State Department.

Although Mr. Reeker said the facts surrounding the incident were sketchy, he confirmed the police actions. "Obviously," he said, "we're dismayed at the actions. That's why we contacted the Turkish officials."

The tour operator decided to continue the cruise, which is scheduled to reach Istanbul on Thursday. The State Department has asked the American consul general to meet the travelers and to help ensure that there are no further problems, Mr. Reeker said.

A spokeswoman for the Turkish Embassy in Washington, Senu Yemisci, said she did not have specific information about the incident. But she disputed a suggestion that Turks were not tolerant of gays and noted that the beach resort of Bodrum, not far from Kusadasi, also near Samos, was popular among homosexual tourists. She called the allegations of police bias absurd.

"There are hundreds of thousands of gays in Turkey," Ms. Yemisci said. "Probably, ordinary people don't like it very much. But it doesn't make any difference."

David Mixner, a gay Democratic Party campaigner who spoke by telephone with the tour organizer in Turkey, said the Turkish police had told the tourists that they were not allowed ashore because of their homosexuality. Mr. Mixner said he spoke with Rich Campbell of Atlantis Events, the operator, which has its headquarters in Los Angeles.

"They were not allowed off the ship because they were gay," Mr. Mixner said. "This was not a secret. There was no issue other than that. There was no inappropriate behavior or confrontation. They were tourists."

The weeklong luxury cruise was to include stops to see the Parthenon in Greece, the Pyramids in Egypt and Israeli holy sites. In promotional material, Atlantis, the largest American tour operator that caters to gays, described the trip as "unlike any Atlantis has ever offered."

The incident was the third time that Atlantis has faced a significant confrontation abroad.

In 1998, the Cayman Islands, a Caribbean destination renowned for its scuba diving, notified Atlantis that it would not allow its cruise ship to dock. The tour was rerouted to Belize.

Also that year, members of an Atlantis group faced small public protests in Costa Rica. Government officials subsequently apologized, Atlantis

officials said.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

2 Atrocity Suspects Arrested by Croatia

By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

ZAGREB, Croatia, Sept. 6 -- The police have arrested two Croatian men suspected of roles in a 1993 killing spree in a Bosnian Muslim village during the war of secession from Yugoslavia, an Interior Ministry official said today.

The men, Ante Sliskovic, 50, and Tomo Vlajic, 35, were found hiding in Zadar, on the Adriatic, and arrested this week, said a police spokesman, Emil Bilic.

Mr. Bilic said the police were looking for two other men, Vlado Cosic and Pasko Ljubcic, who also are suspected of taking part in the killing of more than 100 Muslims, including women and children, in Ahmici, in central Bosnia.

The four are not sought by the United Nations war crimes tribunal in The Hague, so they probably will be prosecuted here. If there is a trial, it would be the first time Croatia tried its citizens for war crimes committed against Muslims in Bosnia.

Prime Minister Ivica Racan, whose government has cooperated with the tribunal in The Hague since taking power eight months ago, said the arrest "proves that criminals will no longer be able to live freely and peacefully here."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Colombia Paramilitary Chief Says Businesses Back Him

By REUTERS

BOGOTÁ, Colombia, Sept. 6 -- The head of the outlawed right-wing paramilitary forces, who has conceded that most of his financing comes from the drug trade, said today that he also received support from businesses.

The leader of the group, the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, Carlos Castano, spoke of his ties to businessmen in an open letter to Congress a day after Defense Minister Luis Fernando Ramírez had urged lawmakers to investigate private financing sources for the paramilitary militias that attack leftists and suspected rebel sympathizers.

"Why shouldn't national and international companies support us when they see their investments limited by the terrorism and barbarity of the guerrillas?" Mr. Castano asked in his letter. "The growing support of the business sector is an urgent necessity in our case. Either they defend themselves from our national enemy or they will disappear."

Mocking Mr. Ramirez and his call for a crackdown on people who secretly back the paramilitaries, Mr. Castano said, "The crime of ant subversion or of pro-capitalism" was something that could not exist in a "civilized universe."

"We don't believe the country will advance toward peace by pursuing businessmen, civic leaders and defenseless citizens or by preventing them from adopting an ant subversive stance," he said.

Local and international human rights groups said the paramilitary group, which is responsible for many peasant massacres and other abuses, operates with the support of state security forces.

