

# Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

## Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	From Thurgood Marshall Jr to Elisabeth Steele Re: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	07/17/1997	b(6)
002. email	From Kevin Moran to Rochester Johnson Re: [No Subject] [partial] (1 page)	10/27/1997	b(6)
003. email	From Kevin Moran to Jordan Tamagni Re: [No Subject] [partial] (1 page)	12/04/1997	b(6)

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
Automated Records Management System [Email]  
WHO ([Randall Kennedy])  
OA/Box Number: 500000

### FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1995 - 12/23/1997]

2019-1029-F

in589

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: KyleB45403@aol.com@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-MAY-1995 15:52:00.00

SUBJECT: Aff action

TO: DMartin628 ( DMartin628@aol.com@INET@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: baker\_k ( baker\_k@A1@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:15-MAY-1995 09:35:10.50

TEXT:  
From Investor's Busines Daily 5/5:

"Nonracial affirmative action:" The concept seems a contradiction.

Wasn't affirmative action, most of all, intended to help racial minorities, especially blacks?

Yet in the last several weeks, as debate has heated up over whether affirmative action is still (or was ever) needed, the notion of race-neutral goals, timetables and quotas is rapidly gaining currency.

That notion may have received a boost on April 17, when the U.S. Supreme Court announced it would not review affirmative action decisions in Birmingham and Pittsburgh, where appeals courts ruled in favor of challenges to racial quotas of local government and private employers, respectively.

In the Birmingham case, the high court let stand a decision in favor of that city's white fire department employees, challenging a requirement that at least 50% of all promotions to the rank of lieutenant had to go to blacks. That quota is effectively finished, say observers.

Justices Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas have indicated support for nonracial affirmative action of some type.

To supporters, mandating or encouraging economic need rather than race as a basis for reserving job, school-admissions and contract slots combines the best of both worlds: It promotes social equality, yet without inciting racial resentment.

Author Richard Kahlenberg, in the April 3 New Republic cover story, "Class, Not Race," argues that quotas based on economic preferences contain "morally unassailable underpinnings and a relatively inexpensive agenda," which also happened to be the civil-rights movement's original successful formula.

Will Marshall, president of the Progressive Policy Institute, a moderate Democratic think tank, told INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY that he wants to continue affirmative action, but by "including claims of racial and other minorities within a broader economic empowerment agenda."

He suggests such an approach should combine means-testing and racial preferences, and focus on college admissions and aid.

Yet such optimism disregards potentially harmful moral and economic consequences, argues John Miller, vice president of the Center for Equal Opportunity, a Washington think tank headed by Linda Chavez, who served as

staff director for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights during 1983-85.

"A bonus system that rewards job-seekers simply for falling below a threshold of need would give an incentive for many people to remain below that threshold, functioning similar to the Earned Income Tax Credit. We should be motivating people to get out of poverty, not to remain in it," he said.

For such critics, class-based affirmative action would be the latest wrong turn in a long journey of social engineering.

Observers commonly cite a 1965 executive order by President Lyndon Johnson creating the Office of Federal Contract Compliance as a launch pad for affirmative action.

Though the order did not involve quotas, the office, ostensibly to ensure color-blindness in contracting practices, eventually developed guidelines requiring employers eliminate "under- utilization" of minorities and women in various job categories.

The OFCC and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the latter created by the 1964 Civil Rights Act, experienced little or no resistance during the Johnson or Nixon years, when they came to interpret civil- rights legislation as a mandate for favoritism.

When in 1971 the Supreme Court upheld company racial set-asides in *Griggs vs. Duke Power Co.*, racial goals, timetables and quotas became enshrined, in the eyes of many.

#### 'MANIFEST IMBALANCE?'

---

Currently, there are some 160 federal laws and guidelines that in some way require special consideration in economic and educational standards for blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, women and other "disadvantaged" groups.

Despite the Supreme Court's decision not to review the Birmingham and Pittsburgh cases, its affirmative action-related rulings over the years reflect a view that while the 1964 act does not REQUIRE racial remedies for statistical imbalances, it does not forbid them either.

In *United Steelworkers of America vs. Weber* (1979), Justice William Brennan, writing for the 5-4 majority, upheld a company minority training program quota that sought to "eliminate manifest racial imbalance in traditionally segregated job categories."

While civil-rights leader and George Mason University professor Roger Wilkins sees racial set-asides as "good for the country," critics counter that they are costly and divisive.

According to *Forbes* magazine's Peter Brimelow and Leslie Spencer, employment quotas in 1991 imposed on the U.S. economy nearly \$115 billion in direct and indirect private- and public-sector costs, a figure excluding resource misallocation.

But by favoring nonwhites and women, affirmative action also exacts a less quantifiable toll.

Frederick Lynch, a professor of government at Claremont McKenna College, interviewed white men for his book, *"Invisible Victims: White Males and the Crisis of Affirmative Action,"* and found that quotas had a damaging effect on their morale, something that could not be chalked up to prejudice.

Yet opposition to affirmative action is not limited to white men. A Washington Post-ABC News poll in March indicated that 75% and 73% of

respondents, respectively, rejected the notion of preferences for minorities and women in hiring, promotions and college admissions to make up for past discrimination.

Whites and blacks, by margins of 81% and 46%, respectively, rejected minority preferences, while men and women, by 76% and 69%, opposed sex-based preferences.

Although the House Republican "Contract With America" makes no mention of affirmative action, the GOP lately has been riding a tidal wave of opposition to it. House Speaker Newt Gingrich and Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole each recently have called racial preferences inherently unfair.

## CALIFORNIA'S INITIATIVE

---

Some leading moderate Democrats also have expressed criticism.

"You can't defend policies that are based on group preferences as opposed to individual opportunities," said Sen. Joseph Lieberman, D-Conn., adding such policies "have the effect of breaking some of the ties in civil society that have held us together."

Such sentiments are being translated into action in California.

There, opponents of affirmative action are planning to gather signatures to place the California Civil Rights Initiative on the ballot in November 1996. CCRI would outlaw the state's use of "race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin as a criterion for either discriminating against, or granting preferential treatment to, any individual or group" in public employment, education or contracting.

President Clinton, hesitant to alienate either side of the issue, admits this is "psychologically a difficult time" for white males, but asserts there will be "no retreat from the goals of affirmative action." The White House is awaiting the findings of a bipartisan commission review of affirmative action programs.

Enter nonracial affirmative action as an ostensibly happy medium.

The idea has been percolating for several years. In his 1991 book, "Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus," Dinesh D'Souza, a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, suggested "nonracial affirmative action" could defuse racial tensions triggered by the academic Left.

## EQUAL PLAYING FIELD

---

He wrote: "(I)n admissions decisions, universities would take into account such factors as the applicant's family background, financial condition, and primary and secondary school environment, giving preference to disadvantaged students . . . Race or ethnicity, however, would cease to count either for or against any applicant."

D'Souza envisioned a white, black or Hispanic doctor's son competing on an equal playing field, but "the daughter of an Appalachian coal miner" or "a Vietnamese street vendor" getting special consideration for admissions and scholarships.

Black supporters of race-based policies believe such a notion is an unacceptable retreat from moral responsibility, and vow to fight it.



"Affirmative action for African-Americans came about because of a decent sense of shame. I would be loath to abandon it unless something at least as good replaced it," said Randall Kennedy, a Harvard Law School professor.

Such statements prompt the Center for Equal Opportunity's Miller to believe that even if class-based affirmative action formally replaces, rather than accompanies, the present racial system, the latter may flourish all but in name anyway.

"Civil-rights leaders are likely to put extreme pressure on legislators and bureaucrats to make sure that blacks aren't 'underrepresented,' " Miller remarked.

Lynch noted that at the University of California at Berkeley, whose undergraduate admissions process considers need as well as race, officials have admitted Asians in disproportionately high numbers, something they prefer to downplay for fear of arousing opposition from civil rights activists.

## LARGE SUBSIDIES

---

Jeff Tucker, editor and researcher at the Auburn University-based Ludwig von Mises Institute, maintains that economic affirmative action applied throughout the economy would be the ultimate means-tested aid program, delivering jobs, mortgage loans and other benefits to people below fungible eligibility thresholds.

"All that socialists ever could want would exist under the cover of 'respectable' goals and quotas. It would pay to declare one's self 'disadvantaged,' " he said.

Even if limited to higher education, such a strategy could require large subsidies.

"One can imagine covering all costs for higher education for everyone, as European countries attempt to do, but the costs would be enormous," wrote Nathan Glazer, a professor of education at Harvard University, and a supporter of voluntary racial preferences.

"Admissions officers for years have given the benefit of the doubt to promising high school seniors who come from a poor family. There is no need for government to mandate this practice," added Miller.