The government has been fighting an increasingly dirty war with Marxist rebels that has taken more than 35,000 lives since 1990.

In a rare television interview in March, Mr. Castano said that drug trafficking and drug traffickers probably financed 70 percent of his organization's operations.

He did not elaborate on his ties to businesses and business leaders in his letter today.

But Mr. Castano and his private army, which is made up of an estimated 5,000 mostly working-class fighters, have long been seen as important defenders of the economic and political interests of the conservative financial elite.

"We have always proclaimed that we are the defenders of business freedom and of the national and international industrial sectors," Mr. Castano wrote. "We have said over and over again that Colombian subversives are preventing the adequate development of productive forces."

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Southeast Asia Losing Ground in New Economy, Report Says

By WAYNE ARNOLD

SINGAPORE, Sept. 6 * The Association of Southeast Asian Nations has released a report warning that despite a level of economic recovery, globalization threatens the region's competitiveness as an exporter and a place to invest.

"All over the world, continent- sized economies, regional free trade areas and other forms of economic partnership mount a serious challenge to Asean in the global competition for markets and investments," said the report, written by the regional group's general secretary, Rodolfo C. Severino of the Philippines.

The report is usually released after an annual meeting in July of Asean foreign ministers, but a spokesman for the association said it was withheld this year by mistake.

The released report omits references to doubts about governments' commitment to economic reform, which were included in earlier versions leaked to local reporters.

Nonetheless, the report is certain to provide grist in the debate about the effects of globalization. As world leaders meet at the United Nations this week to discuss globalization, economists and financial authorities in Southeast Asia are contemplating how the increasingly borderless world of commerce and information is somehow marginalizing once-envied tiger economies.

Despite an uneven recovery from the financial crisis that began in 1997, most Southeast Asian economies, while still growing, have slipped behind in opening markets and competing globally.

Political instability, sluggish efforts to mobilize private capital and inadequate progress in high technology are combining with increased competition from outside the region to reduce Southeast Asia's ability to meet the aspirations of a generation of young job seekers raised on Hollywood and MTV.

As the demands for change from this up-and-coming generation collide with vested interests, "there is potential for serious political turmoil," said William C. Belchere, head of fixed-income research at Merrill Lynch here in Singapore.

On the surface, Southeast Asia's vital signs look good. Economic growth is slowing but is on track toward a 7 percent gain this year, according to J. P. Morgan. Exports remain strong, with the region a major source of computer and telecommunications hardware.

But the report from Asean * which groups together Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam * points up several worrisome trends.

First is a dwindling share of exports to the United States, the world's largest economy. Though Southeast Asian exports have steadily risen, United States imports from China and from Mexico are rising more quickly. In the meantime, foreign investment in Asean nations has been shifting to other developing countries, according to the report.

"If Southeast Asia doesn't work harder, you could see some deindustrialization," said Tan Kong Nam, who heads the department of business policy at the National University of Singapore.

Economists like Professor Tan warn that Southeast Asia is caught in a difficult transition between an older model of Japanese-style, state-guided economic growth and a new and unproven model based on free movements of capital and labor. Under the old model, foreign and especially Japanese investment played a crucial role * along with huge public bank deposits * in helping governments build export industries.

That investment reached a peak in 1996, resulting in industrial overcapacity, a collapse in asset prices and a debt burden that still hobbles the region's banks and curtails its ability to finance the transition to the new economy, Professor Tan said.

Indeed, the Asean report finds a "stark" digital divide between Southeast Asia and some other economies, offering statistics showing, among other things, that the Chinese are more than twice as likely to use the Internet as Southeast Asians.

The size of this region's market for electronic commerce indicates a similar kind of disparity. Though growing rapidly, Southeast Asia has made only one-tenth the transition toward the new economy that the United States has, according to figures from the International Data Corporation.

Asia lacks much of the physical infrastructure required for electronic commerce to take off. Attitudes also play a big part, technology executives say, since transactions conducted over networks have a kind of transparency that is anathema to the cozy relationships and under-the-table deals that have long characterized business in the region.