Kahlenberg believes that it is possible to establish reasonable thresholds of need, without aggravating the entitlement mentality, and proposes three alternative point systems for measuring hardship. His "moderately complicated" scale, for instance, would combine the income, education and occupation of an applicant's parents.

"This kind of rating system resembles the Clinton health care proposal. It's the height of conceit," responded Tucker.

Nonracial quotas also may invite falsification of income, assets and other information, necessitating large bureaucracies to determine and enforce case-by-case eligibility.

"The current system is subject enough to fraud as it is," said Lynch.

////////////////////////////////////

Copyright (c) 1995 Investors Business Daily, All rights reserved.  
Investor's Business Daily - National Issue (05/05/95)  
Need-Based Affirmative Action?  
Some See Tensions Easing, Others See Socialism  
By Carl Horowitz

Transmitted: 95-05-04 20:51:03 EDT (aaab6e3c)

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:14-MAY-1995 15:57:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from gatekeeper.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V4.3-13 #6879)

id <01HQHYSL5WGG0019ES@PMDf.EOP.GOV>; Sun, 14 May 1995 15:52:46 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by gatekeeper.eop.gov (5.65/fma-120691); id AA18859; Sun,  
14 May 95 15:53:09 -0400

Received: by mail06.mail.aol.com (1.37.109.11/16.2) id AA065371254; Sun,  
14 May 1995 15:54:14 -0400

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Rebecca A. Cameron@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME: 5-DEC-1996 17:00:00.00

SUBJECT: Potential Inauguration Invitation List

TO: ROBINSON\_H ( ROBINSON\_H@A1@CD ) (WHO)

READ: 6-DEC-1996 10:11:12.44

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 5-DEC-1996 16:54:00

Per our conversation...for Helen

----- Forwarded by Rebecca A. Cameron/WHO/EOP on 12/05/96

04:53 PM -----

Kevin S. Moran

12/05/96 04:42:58 PM

Record Type: Record

To: HERNREICH\_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

cc: Rebecca A. Cameron/WHO/EOP

Subject: Potential Inauguration Invitation List

Inauguration Invitation List

Book

William Nothdurft Writer

Joellyn Murphy Researcher

Harold Evans Random House President and Publisher

Peter Osnos Random House Publisher

Steve Wasserman Random House Editorial Director

Mary Beth Roche Random House Public Relations

Bruce Sanford Lawyer, Baker & Hostetler

Eli Segal

Kent and Carmen Amos Book reference

Marilyn Concepcion Book reference

Seamus Heaney Poet

Rev. Terrance Mackey Book reference

Political Consultants

Mark Penn

Josh Starr

Joel Benenson\*

Doug Schoen\*  
Bob Squier  
Bill Knapp  
Kaitlyn Sherman, SKO Video Production\*  
Stacey Millander, SKO Video Production\*  
Jamie Sterling, SKO Video Production\*  
Tom Ochs  
Lisa Linden  
Frank Greer  
Stan Greenberg  
Paul Begala  
James Carville  
Michael Sheehan  
Henry Sheinkopf  
Marius Penczner  
Dick Morris  
Tom Freedman

Academic Consultants

Bruce Ackerman  
Benjamin Barber  
Larry Bartels  
Stephen Carter  
Alan Ehrenhalt  
Jean Bethke Elshtain  
Amitai Etzioni  
Bill Galston  
Henry Louis Gates  
Amy Gutman  
Charles Johnson  
Randall Kennedy  
Sheilah Mann  
Thomas Mann  
Jane Mansbridge  
Thomas Patterson  
Samuel Popkin  
Robert Putnam  
Wendy Rahn  
Raymond Wolfinger  
John Zaller

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Bruce N. Reed ( CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-APR-1997 10:53:25.00

SUBJECT: Re: Awaiting your response...

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

TEXT:

I talked to Al From, who thinks a commission is a mistake because no matter what we do, it will become dominated by "identity politics" rather than bringing people together. He suggested a few names -- Randall Kennedy, Glen Lowry -- but said that we were better off trying to solve problems than just talking about them.



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dawn M. Chirwa ( CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-MAY-1997 12:18:10.00

SUBJECT: Re: Talking Points for the First Round of Calls

TO: Robert B. Johnson ( CN=Robert B. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Ben: I wanted to add the following scholars names to your list:

Charles Lawrence -- Georgetown Law School (definitely need to touch base with him, since we are talking to his wife,  
Mari Matsuda

Cheryl Cashin -- former WH official, now with Georgetown Law School

Derrick Bell -- NYU Law School

Kim Taylor -- NYU Law School

Patricia Williams -- University of Wisconsin Law School

Jerry Lopez -- UCLA Law School

Richard Delgado -- University of Colorado Law School

Kimberly Crenshaw -- Columbia Law School

Paul Butler -- George Washington Law School

These people are all prominent legal scholars in the "Critical Race Theory" genre. If you want to add them to your list, I'll track them down and speak with them. (They should all be 1 call, week before)

Also definite must adds as 1 call the week before: (1) Randall Kennedy at Harvard Law (I'm willing to call him unless someone else has a relationship with him). (2) Studs Terkel; (3) Dick Gregory -- I think these two should be called, however, I do not know where they are currently -- sorry. If we mention the names at today's meeting, however, someone may know.

Oh, and someone who should receive 2 calls for input and a heads up -- Myrlie Evers. Someone who knows her or a head of an office should make that call.

Sorry I'm just adding these names. I just got a burst of inspiration today, I guess.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kevin S. Moran ( CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-MAY-1997 14:01:57.00

SUBJECT: Some information that might be helpful

TO: Ann F. Lewis ( CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is the link to Randall Kennedy's Atlantic Monthly article, "My Race Problem -- And Ours":

<http://www.theAtlantic.com/atlantic/issues/97may/kennedy.htm>

Also, I think you might find the following site useful. It's not pretty, but it has links to almost every imaginable news home page on the web:

<http://www.drudgereport.com>

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

CREATOR: Neera Tanden ( TANDEN\_N ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1997 15:06:02.87

SUBJECT: FYI

TO: Jose Cerda III ( CERDA\_J ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee ( Jose Cerda  
III@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Just in case you missed it - Randall Kennedy wrote an article on Race in yesterday's Washington Post. It wasn't really about race and crime and didn't set forth that much, but pretty much just said a dialogue about race would be useful. Unless I misread the tone, he seems a little disillusioned overall with the President.  
Talk to you soon.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY ( Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1997 09:05:03.00

SUBJECT: PBS: News Hour with Jim Lehrer, 6/16/97

TO: jgibbons@ostp.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY ( jgibbons@ostp.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY [ OSTP ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles@ovp@eop ( Lorraine A. Voles@ovp@eop [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop ( Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Darby E. Stott@eop ( Darby E. Stott@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Silverman@EOP ( Joshua Silverman@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stuart Schear@eop ( Stuart Schear@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin Moran@eop ( Kevin Moran@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine L. Wytkind@eop ( Lorraine L. Wytkind@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr.@OVP@EOP ( Thurgood Marshall Jr.@OVP@EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G N. Lattimore@eop ( G N. Lattimore@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angus S. King@eop ( Angus S. King@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel J. Gunia@eop ( Daniel J. Gunia@eop [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason S. Goldberg@EOP ( Jason S. Goldberg@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen E. Finney@eop ( Karen E. Finney@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm Emanuel@eop ( Rahm Emanuel@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle Crisci@eop ( Michelle Crisci@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jill M. Blickstein@eop ( Jill M. Blickstein@eop [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman@eop ( Michael Waldman@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv@EOP ( Barry J. Toiv@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: sally j. aman@ovp@eop ( sally j. aman@ovp@eop [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling@eop ( Gene B. Sperling@eop [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz@eop ( Laura D. Schwartz@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine@eop ( Alison Muscatine@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: April Mellody@eop ( April Mellody@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason@eop ( Julie E. Mason@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia F. Lewis@eop ( Patricia F. Lewis@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heidi Kukis@OVP@EOP ( Heidi Kukis@OVP@EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz@eop ( Russell W. Horwitz@eop [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia R. Green@eop ( Julia R. Green@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines@eop ( Jeremy M. Gaines@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov@eop ( Paul K. Engskov@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards@eop ( Anne M. Edwards@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven A. Cohen@eop ( Steven A. Cohen@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN



TO: Lori Anderson@eop ( Lori Anderson@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 17-JUN-1997 08:48:00

News Hour with Jim Lehrer: ONE AMERICA

AIRED ON JUNE 16, 1997

The President's call for a national conversation on race last weekend is just part

of an larger initiative he's dubbing "One America." Following excerpts from the

President's speech, experts debate if his plans are rhetoric or real policy.