Analysts and investors say Southeast Asia's diversity also hinders the development of a new economy. The region, with a market of nearly 800 million people, is divided by nationality, culture, language and regulations, with no one market of Internet users, that can compare with the likes of China or even Latin America. "It makes it tougher for these companies to develop," said Dane Anderson, vice president for Internet research at International Data in Singapore.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

U.S. and Europeans Raising the Stakes in Trade Impasse

By ELIZABETH OLSON

GENEVA, Sept. 6 * The European Union and the United States are holding fast in several trade disputes, their continued standoff threatening a more punishing confrontation between the two trading blocs, the world's biggest.

The European Union has rejected the United States' attempt to overhaul a tax benefit that saves American companies millions of dollars a year. The move comes at a time when Washington is drawing up a list of more than

\$300 million in tariffs on European goods, mainly food, after the Europeans refused to alter their restrictions on banana imports and on hormone-treated beef.

Earlier this year, a panel of the World Trade Organization, based here, ruled that the United States must change a law that allowed companies * including General Motors, Microsoft and Boeing * to avoid paying taxes on some overseas sales by channeling them through offshore subsidiaries. Under the trade forum's rules, Washington has until Oct. 1 to revise the law, which the panel called an illegal export subsidy.

In a letter made public late last week, the European Union trade commissioner, Pascal Lamy, asserted that American changes still retain export subsidies in violation of W.T.O. rules, and enable the subsidies to exist beyond the October deadline. "The only way for a U.S.- based manufacturer to benefit from the new regime is by exporting," said a European summary of the letter to Stuart E. Eizenstat, the deputy secretary of the Treasury.

An attempt in May to reach a compromise failed, and Mr. Eizenstat warned in July that "a major trade war" could follow.

The new system for offshore sales was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee late in July, and awaits approval by the House and Senate. Clinton administration officials indicate they intend to press for Congressional approval of the modified law.

Although the European letter was not made public, Mr. Lamy is understood to have argued that the only real change in the American tax breaks was eliminating a requirement that a paper company be set up offshore. Some 5,000 such offshore tax havens exist, most of them based in the Caribbean region.

European officials in Brussels say they are willing to continue negotiations. "There is one month before the Oct. 1 deadline, and we believe there is still time for a solution," said Hervé Jouanjean of the European Commission, the year-round administrative arm.

Without a compromise, Brussels is expected to seek W.T.O. permission to impose retaliatory sanctions on American exports in amounts that dwarf previous trade disputes. Such sanctions are meant to be based on the amount of harm suffered in the international marketplace. Using that measure, the Europeans are likely to seek 100 percent tariffs on \$4 billion in American exports.

If Congress passes the proposed legislation before Oct. 1, trade experts said, the European Union would most likely have to file a new challenge to the law. A ruling, which is delivered by a three-judge panel, could take months.

In the dispute over bananas and beef, the Clinton administration is preparing a list of European products that would be subject to tariffs. Britain is lobbying for the exemption of Scottish cashmere from the list.

The European Union's initial effort to modify its banana-import rules, which gave preferential treatment to former European colonies in Africa and the Caribbean, was rebuffed by the United States as insufficient. Brussels officials are now trying to work out agreement on a new alternative among the European nations and their banana-exporting partners.

The Europeans and the United States also remain at odds over how to replace Brussels' ban on hormone- treated beef, which was struck down at the W.T.O. Currently, the Europeans are banning one hormone and temporarily excluding four others while scientific studies evaluate their effect on human health. The United States maintains that the growth-inducing hormones are safe.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

U.N.'s Global Compact

To the Editor:

Re "Globalization Tops 3-Day U.N. Agenda for World Leaders" (front page, Sept. 3):

You quote critics who assert that the secretary general's "global compact," designed to identify and promote good corporate practices in human rights, labor standards and the environment, opens the United Nations' doors to big business. These critics ignore the fact that the compact is an equal partnership among business, international labor and global nongovernmental organizations. The United Nations has guidelines for dealing with business; they were adopted in July.

You report that one critic suggested that the inclusion in the global compact of companies that may have had spotty records in the past sends the wrong signal. The implication is that the United Nations should strive to improve the performance only of the perfect. Doing so would make life easier, but what would be the point?

JOHN G. RUGGIE

Assistant Secretary General

United Nations

New York, Sept. 5, 2000

Order in the Court, and at the A.C.L.U.

To the Editor:

Re "Life Change for A.C.L.U. Chief. Not That Words Fail Him" (Public Lives column, Sept. 2):

Ira Glasser merits great praise for his highly effective stewardship of the American Civil Liberties Union. But surely you exaggerate when you describe the union, pre-Ira, as "a chaotic group of young lawyers in threadbare offices with pizza crusts lurking under broken chairs." During the 1970's, I was regularly on the premises of the A.C.L.U. (and had office space there from 1972 to 1973), helping to start the union's Women's Rights Project and serving as one of its general counsel. The union in those days was ably managed by its executive director at the time, Aryeh Neier. Staff and volunteer lawyers ranged in age from late 20's to late 40's.

Care, and not chaos, marked the quality of the legal work. My office at the A.C.L.U. was no more, indeed less, threadbare than my faculty office at Columbia Law School, and I never encountered the remains of a pizza lingering under a chair.

It hardly detracts from Ira's good work and the good work of his staff to recognize that they carried forward the good work of their predecessors.

RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Associate Justice

Supreme Court

Washington, Sept. 5, 2000

An Independent Taiwan

To the Editor:

Re "Risking China's Ire, Taiwan Leader Questions Unification" (news article, Sept. 2):

As a Taiwanese-American, I agree with President Chen Shui-bian that Taiwan should not move toward unification with Communist China but rather toward becoming a free, democratic and independent country.

Whether this will "risk China's ire" is less important. Didn't American colonists risk British ire when they wanted to be free from oppression and declared independence in 1776? China should accept Taiwan as a friendly neighbor just as Britain now accepts the United States.

This direction is indeed a break from the policies of the Nationalist Party, which ruled Taiwan for 55 years. It is for this reason that the people of Taiwan voted in Mr. Chen and the Democratic Progressive Party.

MEI-CHIN CHEN

Rockville, Md., Sept. 2, 2000

Advance the Cause of Human Rights

To the Editor:

You reported (news article, Aug. 30) about Australia's reaction to criticism of its policies by United Nations human rights monitors. Today, leaders from more than 150 countries are gathered at the United Nations to discuss a wide range of global challenges, especially the universal protection of human rights.

It is imperative that these countries commit to increasing support for critical United Nations human rights monitoring activities, even in the face of Australia's recent actions. It is unfortunate that Australia would react defensively to issues raised by the committee that monitors the United Nations Race Convention, which Australia ratified in 1975.

Prime Minister John Howard argues that democracies should not be the subject of criticism because they have internal checks that ensure the enjoyment of human rights in those societies. This argument undermines the concept of a universal system in which all governments are scrutinized according to the same standard.

Because treaty bodies have no enforcement powers, their only function is to assess how well governments are living up to the standards to which they agreed. For a democracy to denounce a United Nations committee's findings only gives abusive governments an excuse to bow out of the process.

JIMMY CARTER

Atlanta, Sept. 5, 2000

Debates, and Other Skirmishes

To the Editor:

Re "First, Three Big Debates" (editorial, Sept. 6):

Every four years the two parties have a song-and-dance routine in which they argue over every aspect of the presidential debates. It wastes time and detracts from the candidates' ability to address the issues that confront the electorate.

A simple solution would be for the parties to be required to accept the debate parameters set forth by a bipartisan commission, whether in the

current form or otherwise devised, as a prerequisite for receiving the huge amount of federal money provided to the major-party candidates. No debates, no money.

Thus, the public can be assured of seeing the candidates discuss the issues and be more able to make an informed choice when they vote. It's the least the parties can do to justify those funds.

ANDREW M. WONG

New York, Sept. 6, 2000

To the Editor:

Re "Bush on Issues and Tactics in the Presidential Race" (interview excerpts, Sept. 2):

George W. Bush runs attack ads against Al Gore's character after promising he would not. Mr. Bush dodges one obvious test of his presidential skills by trying to avoid the impartial debates set up by the Commission on Presidential Debates, while he demands that states lose federal funds if schools don't give standardized tests to students and publish the results. In these and other instances, Mr. Bush insults the intelligence of the American voter.

JOHN E. COLBERT

Chicago, Sept. 2, 2000

To the Editor:

Re "TV Networks Jilted by Bush Won't Take Part in 2 Debates" (front page, Sept. 5):

The debate over presidential debates has given the American people some insight into the kind of president that George W. Bush would be. He has indicated that if elected president, he would move forward with missile defense, despite opposition from Russia and allies of the United States.