JIM LEHRER: Now, five perspectives on the President's initiative. Ward Connerly is a regent for the University of California system. He was the moving force behind California Proposition 209, which abolished racial preferences and public programs there. Congressman John Lewis, Democrat of Georgia, accompanied the President to San Diego for the commencement address. Ronald Blackbird Moreno is national executive director of the Aspera Association, a Latino Youth Organization. He also chairs the National Hispanic Leadership Council. Susan Allen is an attorney, president of the United States Pan Asian American Chamber of Commerce; and Jim Sleeper is a journalist and author. His most recent book is entitled Liberal Racism.

Ms. Allen, what did you think of the President's approach and speech?

SUSAN AU ALLEN, US Pan Asian American Chamber of Commerce: I thought--I went to listen to that speech with high hopes--but I came out disappointed. I had hoped that he would really walk the talk and practice what he would preach. He gave us a lot of nice words and feel-good words, but I think in the end there was no substance in his speech. I had hoped that he would repeat his teen-age idol, President Kennedy, when President Kennedy said--I think it was on June

11, 1963--that race does have no place in American life and law.

And I hoped that he would start with affirmative action and as the captain of the ship of state steer the country away from the politics of division, preferences, quotas, and set asides toward a country where people are united together under the principle that this country was founded on--equality for all and preference and special treatment for none. He did not do that. Indeed, he went to California and spoke to the people who had voted not too many months ago overwhelmingly in support of the elimination of affirmative action as we know it today. It was a disappointment.

JIM LEHRER: A disappointment, Congressman Lewis?

REP. JOHN LEWIS, (D)

Georgia: It was not a disappointment for me. I thought it was a great speech, a very moving speech. It brought tears to my eyes really. This is the first time since the days of Lyndon Johnson, the days of John F. Kennedy, that we had an American President to speak from his heart, from his very soul, about the whole question of race.

I think the President was saying in so many words that if diversity is a goal, then we must be a diversified society. It's good in the boardroom, the classroom, the courtroom. It's good for America. And we see affirmative action only as a tool, only as an instrument to moving toward one America. I think those who criticize the President should give this young southern President an opportunity to make this effort work.

This man came of age during the height of the Civil Rights movement. He was not speaking just as President, not as a politician, but as a human being. He really believed that we must move toward one America. JIM LEHRER: Mr. Connerly, what did you think of the speech?

WARD CONNERLY,  
American Civil Rights Institute:  
Well, I remember that  
commercial, tastes great, less  
filling. And I think as you listen  
to different people you sort of

get the tug and pull of our feelings about the speech. I think it was a great speech; I really do. I think the

President really shows an understanding of the enormously complex racial problem that we have in the nation. These are the best of times in dealing with that problem, and these are the worst of times in dealing with it. There are some--there are some disconnections, however, in the speech.

The President says he wants to bring us together as one nation, and yet, he proposes that we use race--something that 30 years ago I'm sure he would have been saying let's not use race--but he wants us to use race to treat ourselves differently. And I just don't know how we get to where he wants us to be and where I think most people of goodwill want to be treating American citizens differently. And the central theme of this whole issue about race has to be a discussion of what do we do with affirmative action preferences, and the President said he wants to talk to all of us, even those who happen to disagree, but he didn't talk to anybody from my side, from my point of view, before he gave the speech.

He didn't include even a token 209 believer on his presidential advisory board on race.

And so there are some things there that don't quite hang together between what he says and what he is doing. But overall, I thought that the President did the right thing and he impressed me with his understanding of the problem, although I felt that the solution came up very, very lacking.

JIM LEHRER: Mr. Moreno, does it hang together for you?

RONALD BLACKBURN-MORENO, National Hispanic Leadership Agenda: Yes, certainly. I think it's a very good start. I think we're going down a very dangerous course in this country. And if we don't come to grips with the

issues of discrimination against not only  
African-Americans but  
other groups as well, we're going to be in an  
explosive  
situation  
in the next fifteen to twenty years.

And I think bringing this to the forefront of  
attention,  
making it  
central to the debate, I think it's very, very important,  
especially when  
we didn't have a  
racial crisis at the moment. I have to commend the President, first  
of  
all, for bringing it  
to the center of attention; second, for broadening the frame of the  
issue  
beyond black  
and white, and bringing in other minority groups into--into the  
discussion.

Third, for his strong support of affirmative action we can't wait  
until  
we have equal  
opportunity, until we are able to admit students of color at the  
University of California,  
provide them equal opportunity. Especially, we know we don't have  
an equal  
opportunity school system. Third, for supporting education, I think  
that's going to be  
key for providing equal opportunity for our children and our youth in  
the  
future.

JIM LEHRER: Jim Sleeper, the President said we must  
have  
an  
honest dialogue. Is an honest dialogue possible  
about  
race?

JIM SLEEPER, Journalist/Author: Well, I think it is,  
Jim.  
I'm not  
sure he hit all of the right notes toward getting us  
there, though. I  
think if we're going to talk about becoming one America, we've  
got to  
admit that part  
of the problem is not just our racial history, profound though it is.

It's the sheer rapidity and validity of the change we're  
undergoing now that is scrambling our notions of race so

completely that I agree with those who!,ve said there!,s  
something wrong with using it as the main lens. And another  
problem I think with having an honest dialogue, he said at one  
point that if we--the rollback of affirmative action would  
resegregate campuses. I don!,t know if he meant to imply that  
there!,s  
something racist  
about admissions officers who would not admit qualified candidates.

I think if we want to have an honest dialogue, we have to ask why  
have the  
number of  
applications dropped in Texas and California? These go to questions  
of  
preparation, of  
remediation, things that do demand resources, but in order to get to  
the  
point where we  
could build a consensus about assembling those resources, we have to  
be  
honest that  
some of the racial color coding, some of the relentless color coding  
of  
our public and  
private lives that we!,ve been engaged in is not the solution.

JIM LEHRER: Do you agree with that, Congressman Lewis, there!,s too  
much  
color  
coding?

REP. JOHN LEWIS: No. I don!,t think so. I think what the  
President said and what many of us who have been involved in  
the Civil Rights movement have been trying to say, we!,ve come  
a distance, we!,ve made a lot of progress, but the scars and  
strings of racism are still deeply embedded in American society.  
And we cannot forget that. Look what has happened in  
California. Look at what has happened in Texas and other places  
around the  
country.

There must be a willingness of us to put all of our cards on the  
table and  
deal with the  
whole question of race.

JIM LEHRER: Ms. Allen, from your perspective, are all the cards on  
the  
table, all the  
things that need to be talked about being talked about, and will they  
be  
talked about?

SUSAN AU ALLEN: Well, I hope so, but I think we should not look to  
the



federal

government as the arbiter. It is nice for the President to put it on the

national agenda,

but I think the most effective way to deal with race relations is to go to

the local

communities. I can tell you places in New Orleans, in St. Petersburg,

and

in North

Dakota.

They have started this process long before our President started to talk

about it. In

1971 and 1972, for two years, I sat with Marilyn Quayle and 25 women

of

all ethnic

groups, all religious beliefs and all racial orientations--racial back-

grounds, and we sat

down. We wanted to talk about what it is that we women of all colors,

all

backgrounds, can do together to bring a more harmonious society. We

did

that in

1991, and there was no photo ops, no cosmetic jobs.

I think while we have to deal with this, it is pernicious for us to

ask four-year-olds when they first step into a

school to

directly

themselves or through the parents to categorize the

children by

race,

to ask to check the box to say whether they're

Asian,

Hispanic,

Black, native American, or white. My 18-year-old

was

filling

out a form for the University of Chicago last

night. He

got

accepted there.

I'm very happy. He yelled out from the kitchen, "Mom, what am I?

Which

box should I

check?". I had to say, "Check whatever--that describes you." He is

both

white and

Asian, but he said, "Mom, there's only one box." I said, "Ignore

that ins  
truction." This is  
not right for children, for students to have to pick a classification  
on  
racial grounds. And  
that classification will later follow them for the rest of their  
professional and business life  
to hurt them and sometimes help them. This is not right. It!,s not  
fair,  
and it!,s not fair to  
people like the Chinese woman who we saw on television.

That kid never discriminated against anyone. Why should he, having  
forgone  
television,  
video games, and all that, worked hard, would be excluded from the  
school  
of his  
choice so that he can move over and give it to somebody else who may  
qual  
ify for the  
school but did well than he did?

JIM LEHRER: Mr. Moreno, you believe the classification by race must  
continue.

RONALD BLACKBURN-MORENO: I believe that people who have been  
historically discriminated against in this country have the right to  
equal  
opportunity. And  
that!,s the main purpose of affirmative action, is to provide equal  
opportunity to students  
who don!,t have equal opportunity, to students who don!,t have  
access to  
college.

We--on the one hand, we have a growing divide in the country by race,  
by  
socioeconomic status. And on the other, we!,re having a very, very  
significant and rapid  
change in the face of America.

And we have to come to grips with that. And until  
we can  
come up with a way--until we can come up with a  
school  
reform, for instance, that will provide equal  
opportunity to all  
students, to all students, quality education for  
all  
students, we  
have to find ways of providing the opportunities  
for  
students  
to go on to college. Why don't students go on to

the

University of California and University of Texas? Why are applications down? What message is the University of Texas and the University of California sending to minority students?

JIM LEHRER: Mr. Connerly.

WARD CONNERLY: You know it is kind of interesting that all of those who want to continue affirmative action preferences point to diversity. It is the very diversity in California that has inspired us to say we can't go on doing what we have been doing in the past. We're making public policy for the future. We're trying to build a society in which those things don't matter; that race will not matter. And I don't know how we do that if we keep living in the past. And our skin color and our--how we spell our last name are not measurements of who we are.

And what we want to do in this state--and this is why people of California voted for 209--is we recognize that this natural diversity that is bubbling out of our system here is not going to allow us to continue classifying people by race. We don't even know what boxes to check, as Ms. Allen said, and the only hope for us to make this experiment of American democracy work is to do away with those silly little boxes and get beyond the questions of race. And we can't do that until we do away with these programs that classify us and decide who gets into college and who gets a job and who gets a contract on the basis of race.

JIM LEHRER: Jim Sleeper, can there be a dialogue about this very subject, a national dialogue about whether or not we should continue to classify people by race?

JIM SLEEPER: Oh, I think it is inevitable. I think we're going to

have  
it. And--

JIM LEHRER: As a result of what the President has done, or was it already underway?

JIM SLEEPER: I think it has already underway. And I think, again, I share the concern on his panel, he should have included some of the younger black writers, whether it be Randall Kennedy, or Itibarian Jerry, and others who are dealing with the increasing vagueness of around race loyalty and race pride. I think that has very important. And if I can just say, Mr.

Moreno  
rightly invoked the idea of equal, equal opportunity education--equal opportunity for people as individuals, not as members of groups.

When the President said, if there has an alternative to affirmative action show me and I will embrace it, I am sure Mr. Connerly could speak to that better than I, but my

understanding is that when the University of California realized that

209  
was going to pass, the institute had special preparatory sessions, remedial sessions in some inner city

neighborhoods. Kids flocked to them. People applauded. And the only question in my mind was: My gosh, why weren't they doing this before? Isn't that a way of equalizing

opportunity without pasting labels on people and making these presumptions. Those are the kinds of things that I would like to see candidly discussed in the kind of dialogue that the President is initiating.

JIM LEHRER: Can they be talked about, Mr. Moreno?

RONALD BLACKBURN-MORENO: Of course, of course, and I think that the President is just bringing this to the forefront once more. And I

think  
that the issues that  
have been discussed here like equal opportunity and other people have  
to  
be brought  
into the discussion as well. The people who really held power in this  
country have not  
been part of this discussion.

JIM LEHRER: Like who?

RONALD BLACKBURN-MORENO: Corporate America  
has not been part of it. And more than any other

sector,  
these

are the people who own the economic resources in

this  
country,

93 percent of the economic resources in this

country. And  
these

are the people who, these Fortune 1000 companies have to be part of  
the  
dialogue.

They have to realize that equal opportunity and inclusion are good  
for  
America and are  
good for American business. And it is very important that this major  
group--the major  
sector be included in this discussion.

JIM LEHRER: Mr. Connerly, are they going to be included?

WARD CONNERLY: Well, I am sure they will be included, but I  
respectfully  
disagree

here. This problem is not going to be solved by corporate America.  
This  
problem is

going to be solved by the firemen and the policemen, the shoeshine  
man,

the people on  
the street who have to live with the whole problem of race every day.  
Those are the

people that will solve this problem. And until we  
recognize that

reality, we are not getting anywhere. The problem  
has to  
be

solved within the hearts and minds of the American  
people and

all the stereotypes about race have to be banished  
by  
those



people. We !,ve gone as far as we can go with those  
who  
have  
the lovers of power in government. It has to be  
solved  
by the  
everyday people in our society.

JIM LEHRER: Congressman Lewis, is it a hearts and mind problem now?

REP. JOHN LEWIS: Well, it !,s that, and it !,s more, but when you  
have the  
President of  
the United States, the highest elected official, helping to set the  
climate, creating an  
environment, creating a sense of hope and optimism, I think it !,s  
important. I think we  
should be grateful that we have a President who !,s prepared to take  
on  
this hard and  
difficult task, but in the real sense there must be a revolution of  
ideas  
and values on the  
part of the American people.

The same way during the 60's, that we brought the problems of  
segregation and discrimination from under the American rug I  
think we must bring this problem out into the open, and we all  
can deal with it. I think we can have a national dialogue, and we  
can change the hearts and minds of the people, but the  
President must be involved in that process.

JIM LEHRER: National dialogue has begun, Ms. Allen?

SUSAN AU ALLEN: Yes, it has, and I think I do agree  
with  
the  
President that you cannot throw money at it; power  
cannot  
change  
it; and you cannot use high technology to create it.  
It  
has to start  
with people !,s hearts, and people will only follow  
if they  
think they  
will be treated fairly.

JIM LEHRER: Ms. Allen, gentlemen, thank you all very  
much.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: uucp@WhiteHouse.gov@INET@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-JUN-1997 12:10:00.00

SUBJECT: scanner results

TO: binns\_m ( binns\_m@Al@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: horn\_s ( horn\_s@Al@CD ) (WHO)  
READ:20-JUN-1997 16:17:07.06

TEXT:  
SCANNER RESULTS

-----  
after much thought he had overcome  
his reservations about ending all affirmative action. Get rid of it, he  
says. If you don't have a racial problem, who needs racial remedies?

<p>Mr. Gingrich's stance is a reflection of what Theodore Shaw of the

MESSAGE BODY

-----  
From lemeeg@epix.net Fri Jun 20 12:09:10 1997  
Received: (from uucp@localhost) by WhiteHouse.gov (8.7.1/uucp-relay) id MAA08739 for  
<President@WhiteHouse.GOV>; Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:09:10 -0400 (EDT)  
From: lemeeg@epix.net  
Received: from storm.eop.gov/198.137.241.51 via smap  
Received: from DIRECTORY-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)  
id <01IKAMRA3CGW000BES@STORM.EOP.GOV> for President@WhiteHouse.GOV; Fri,  
20 Jun 1997 12:08:06 EDT  
Received: from SCAN-DAEMON by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)  
id <01IKAMR8YCSC000BLV@STORM.EOP.GOV> for president@Whitehouse.GOV; Fri,  
20 Jun 1997 12:08:04 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from pear.epix.net ([199.224.64.22])  
by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)  
with ESMTP id <01IKAMQXFL9M000AU7@STORM.EOP.GOV> for president@Whitehouse.GOV;  
Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:07:49 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from none.compuserve.com (mtrs-71ppp233.epix.net [199.224.71.233])  
by pear.epix.net (8.8.5/8.8.5/970414Scott Paul) with ESMTP id MAA01091 for  
<president@whitehouse.gov>; Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:07:46 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:07:44 -0400  
Subject: Racism's Nine Lives  
To: Clinton <president@WhiteHouse.GOV>  
Message-id: <33AAAAD0.48EE72C4@epix.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.01 [en] (Win95; I)  
Content-type: MULTIPART/MIXED; BOUNDARY="Boundary\_[ID\_r/cDNgelMXkvEGuJJzVs7w]"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
Comments: This message scanned by SCAN version 0.1 jms/960226

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--Boundary\_[ID\_r/cDNgelMXkvEGuJJzVs7w]

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/20herb.html>

--Boundary\_[ID\_r/cDNgelMXkvEGuJJzVs7w]

Content-type: text/html; name=20herb.html; charset=us-ascii

Content-disposition: inline; filename=20herb.html

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Content-Base: "http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/ 20herb.html"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "html2.0">

<HTML><HEAD>

<!-- ELEMENT META-->

<META NAME="Filingmethod" CONTENT="Atex">

<META NAME="UnixSlug" CONTENT="../backfield/savekeep/20HERB.W01">

<META NAME="Date" CONTENT="97/06/20">

<META NAME="Type" CONTENT="story">

<META NAME="AtexNotes" CONTENT="" ">

<META NAME="AtexSlug" CONTENT="20herb ">

<META NAME="AtexHJ" CONTENT="y016.80/0126">

<META NAME="AtexFrom" CONTENT="launch-edt;06/19,18:06 ">

<META NAME="AtexOp" CONTENT="stpick;06/19,18:05">

<META NAME="AtexBy" CONTENT="edpage;06/19,15:44">

<META NAME="section" CONTENT="oped">

<META NAME="subsection" CONTENT="">

<META NAME="End of header" CONTENT="">

<!--ELEMENT TITLE -->

<TITLE>Racism's Nine Lives</TITLE>

</HEAD><BODY bgcolor="#ffffff">

<NOBR><A HREF=""><IMG SRC="/images/banoped.gif" BORDER=0 ALT=banner align=left></A>

<A

HREF="http://images.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/0/Top/OPED0001/empty.gif/6c656d656567"><IMG

SRC="http://images.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/0/Top/OPED0001/empty.gi

<!--ELEMENT HEAD ADVT-->

</NOBR>

<BR clear=all><A HREF="/images/toolbar.map"><IMG SRC="/images/toolbar.gif" Border=0 ALT=toolbar ISMAP>

</A>

<BLOCKQUOTE><BLOCKQUOTE>

<!--ELEMENT DATE-->

<H5>June 20, 1997</H5><br>

<!--ELEMENT HEADLINE-->

<h5><font color="ag0000">IN AMERICA

/

By BOB HERBERT</font></h5>

<H2>Racism's Nine Lives</H2>

<p>In Fayetteville, N.C., a black man and woman walking down the street are shot and killed by white supremacists on the prowl for "niggers" to torment.