Now, Mr. Bush unilaterally rejects the debate proposal prepared by a bipartisan commission in favor of his own plan. Do these actions really seem like the actions of someone who purports to be a consensus-builder willing to work with others to achieve the best outcome?

KEVIN W. WILLIAMS

Boston, Sept. 5, 2000

To the Editor:

You report (news article, Sept. 5) that George W. Bush used a vulgarity in referring to a reporter for The New York Times and that his running mate, Dick Cheney, concurred. Is this how the Republican team hopes to restore dignity to the Oval Office?

RAY LURIE

New Haven, Sept. 6, 2000

To the Editor:

Re "What Hath God Wrought? Lieberman and the Right" (Week in Review, Sept. 3):

There is more to separating church and state than meets the Constitution.

First, a candidate who wears his religion on his sleeve invariably raises the specter that he will be swayed more by his religious leaders than by his constituents.

Second, if a campaign focuses too much on religion, we can expect voting primarily along religious lines, with the largest religious group winning.

And third, political debate would quickly morph into openly religious debate * not a good idea in a country that requires tolerance for the peaceful coexistence of its many peoples and for the successful perpetuation of its democracy.

Once a candidate too frequently and fervently espouses his personal religious beliefs, do we not have a proper expectation that he is in the pocket of those who hold religious sway over him, just as surely as we have the right to fear the influence of special-interest money?

ELLEN SCHNEIDER

Fort Lauderdale, Fla., Sept. 3, 2000

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Competing to Make Things Worse

By RICHARD A. EPSTEIN
C

HICAGO -- The health care debate has heated up in earnest with George W. Bush's detailed proposal to overhaul Medicare. On this issue, Mr. Bush

seeks to meld the best of the open market with what he terms the nation's "moral obligation" to secure the health needs of the elderly.

His plan rejects Al Gore's flawed strategy of shoring up the existing Medicare system and expanding it to include prescription drugs. In its stead, Mr. Bush proposes that insurance companies compete to supply the elderly with an expansive package of medical benefits for a fee underwritten in part by the federal government. But the elderly would retain the right to stick with the basic Medicare program.

Unfortunately, this plan won't induce many insurers to offer expanded health care packages. Mr. Bush may lure customers, but he won't attract any insurer that speaks to its actuaries first. Offering individuals insurance options may work in settings where they do not already know their medical condition. But this approach can't work for populations like the elderly, who tend to have intimate knowledge of their own health profiles.

Suppose the government offers to pay a private health plan \$5,000 toward coverage of any enrollee who signs up for its souped-up health plan. Older people with chronic illnesses, for example, will surely flock to the plan, even with a required copayment; but healthier and younger retirees are much more likely to stick with Medicare, because they won't want to pay for the extra coverage. What insurance carrier will cover high-risk patients for premiums calibrated to some group average by the federal government? Mr. Bush's proposal will not achieve its laudable objective of weaning the elderly from government programs. It will only reaffirm the status quo, in which everyone stays in Medicare.

Mr. Gore's proposal, on the other hand, could easily make things worse, by increasing the drain of Medicare on all taxpayers. He seeks to tap into the common sentiment that health care is a special good that markets cannot be trusted to properly supply. But the gloomy economist reminds us that two constraints still apply.

First, any system of uniform prices works against the market, sheltering companies that can only supply health care services at high cost.

Second, increased health care subsidies lead to increased health care consumption * to be paid for by someone else, with no ceiling to limit costs. This pattern of consumption goes a long way to explaining the looming Medicare deficits.

The seeds for Medicare's long-term woes were sown by its very passage in 1965. The program subsidizes the elderly as a class at the expense of the general taxpayer. And it imposes little financial restraint on recipients of medical services. To slow down consumer demand without charging higher prices, Medicare has adopted countless stratagems, including monitoring hospitals and doctors, imposing delays on services and raising taxes.

Mr. Gore's program will do nothing to relieve these pressures. Far from it, his prescription drug plan (more generous and hence more uncertain than Mr. Bush's) will surely increase the overall cost of running Medicare by expanding benefits that are covered.

It is hard to think of a sensible way out of this hole. It is intolerable suddenly to reverse course, forcing millions of the elderly to pay for medical benefits that they long thought they would enjoy in retirement as a right.