<p> In Orange County, California, an Asian-American man who has just earned a master's degree at Georgetown University is attacked while Rollerblading and stabbed to death. Police say the two young men arrested in the killing had decorated their apartment with Nazi symbols and white-supremacist posters.

<p> In Syracuse, a group of Asian-Americans and a white friend are refused service at a Denny's restaurant and then are attacked and beaten in the parking lot by a group of white men yelling anti-Asian slurs. The beating continues until a group of black patrons intervenes.

<p> In Fort Washington, Md., a black teen-ager shopping at an Eddie Bauer outlet is detained by police officers and forced to strip off his shirt because he cannot prove that it isn't stolen.

<p> In rural Siskiyou County, California, unrelenting racial harassment forces an Asian-American student to leave high school and continue her studies at home.

<p> Welcome to the enlightened 1990's, an era in which many people, most of them white, have declared that racism and discrimination are no longer much of a problem. That noise you hear is college doors being slammed in the faces of black and brown applicants in states where affirmative action is being destroyed. The only discrimination worth worrying about, we are told by the politicians and commentators in the nation's sociopolitical comfort zones, is discrimination against white men.

<p> Now comes Bill Clinton, who has worked so many sides of the race issue he sometimes confuses himself. Is he a demagogue or a visionary? Is he shoring up his bona fides with Reagan Democrats by consigning a million additional children to a miserable and wholly unnecessary stretch in the prison of poverty, or has he stumbled upon a moment of sincerity, which has prompted him to gaze earnestly into all of our eyes and ask, "Can we be one America?"

<p> It is very hard not to be cynical. The best guess is that the President, who has never met a group he felt he couldn't romance, now has his mind and heart set on the historians. It's legacy time. So, presto, a Presidential advisory board on race relations. Let's all be nice to one another.

<p> The problem is that the cynicism gets us nowhere. There is a vacuum of high-level leadership that needs to be filled. And as weak and periodically demagogic as Mr. Clinton has been, he is a substantial improvement over the racially poisonous Reagan-Bush era. That period began with Ronald Reagan brazenly kicking off his 1980 Presidential campaign in Philadelphia, Miss., where the civil rights workers Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman and James Chaney had been slain in 1964, and ended with Clarence Thomas making a mockery of Thurgood Marshall's seat on the Supreme Court.

<p> Those who yearn for progress in race relations may not like it, but they don't have the luxury of turning their backs on Mr. Clinton. Despite improvements over the past several decades, bigotry and other insidious threats to the interests of ethnic minorities remain intense. Newt Gingrich announced on Wednesday that after much thought he had overcome his reservations about ending all affirmative action. Get rid of it, he says. If you don't have a racial problem, who needs racial remedies?

<p>Mr. Gingrich's stance is a reflection of what Theodore Shaw of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund describes as the refusal of many whites to acknowledge that bigotry continues to permeate American life.

<p> "Racism is still endemic," he said. "My God, you have to be willfully blind not to see it."

<p>Randall Kennedy, a Harvard law professor and author of an excellent new book, "Race, Crime and the Law," said he hoped Mr. Clinton's initiative would lead at the very least to an honest discussion of the extent to which racism remains a problem. One of his students kicked off a spirited discussion recently by saying she did not believe there was as much discrimination in the United States as Professor Kennedy contended.

<p>

<p> It turned out that several other students felt the same way, Mr. Kennedy said, "but just weren't saying it." <br>

<P>

</BLOCKQUOTE> </BLOCKQUOTE>

<!--ELEMENT FOOTER-->

<BR>

<CENTER><H5>

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

<A HREF="/info/contents/sections.html">Sections</A> |

<A HREF="/info/contents/contents.html">Contents</A> |

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

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

<A HREF="/info/help">Help</A>

<P>

Copyright 1997 The New York Times Company

</H5><HR size=1 width=460><BR>

<A

HREF="http://images.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/click\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/0/Bottom/OPED0001/empty.gif/6c656d656567"><IMG

SRC="http://images.nytimes.com/RealMedia/ads/adstream\_lx.ads/www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/oped/0/Bottom/OPED0001/em

<!--ELEMENT TAIL ADVT-->

<P></center>

</BODY>

</HTML>

--Boundary\_[ID\_r/cDNgeIMXkvEGuJJzVs7w]--

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

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE:20-JUN-1997 12:10:00.00

ATT BODYPART TYPE:D

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)

id <01IKAMTSAKEO004A8A@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:10:07 -0500 (EST)

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

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IKAMTQJLTC0043Q9@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:10:04 -0500 (EST)

Received: from WhiteHouse.gov ([198.137.241.30])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <01IKAMT6EDQW000AU7@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:09:37 -0400 (EDT)

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

id MAA08821; Fri, 20 Jun 1997 12:09:36 -0400 (EDT)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tracey E. Thornton ( CN=Tracey E. Thornton/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-JUL-1997 18:47:16.00

SUBJECT: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

TO: Stacey L. Rubin ( CN=Stacey L. Rubin/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Looks like a Lee hit to me...

----- Forwarded by Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP on 07/15/97

06:30 PM -----

Jose Cerda III

07/15/97 04:16:31 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Members of the Race Working Group:

On July 29th, from 5 to 7 pm, HUD will sponsor the second of the VP's 2020 Conferences, and the topic of discussion will be -- "Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in American Cities. Invited to speak at the event are Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, Linda Chavez-Thompson of the AFL-CIO and Race Commission, and Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School. Secretary Cuomo's Deputy Chief of Staff, Rhoda Glickman, and others would like to come over to the White House and brief interested members of the Race Working Group on this event. I would like to try and schedule a briefing/meeting Friday morning -- maybe 10am -- for members of the Race Working Group to get plugged into this event. If you're interested, and this time works please let me know by e-mail. If not, I'll try and schedule something for next week. In the meantime, I'll send an info-pak around to everyone by inside mail.

Thank you,  
Jose'

(NB: Andrew, am I missing any key folks from this distribution list?)

Message Sent

To:

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP



Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP  
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP  
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP [ OPD ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-JUL-1997 16:17:13.00

SUBJECT: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

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

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

TO: Ananias Blocker III ( CN=Ananias Blocker III/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: Carolyn Curiel ( CN=Carolyn Curiel/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Lynn G. Cutler ( CN=Lynn G. Cutler/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Trooper Sanders ( CN=Trooper Sanders/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth S. Steele ( CN=Elisabeth S. Steele/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kim B. Widdess ( CN=Kim B. Widdess/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Susan M. Liss ( CN=Susan M. Liss/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura K. Demeo ( CN=Laura K. Demeo/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: Andrew J. Mayock ( CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Emil E. Parker ( CN=Emil E. Parker/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Cathy R. Mays ( CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Doris O. Matsui ( CN=Doris O. Matsui/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Angelique Pirozzi ( CN=Angelique Pirozzi/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: Minyon Moore ( CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Members of the Race Working Group:

On July 29th, from 5 to 7 pm, HUD will sponsor the second of the VP's 2020 Conferences, and the topic of discussion will be -- "Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in American Cities. Invited to speak at the event are Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, Linda Chavez-Thompson of the AFL-CIO and Race Commission, and Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School. Secretary Cuomo's Deputy Chief of Staff, Rhoda Glickman, and others would like to come over to the White House and brief interested members of the Race Working Group on this event. I would like to try and schedule a briefing/meeting Friday morning -- maybe 10am -- for members of the Race Working Group to get plugged into this event. If you're interested, and this time works please let me know by e-mail. If not, I'll try and schedule something for next week. In the meantime, I'll send an info-pak around to everyone by inside mail.

Thank you,  
Jose'

(NB: Andrew, am I missing any key folks from this distribution list?)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anne E. McGuire ( CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 16-JUL-1997 10:40:23.00

SUBJECT: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

TO: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hey Jose- can you keep me involved in this...thanks.

----- Forwarded by Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP on 07/16/97

10:37 AM -----

Katherine Hubbard  
07/16/97 10:30:06 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Are you aware of this?

----- Forwarded by Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP on 07/16/97

10:31 AM -----

Jose Cerda III  
07/15/97 04:16:31 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Members of the Race Working Group:

On July 29th, from 5 to 7 pm, HUD will sponsor the second of the VP's 2020 Conferences, and the topic of discussion will be -- "Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in American Cities. Invited to speak at the event are Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, Linda Chavez-Thompson of the AFL-CIO and Race Commission, and Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School. Secretary Cuomo's Deputy Chief of Staff, Rhoda Glickman, and others would like to come over to the White House and brief interested members of the Race Working Group on this event. I would like to try and schedule a briefing/meeting Friday morning -- maybe 10am -- for members of the Race Working Group to get plugged into this event. If you're

interested, and this time works please let me know by e-mail. If not, I'll try and schedule something for next week. In the meantime, I'll send an info-pak around to everyone by inside mail.

Thank you,  
Jose'

(NB: Andrew, am I missing any key folks from this distribution list?)

Message Sent

To:

---

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP  
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP

Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Katherine Hubbard ( CN=Katherine Hubbard/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUL-1997 10:38:51.00

SUBJECT: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

TO: Anne E. McGuire ( CN=Anne E. McGuire/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Are you aware of this?

----- Forwarded by Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP on 07/16/97

10:31 AM -----

Jose Cerda III

07/15/97 04:16:31 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Members of the Race Working Group:

On July 29th, from 5 to 7 pm, HUD will sponsor the second of the VP's 2020 Conferences, and the topic of discussion will be -- "Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in American Cities. Invited to speak at the event are Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, Linda Chavez-Thompson of the AFL-CIO and Race Commission, and Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School. Secretary Cuomo's Deputy Chief of Staff, Rhoda Glickman, and others would like to come over to the White House and brief interested members of the Race Working Group on this event. I would like to try and schedule a briefing/meeting Friday morning -- maybe 10am -- for members of the Race Working Group to get plugged into this event. If you're interested, and this time works please let me know by e-mail. If not, I'll try and schedule something for next week. In the meantime, I'll send an info-pak around to everyone by inside mail.

Thank you,  
Jose'

(NB: Andrew, am I missing any key folks from this distribution list?)

Message Sent

To:

---

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP

Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP  
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP  
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP

---

**Clinton Presidential Records  
Automated Records Management System  
[EMAIL] and Tape Restoration Project [Email]**

---

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies a responsive email, already made available within another collection.

---

Collection: 2009-1006-F

Bucket: WHO

Creation Date: 1997-07-16

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Creator: Jose Cerda III CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD ]

---

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	From Thurgood Marshall Jr to Elisabeth Steele Re: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities [Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	07/17/1997	b(6)

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
Automated Records Management System [Email]  
WHO ([Randall Kennedy])  
OA/Box Number: 500000

### FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1995 - 12/23/1997]

2019-1029-F

jn589

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thurgood Marshall Jr ( CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUL-1997 08:23:10.00

SUBJECT: Re: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

TO: Elisabeth S. Steele ( CN=Elisabeth S. Steele/O=OVP @ OVP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Rosemary B. O'Shea ( CN=Rosemary B. O'Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I SHOULD ATTEND. THE ONE CATCH WILL BE A POSSIBLE DC-OZONE CONFERENCE CALL WITH KRIS. MAYBE 10:45 OR 11:45 WILL WORK.

ALSO, FYI, I AM GOING TO DROP THE ROSE GARDEN THIS MORNING FOR THE JCS ANNOUNCEMENT AT 8:40. (IT WILL BE GOOD TO GET A FULL SWEAT GOING BEFORE 9:00) I WILL GO STRAIGHT FROM THERE TO THE OCA STAFF MEETING.

Elisabeth S. Steele @ OVP 07/16/97 06:33:13 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Do you want to go? Your Friday would look like this...

Friday, July 18

NOTE: Stefanie Sanford is out of the office (Austin).

7:45 AM WH Senior Staff Meeting (The Roosevelt Room)  
8:30 AM OCA CoS Conference Call (757-2104; Code 1270).  
8:30 AM Breakfast with Al Mottur (The White House Mess)  
DOB: (b)(6) SSN: (b)(6)

NOTE: He ,ll meet you in the West Basement.

CONTACT: Al Mess (202) 887-4463

9:15 AM to 9:45 AM OCA Staff Meeting (OEOb 160)  
FYI: 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM OVP Senior Staff Meeting  
(OEOb 276)

FYI: 10:00 AM OVP Management Meeting (OEOb  
276)

10:00 AM OCA Press Conference Call (757-2104; Code 7722).

[001]

10:00 AM RWG Briefing on VP ,s 2020 Conference (The  
Roosevelt Room)  
11:00 AM CoS Scheduling Meeting (Erskine ,s Office)  
1:00 PM to 3:00 PM Hold for the Weekly Report (Your Office)

Jose Cerda III @ EOP  
07/16/97 06:29 PM

To: Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP @ EOP, Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Susan M. Liss/OVP, Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP, Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Trooper Sanders/OVP, Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP @ EOP, James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP @ EOP, Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP @ EOP, Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP @ EOP, David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP @ EOP, Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP @ EOP

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Esteemed Members of the Race Working Group:

Thanks for getting back to me on the proposed HUD briefing. It seems as if a core group is interested and can make it. I've asked Rhoda Glickman and others from HUD to join us on Friday at 10am in the Roosevelt Room. I'll have someone from my office call around tomorrow to confirm, or please send me an e-mail if you are planning to attend.

Thank you,  
Jose'

----- Forwarded by Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP on 07/16/97  
06:20 PM -----

Jose Cerda III  
07/15/97 04:16:31 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc:  
Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

## Members of the Race Working Group:

On July 29th, from 5 to 7 pm, HUD will sponsor the second of the VP's 2020 Conferences, and the topic of discussion will be -- "Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in American Cities. Invited to speak at the event are Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, Linda Chavez-Thompson of the AFL-CIO and Race Commission, and Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School. Secretary Cuomo's Deputy Chief of Staff, Rhoda Glickman, and others would like to come over to the White House and brief interested members of the Race Working Group on this event. I would like to try and schedule a briefing/meeting Friday morning -- maybe 10am -- for members of the Race Working Group to get plugged into this event. If you're interested, and this time works please let me know by e-mail. If not, I'll try and schedule something for next week. In the meantime, I'll send an info-pak around to everyone by inside mail.

Thank you,  
Jose'

(NB: Andrew, am I missing any key folks from this distribution list?)

## Message Sent

To:

---

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP



Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP  
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP  
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Virginia N. Rustique ( CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUL-1997 12:19:52.00

SUBJECT: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

TO: Janet Murguia ( CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Allison L. Bowles ( CN=Allison L. Bowles/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

should i put this on your schedule?

----- Forwarded by Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP on  
07/17/97 12:15 PM -----

Jose Cerda III

07/16/97 06:29:24 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Esteemed Members of the Race Working Group:

Thanks for getting back to me on the proposed HUD briefing. It seems as if a core group is interested and can make it. I've asked Rhoda Glickman and others from HUD to join us on Friday at 10am in the Roosevelt Room. I'll have someone from my office call around tomorrow to confirm, or please send me an e-mail if you are planning to attend.

Thank you,

Jose'

----- Forwarded by Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP on 07/16/97  
06:20 PM -----

Jose Cerda III

07/15/97 04:16:31 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

## Members of the Race Working Group:

On July 29th, from 5 to 7 pm, HUD will sponsor the second of the VP's 2020 Conferences, and the topic of discussion will be -- "Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in American Cities. Invited to speak at the event are Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, Linda Chavez-Thompson of the AFL-CIO and Race Commission, and Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School. Secretary Cuomo's Deputy Chief of Staff, Rhoda Glickman, and others would like to come over to the White House and brief interested members of the Race Working Group on this event. I would like to try and schedule a briefing/meeting Friday morning -- maybe 10am -- for members of the Race Working Group to get plugged into this event. If you're interested, and this time works please let me know by e-mail. If not, I'll try and schedule something for next week. In the meantime, I'll send an info-pak around to everyone by inside mail.

Thank you,  
Jose'

(NB: Andrew, am I missing any key folks from this distribution list?)

## Message Sent

To:

---

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP

Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP  
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP  
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP

Message Sent

To:

---

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP

Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP  
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP  
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP  
Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alex D. Mandl ( CN=Alex D. Mandl/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JUL-1997 18:05:49.00

SUBJECT: 3rd time's a charm!