But at the very least, both parties should stop serving up endless plates of goodies. Though Medicare is here to stay, the burdens that their programs would impose on the taxpayer make the phrase "risky scheme" seem an understatement. Before the next economic downturn, the next president should forthrightly work to trim coverage and increase the out-of-pocket amount people contribute in Medicare copayments. Either we sober up today, or we reap the whirlwind tomorrow, no matter who wins the next election.

Richard A. Epstein, a law professor at the University of Chicago, is author of "Mortal Peril: Our Inalienable Right to Health Care?"

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

IN AMERICA
Bush's Medicare Fix

By BOB HERBERT

Oh-oh.

George W. Bush has come up with a plan to overhaul Medicare.

This should be interesting. It's always interesting when the foxes roll up their sleeves and start renovating the chicken coop.

To say that the Republican Party has been hostile to Medicare is to engage in the grossest of understatements. To Ronald Reagan, Medicare was an affront to the very idea of America. Robert Dallek, in his biography of Lyndon Johnson, "Flawed Giant," recalled that Mr. Reagan "saw Medicare as the advance wave of socialism, which would 'invade every area of freedom in this country.' "

"Reagan," wrote Mr. Dallek, "predicted that Medicare would compel Americans to spend their 'sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was like in America when men were free.' "

In the mid-1990's, when the Republicans were trying to cut taxes while at the same time eliminating \$270 billion in anticipated Medicare expenditures, Bob Dole was bragging about the fact that he had opposed the original Medicare bill in 1965, opting instead to support a voluntary alternative.

And during that same budget fight, Newt Gingrich, apparently referring to the original fee-for-service version of Medicare that by then had become

cherished by the elderly, wisecracked: "We don't get rid of it in Round One because we don't think it's politically smart."

If it had been up to the Republicans there would have been no Medicare. And if you want to conjure up something frightening, think of America without it.

Now comes Mr. Bush, the G.O.P.'s affable front man for the likes of Trent Lott, Dick Armey and Tom DeLay, and he's suddenly got a plan to fix Medicare. This is the same Mr. Bush whose own state of Texas has not bothered to comply with a 1996 consent decree requiring it to provide appropriate health care services to more than 1.5 million children who were eligible for Medicaid.

Oh, doctor.

Mr. Bush's proposed renovation of Medicare includes a prescription drug benefit. That applause you hear is coming from the executives of the drug companies and the insurance industry. They like Mr. Bush's plans. Which should tell you something.

Rather than providing the elderly with the traditional defined benefits under Medicare, the Texas governor would set up a potentially chaotic system in which private insurers would compete with the government to provide health coverage for the nation's 39 million Medicare beneficiaries. The prescription drug benefit would come largely in the form of a government subsidy to be used to purchase the drug benefit from private insurers.

A prescription drug benefit was not always a cornerstone of Mr. Bush's presidential campaign. Health care was hardly his strong point, or even a matter of major interest to him. But polls seemed to show that Vice President Al Gore was scoring points by pressing hard for his prescription drug proposal, which would be part of the existing Medicare program and would provide greater benefits to more people.

It makes a difference whether the drug benefit is contained within an expanded Medicare program (Mr. Gore's proposal) or is farmed out via subsidies to private insurers, as Mr. Bush wants. Ron Pollack, the executive director of Families USA, a nonpartisan, nonprofit advocacy group for health care consumers, discussed this in an interview yesterday:

"The pharmaceutical industry fears, I think correctly, that if Medicare covers prescription drugs then the Medicare program will use its very significant bargaining clout on behalf of the 39 million beneficiaries to get prices down. So the pharmaceutical industry is apoplectic about the notion of expanding Medicare to cover prescription drugs."

Mr. Bush's attempt at a better-late- than-never plan, especially one that would turn so many of the certainties of Medicare over to the whims of profit-oriented insurance companies and health maintenance organizations, has many longtime health care advocates worried. The fear is not only that this is not in the best interest of the nation's elderly, but that the compassionately conservative Mr. Bush is following through on the

Republicans' decades-long dream of thoroughly undermining Medicare.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

The Bush Prescription Drug Plan

Gov George W. Bush announced a proposal on Tuesday to provide prescription drug benefits as an option under comprehensive Medicare reform. But since he does not expect such reform to happen anytime soon, he wants state governments to deal with the problem while a new White House task force works out the details of future reforms.

Mr. Bush, like Vice President Al Gore, hopes to court elderly voters with a plan to help pay for the escalating costs of drugs. But unlike Mr. Gore, Mr. Bush would not create a universal drug benefit for all retirees under Medicare. Instead he lays out a rough Medicare reform plan, with few details, that may or may not make drug coverage more accessible in the future. The Bush plan is inferior because it relies on uncertain action by states and the private sector, and would leave too many people without coverage for now.

Mr. Bush takes a complicated two-track approach. He would first create a four-year transitional program that places the onus on states to provide drug coverage for the elderly while the federal government works on comprehensive Medicare reform. He would provide \$48 billion over four years to help states pay for full drug coverage for retirees with incomes below 135 percent of the poverty line, or about \$12,000 a year for an individual. Those earning up to 175 percent of the poverty level, about \$15,000 a year, would get a partial subsidy.

The trouble is that more than half the states currently do not provide such assistance, and many would have to create new bureaucracies to administer a new drug insurance program. State participation would be voluntary, and states would be allowed to set different premium levels and benefits. Once any retiree has spent \$6,000 a year on prescription drugs, additional costs would be paid for by federal funds. Otherwise, people earning more than 175 percent of the poverty line would get no help under this interim plan. This would leave a big population unprotected, since nearly half of those without drug coverage now are middle-income people, with incomes above the cutoff for subsidies.

Mr. Bush is far less specific about how drug coverage would work in the long term, leaving the details to a task force that would be convened next year. He would not create a universal drug benefit that would be available to all the elderly at the same cost. Instead he would rely primarily on private insurers. Low-income people would be heavily subsidized, as under the Gore plan. But Mr. Bush's plan does not spell out a minimum drug benefit package or maximum premiums for middle- and higher- income retirees. Instead, government would help pay 25 percent of their drug coverage premiums.

Mr. Bush says he wants to spend an additional \$110 billion over 10 years to modernize Medicare by having private insurance plans compete against traditional fee-for-service Medicare. Presumably, many of those plans would provide drugs as an optional benefit.

Mr. Bush hopes that as more retirees choose these plans, fewer will be left without drug coverage. But achieving that goal is uncertain. Without a new Medicare drug program, people who stay in fee-for-service Medicare would still have to buy separate drug coverage on the private market. In that respect, the Bush plan faces the same problem as the flawed bill that passed the House in June. That plan relies on private insurers to sell prescription drug policies. Yet many insurers have said they will not be able to offer affordable policies even with a subsidy because only people with high drug expenses would buy the coverage. Mr. Gore's plan does not have this problem because his program would offer uniform drug coverage to all the elderly at \$25 a month, without relying on private insurers to sell affordable policies.

Mr. Bush's reform proposal does add an interesting element to the debate. He says he would use the \$6,000 cap that would initially apply to drug expenses for all out-of-pocket Medicare costs as part of long-term reform. This is a positive proposal, provided he identifies a way to pay for it.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

Congress Takes Up Defective Tires

The precise reason that the treads on certain Firestone tires on Ford Explorers have been peeling off with deadly consequences is not yet clear, but evidence emerging in Congressional inquiries is making it increasingly apparent that both companies were aware of the safety problems long before they took action to address them. Equally worrisome is the fact that even once the companies did act in some foreign markets, they refrained from doing so in the United States.

An internal Ford memorandum written in March 1999 indicates that the companies disagreed on whether they had a legal obligation to notify American regulators about a planned recall of tires in Saudi Arabia. Ford ultimately recalled the tires but did not notify the regulators. The Ford memo suggests that Firestone opposed the Saudi recall out of concern that it would have to be reported in the United States, a contention that was vigorously denied by Firestone officials testifying before Congress yesterday. In Venezuela, Ford and Firestone face the prospect of a criminal investigation over the tires.

Ford's failure to share news of recalls overseas with American regulators is not acceptable behavior. United States laws should compel a multinational company to advise American regulators of a recall of an unsafe consumer product in another country when that product is also sold domestically.

The National Highway Transportation Safety Administration did not learn about Ford's 1999 replacement of tires in Saudi Arabia and more recent recalls in Thailand and Malaysia until last May, after press reports and insurance company notices finally prompted the agency to launch its own investigation into some 1,400 incidents that resulted in 88 deaths and 250 injuries in America. At the safety agency's request, Firestone last month recalled 6.5 million tires used on Ford Explorers in the United States, but has refused the agency's subsequent request that it recall an additional 1.4 million tires used on other models.