TO: lgreen@ustr.gov@INET@LNGTWY ( lgreen@ustr.gov@INET@LNGTWY @ LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Novelli ( Michael Novelli @ 205-6818 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas Tighe ( Thomas Tighe @ 606-4458 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeanie Frederick ( Jeanie Frederick @ 408-5133 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandy Crary ( Sandy Crary @ 682-5063 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward Heffernan ( Edward Heffernan @ 358-2810 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Kim Weaver ( Kim Weaver @ 482-6635 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Claire Rusk ( Claire Rusk @ 703-790-3260 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ryan Conroy ( Ryan Conroy @ 647-1770 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heyward Bannister ( Heyward Bannister @ 273-4879 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Frankee Greenberg ( Frankee Greenberg @ 366-7952 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena McCoy ( Elena McCoy @ 647-5837 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roslyn Mazer ( Roslyn Mazer @ 616-1239 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rhoda Glickman ( Rhoda Glickman @ 619-8257 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nelson Reyneri ( Nelson Reyneri @ 260-9232 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Rossi ( Diane Rossi @ 205-0501 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Parnice Green ( Parnice Green @ 482-5924 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sue Walitsky ( Sue Walitsky @ 401-7568 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian Coyne ( Brian Coyne @ 358-6076 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen Lomellin ( Carmen Lomellin @ 606-4485 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marna Madsen ( Marna Madsen @ 606-8588 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia Hacaj ( Sylvia Hacaj @ 565-2784 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Denise Miller ( Denise Miller @ 653-8925 @ fax [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Dodds ( Eric Dodds @ 208-5430 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George Haddow ( George Haddow @ 646-3895 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Soto ( Maria Soto @ 663-4931 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sandra Mancini ( Sandra Mancini @ 622-0073 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charlie Duncan ( Charlie Duncan @ 647-5837 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie Caldwell ( Marjorie Caldwell @ 219-7965 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terry Bish ( Terry Bish @ 219-1220 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Betsy D'Jamoos ( Betsy D'Jamoos @ 401-1948 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN



TO: Clare Giesen ( Clare Giesen @ 586-5701 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bailey ( Liz Bailey @ 703-693-6908 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mike Derian ( Mike Derian @ 720-9286 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

July 16, 1997

Dear Friend:

Please join me and a panel of distinguished experts for the next Community 2020 seminar on Tuesday, July 29, 1997. The theme for the evening's discussion is Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in America's Cities. The forum will be held at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW, at 6:30 pm.

"Community 2020" is an exciting new seminar series on the future of the American city. Chaired by Vice President Al Gore, the series brings together dynamic leaders from across the nation to explore the future of America's communities and metropolitan regions: where they are headed and what they will be like in the next 25 years and beyond.

Our guests will address one of the most pressing issues facing our nation as we move to the next century: the future of race relations in our cities. We will focus on the challenges and opportunities presented by the changing demographics of cities, and explore how people can live and work together in our emerging metropolitan communities across racial and ethnic lines. Leading experts, including Hugh Price, President and CEO of the National Urban League, Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School, Linda Chavez-Thompson, Executive Vice President of the AFL-CIO, and Karen Narasaki, Executive Director of the National Asian-Pacific American Legal Consortium, will keynote the discussion.

The event will contribute to the larger discussion of race relations

recently initiated by  
President Clinton, with a specific focus on cities. Just last week, the  
President released a new  
HUD Report on the "State of the Cities" which documents that as migration  
to the suburbs  
continues, our metropolitan areas have become increasingly divided along  
racial and economic  
lines. We hope to explore how -- in an increasingly multi-ethnic and  
multi-racial society --  
residential and economic segregation in our cities can be reduced, and how  
government  
and community can work together to promote social cohesion and civic  
harmony.

Because seating is limited, please RSVP to 202-708-5029 or 800-647-4963,  
no later than  
close of business on Friday, July 25, to reserve a space. I look forward  
to your participation  
in what promises to be an important, timely, and lively discussion.

Sincerely,

Andrew Cuomo

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alex D. Mandl ( CN=Alex D. Mandl/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JUL-1997 16:37:30.00

SUBJECT: Sorry!

TO: Igreen ( Igreen @ ustr.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Novelli ( Michael Novelli @ 205-6818 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas Tighe ( Thomas Tighe @ 606-4458 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeanie Frederick ( Jeanie Frederick @ 408-5133 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandy Crary ( Sandy Crary @ 682-5063 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward Heffernan ( Edward Heffernan @ 358-2810 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Kim Weaver ( Kim Weaver @ 482-6635 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Claire Rusk ( Claire Rusk @ 703-790-3260 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ryan Conroy ( Ryan Conroy @ 647-1770 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heyward Bannister ( Heyward Bannister @ 273-4879 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Frankee Greenberg ( Frankee Greenberg @ 366-7952 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena McCoy ( Elena McCoy @ 647-5837 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roslyn Mazer ( Roslyn Mazer @ 616-1239 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rhoda Glickman ( Rhoda Glickman @ 619-8257 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nelson Reyneri ( Nelson Reyneri @ 260-9232 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Rossi ( Diane Rossi @ 205-0501 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Parnice Green ( Parnice Green @ 482-5924 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sue Walitsky ( Sue Walitsky @ 401-7568 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian Coyne ( Brian Coyne @ 358-6076 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carmen Lomellin ( Carmen Lomellin @ 606-4485 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marna Madsen ( Marna Madsen @ 606-8588 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sylvia Hacaj ( Sylvia Hacaj @ 565-2784 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Denise Miller ( Denise Miller @ 653-8925 @ fax [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Dodds ( Eric Dodds @ 208-5430 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George Haddow ( George Haddow @ 646-3895 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Soto ( Maria Soto @ 663-4931 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sandra Mancini ( Sandra Mancini @ 622-0073 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charlie Duncan ( Charlie Duncan @ 647-5837 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marjorie Caldwell ( Marjorie Caldwell @ 219-7965 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Terry Bish ( Terry Bish @ 219-1220 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Betsy D'Jamoos ( Betsy D'Jamoos @ 401-1948 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Clare Giesen ( Clare Giesen @ 586-5701 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bailey ( Liz Bailey @ 703-693-6908 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mike Derian ( Mike Derian @ 720-9286 @ fax [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

According to my new found friends in computer support this should work now. Thanks for your patience.

Alex

July 16, 1997

Dear Friend:

Please join me and a panel of distinguished experts for the next Community 2020 seminar on Tuesday, July 29, 1997. The theme for the evening's discussion is Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in America's Cities. The forum will be held at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW, at 6:30 pm.

"Community 2020" is an exciting new seminar series on the future of the American city. Chaired by Vice President Al Gore, the series brings together dynamic leaders from across the nation to explore the future of America's communities and metropolitan regions: where they are headed and what they will be like in the next 25 years and beyond.

Our guests will address one of the most pressing issues facing our nation as we move to the next century: the future of race relations in our cities. We will focus on the challenges and opportunities presented by the changing demographics of cities, and explore how people can live and work together in our emerging metropolitan communities across racial and ethnic lines. Leading experts, including Hugh Price, President and CEO of the National Urban League, Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School, Linda Chavez-Thompson, Executive Vice President of the AFL-CIO, and Karen Narasaki, Executive Director of the National Asian- Pacific American Legal Consortium, will keynote the discussion.

The event will contribute to the larger discussion of race relations recently initiated by President Clinton, with a specific focus on cities. Just last week, the President released a new HUD Report on the "State of the Cities" which documents that as migration to the suburbs continues, our metropolitan areas have become increasingly divided along racial and economic lines. We hope to explore how -- in an increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-racial society -- residential and economic segregation in our

cities can be reduced, and how government and community can work together to promote social cohesion and civic harmony.

Because seating is limited, please RSVP to 202-708-5029 or 800-647-4963, no later than close of business on Friday, July 25, to reserve a space. I look forward to your participation in what promises to be an important, timely, and lively discussion.

Sincerely,

Andrew Cuomo

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Virginia N. Rustique ( CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-JUL-1997 19:22:45.00

SUBJECT: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

TO: Jessica L. Gibson ( CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The room has changed to 180 OEOB. I never confirmed w/ Janet that she'd want to attend. She was given the packet of info. from Jose a while ago. You might refresh her memory w/ this e-mail.

----- Forwarded by Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP on  
07/28/97 07:18 PM -----

Jose Cerda III

07/16/97 06:29:24 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Esteemed Members of the Race Working Group:

Thanks for getting back to me on the proposed HUD briefing. It seems as if a core group is interested and can make it. I've asked Rhoda Glickman and others from HUD to join us on Friday at 10am in the Roosevelt Room. I'll have someone from my office call around tomorrow to confirm, or please send me an e-mail if you are planning to attend.