Relations between Ford and Firestone have frayed under the intense scrutiny. In their Congressional testimony yesterday, the companies pointed the finger at each other. Ford maintained that it had relied on Firestone's representations about the tires' safety, and Firestone said it believed that incidents in Saudi Arabia and elsewhere often involved under-inflated tires.

For years, Ford suggested a lower pressure for tires on its Explorer than did Firestone. Further investigations will have to determine whether Ford set the lower level merely to provide a more comfortable ride, or whether it did so to compensate for a lack of structural stability in the Explorer.

The highway safety agency was sluggish in reacting to a number of tips about this case, which may be a result of severe budgetary cuts over the past two decades. If so, this unfolding story should remind Congress that when it comes to safety, free markets are no substitutes for an adequately funded federal watchdog.

END

The New York Times
September 7, 2000

ESSAY
Guarding Your Identity

By WILLIAM SAFIRE

A stalker paid only \$45 to an Internet research service to get Amy Boyer's Social Security number. That supposedly private, personal information led her former suitor to the workplace of the 20-year-old New Hampshire woman. He murdered her and killed himself.

That's the sort of horror story that moves officials to make a pass at action. The Senate Appropriations Committee, at the behest of the New Hampshire Republican Judd Gregg, sent to the floor a bill prohibiting individuals from "displaying to the public" anybody's Social Security number without consent.

His weak bill exempts "information brokers" that led the stalker to his prey. But it's a start, and could be toughened by the Democrat Fritz Hollings on the appropriations panel; that South Carolinian has been

topping John McCain's privacy protection at the Commerce Committee.

Over in House Ways and Means, a privacy bill with teeth in it is sponsored by the chairman of the Social Security subcommittee, Florida's Clay Shaw. Not only would it outlaw the sale of the identifying number, but would brand as an "unfair trade practice" the withholding of services from a consumer who declines to reveal his Social Security number.

No longer would a merchant be able to say "no Social Security number, no credit * even if you have a good credit card." That number of yours has a resale value to other companies eager to target you for dinnertime telemarketing, charitable solicitations or employee monitoring. It is the key to the door of your identity. As in Amy Boyer's case, professional snoops can also offer your unique government identifier to a stalker.

But even symbolic bills like Gregg's can open the way to stronger protection. A law passed last year, excoriated in this space as "the Gramm-Summers sellout," allowed merged banks and insurance companies to pass around personal data on clients and patients without their consent. The banking lobby's triumph, however, contained one good deed for consumers: It enabled the Federal Trade Commission to curb the easy "redisclosure" of nonpublic, personal information by what calls itself "the lookup industry."

The F.T.C. two months ago issued a rule that is enraging credit reporting services, skip-tracing divorce lawyers and some journalists. No longer can "credit header" information be bandied about cheaply and quickly. To obtain your name and address, Social Security and telephone number, and mother's maiden name, the buyer of your personal information must now plunk down the money for an entire consumer report.

That may be meager protection, but it's drawn court challenges from irate snoops. The willingness of the F.T.C. chairman, Robert Pitofsky, to withstand the wrath of the online marketers is a straw of hope in the winds of privacy violation.

Another straw can be seen in the envelopes you have been getting from the Internal Revenue Service for the past couple of years: the plastic windows showing your address are smaller. Why? It's so that any neighbors and postal workers who may be identity thieves won't be able to see your Social Security number without steaming open the envelope and thereby breaking the law.

This idea was adopted last week by the Treasury Department, stung by harangues that Secretary Larry Summers' see-through worship of financial transparency was adding to worries about identity theft. "By removing Social Security numbers from the windows of the mailings of Social Security checks," an underling announced proudly, "we will help safeguard the privacy of millions of Americans." That's 14 million fewer times each month that our S.S.N.'s will not be on public display.

I push this envelope because it shows that even bureaucrats have begun to feel the groundswell against invasions of privacy.

So do presidential candidates. George W. Bush was first to specify his support of "opt-in," requiring sellers to seek informed consent of buyers before trading in personal information. And Al Gore, standing beside Amy Boyer's parents, said, "I will make it a federal crime to buy or sell anyone's Social Security number."

There's time before the election to see which man's party is serious about the privacy issue. It goes into the decision mix.

END