Thank you,

Jose'

----- Forwarded by Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP on 07/16/97  
06:20 PM -----

Jose Cerda III

07/15/97 04:16:31 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: HUD's 2020 Conference on Race and Cities

Members of the Race Working Group:

On July 29th, from 5 to 7 pm, HUD will sponsor the second of the VP's 2020 Conferences, and the topic of discussion will be -- "Access, Opportunity, Mobility: Making Diversity Work in American Cities. Invited to speak at the event are Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, Linda Chavez-Thompson of the AFL-CIO and Race Commission, and Professor Randall Kennedy of Harvard Law School. Secretary Cuomo's Deputy Chief of Staff, Rhoda Glickman, and others would like to come over to the White House and brief interested members of the Race Working Group on this event. I would like to try and schedule a briefing/meeting Friday morning -- maybe 10am -- for members of the Race Working Group to get plugged into this event. If you're interested, and this time works please let me know by e-mail. If not, I'll try and schedule something for next week. In the meantime, I'll send an info-pak around to everyone by inside mail.

Thank you,  
Jose'

(NB: Andrew, am I missing any key folks from this distribution list?)

Message Sent

To:

---

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP



James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP  
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP  
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP

Message Sent

To:

---

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP  
Dawn M. Chirwa/WHO/EOP  
Bob J. Nash/WHO/EOP  
Laura K. Demeo/WHO/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Susan M. Liss/OVP @ OVP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP  
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Tracey E. Thornton/WHO/EOP  
Robert N. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Minyon Moore/WHO/EOP  
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP  
Angelique Pirozzi/WHO/EOP  
Trooper Sanders/OVP @ OVP  
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP  
Ann F. Walker/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP  
Robert B. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP

Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP  
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Emil E. Parker/OPD/EOP  
Ananias Blocker III/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP  
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP  
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP  
Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP

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

CREATOR: Kyle M. Baker ( BAKER\_K ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JUL-1997 11:51:10.48

SUBJECT: EXCERPTS FROM HUD SEMINAR ON RACE AVAILABLE BY ...

TO: Remote Addressee ( dmartin@feminist.org@INET )  
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Date: 07/30/97 Time: 11:19

bExcerpts from HUD Seminar on Race Available by Satellite Today

To: Assignment Desk

Contact: Janice Crump of the U.S. Department of Housing and  
Urban Development, 202-708-0685

News Advisory:

Contributing to President Clinton's larger discussion of race relations, Housing Secretary Andrew Cuomo chaired a provocative discussion last evening on the issues of race relations and diversity in the nation's cities. The occasion was the second in a series of "Community 2020" seminars hosted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to explore the challenges facing America's cities in the next century. Four of the country's leading thinkers on race issues joined Cuomo for the lively and timely discussion. Taped excerpts from this seminar, attended by more than 600, will be available by satellite from 1-2 p.m. EDT today (July 30).

Who:

- HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo
- Randall Kennedy, professor, Harvard Law School and author of "Race, Crime and the Law"
- Hugh Price, president and CEO, National Urban League
- Linda Chavez-Thompson, executive vice president, AFL-CIO
- Karen Narasaki, executive director, National Asian-Pacific American Legal Consortium

What: Community 2020 seminar

Excerpts available via satellite

Theme: "Making Diversity Work in America's Cities"

Coordinates: GE-1, C Band, Transponder 13

TR 13 CH/13

3960 MHZ, Horizontal

103 Degrees West

When: 1-2 p.m. EDT today (July 30)

For more information contact Janice Crump, HUD Public Affairs,  
202-708-0685.

-0-

/U.S. Newswire 202-347-2770/

APNP-07-30-97 1138EDT

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Neera Tanden ( CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-AUG-1997 12:07:35.00

SUBJECT: Dionne

TO: Jose Cerda III ( CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Just read his piece. Thought he was right on. You should give him a call (although he is away for most of August). I think you should also call Randall Kennedy.

Also, has anyone talked to Judge Higginbotham? [We gave him a Presidential Medal of Freedom for all his work in civil rights] He's been sick recently, but in another month or so, it would be good to reach out to him I think.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Neera Tanden ( CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-AUG-1997 11:56:37.00

SUBJECT: Re: Ackermania

TO: Thomas L. Freedman ( CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [ OPD ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

None other than the Dickster himself. He got Ackerman into that 8-intellectual dinner prior to the 1996 SOTU (the Galston, Ben Barber, Henry Luis Gates, Randall Kennedy, etc., etc. dinner). I sort of thought the Pres. had tons of those, until the dinner made it into the WSJ.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY ( Dag Vega@EOP@LNGTWY@LNGTWY [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-AUG-1997 08:47:25.00

SUBJECT: ABC: Nightline, 8/26/97

TO: Michael Waldman@eop ( Michael Waldman@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv@EOP ( Barry J. Toiv@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Darby E. Stott@eop ( Darby E. Stott@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua Silverman@EOP ( Joshua Silverman@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christa T. Robinson@eop ( Christa T. Robinson@eop [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison Muscatine@eop ( Alison Muscatine@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine L. Wytkind@eop ( Lorraine L. Wytkind@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: G N. Lattimore@eop ( G N. Lattimore@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Allison J. King@eop ( Allison J. King@eop [ PIR ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel J. Gunia@eop ( Daniel J. Gunia@eop [ OA ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jason S. Goldberg@EOP ( Jason S. Goldberg@EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen E. Finney@eop ( Karen E. Finney@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rahm Emanuel@eop ( Rahm Emanuel@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle Crisci@eop ( Michelle Crisci@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jill M. Blickstein@eop ( Jill M. Blickstein@eop [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jgibbons@ostp.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY ( jgibbons@ostp.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY [ OSTP ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine A. Voles@ovp@eop ( Lorraine A. Voles@ovp@eop [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop ( Virginia M. Terzano@ovp@eop [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling@eop ( Gene B. Sperling@eop [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura D. Schwartz@eop ( Laura D. Schwartz@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: steven j. naplan@eop ( steven j. naplan@eop [ NSC ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin Moran@eop ( Kevin Moran@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason@eop ( Julie E. Mason@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heidi Kukis@OVP@EOP ( Heidi Kukis@OVP@EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz@eop ( Russell W. Horwitz@eop [ OPD ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julia R. Green@eop ( Julia R. Green@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeremy M. Gaines@eop ( Jeremy M. Gaines@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul K. Engskov@eop ( Paul K. Engskov@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards@eop ( Anne M. Edwards@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven A. Cohen@eop ( Steven A. Cohen@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori Anderson@eop ( Lori Anderson@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
Message Creation Date was at 29-AUG-1997 08:39:00

Nightline: America In Black And White (Part I)  
Race And The Criminal Justice System

Aired on Aug. 26, 1997

TED KOPPEL

It's not supposed to happen, but it does. Sometimes a juror in a criminal case will simply ignore the weight of evidence against a defendant and find that person not guilty. There are quite a few Americans who believe that this is precisely what happened, for example, in the OJ Simpson murder case. No one on that jury has ever confirmed that, but it is a way in which a group of 12 citizens can send a message to society at large or a police department in particular that the evidence in a particular trial was of less importance to them than what they perceived to be a broad pattern of injustice. When that happens it is known as jury nullification. And if you're wondering what sort of a broad pattern a jury might be considering when it ignores the evidence in the case, you need to look no further than a study released only today by the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives. On any given day, the study found, among young black men aged 18 to 35, here in the District of Columbia, 50 percent, one out of every two, is either being sought on an arrest warrant, is out on bond, is on parole or probation or is in prison or jail. Half the young black men here in the nation's capital are entangled in the legal system. Over the course of the next two nights, we're going to be talking about that and a similar trend nationwide. We begin with Nightline correspondent Michel McQueen focusing on the subject of jury nullification.

MICHEL MCQUEEN, ABC NEWS

(VO) A young black man stands accused of possessing or selling illegal drugs. The facts presented in court suggest he did

exactly

that. What should a jury do in such a case? Most people,

like

Washington, DC Superior Court Judge Reggie Walton say convict.

REGGIE WALTON

There's no question. I start out my jury selection process

by

going

through a very lengthy statement with jurors about the fact

that

this

is not an arena in which you vent your social

dissatisfactions with

society. This is an arena where you only consider the facts

and

the

law and you decide whether the government has, in fact, proved somebody guilty. And I tell them if you can't do that, if

you

bring



to this courtroom issues related to sex or things of that nature, you cannot let yourself become a part of this jury panel and I emphasize that very sternly.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

(VO) And yet a small but vocal group of legal scholars, including George Washington University Professor Paul Butler, say let some people go, even if they're guilty as sin.

PAUL BUTLER

I don't think that jurors should support laws that are unjust. And, unfortunately, the way that our drug laws are prosecuted, especially

drug possession laws, is unjust. African - Americans are selectively prosecuted. According to the government, black people don't use drugs any more than whites. We're about 13 percent of people who use drugs. And yet we're 74 percent of people who are in prison for drug use. I think that that's unfair.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

(VO) It is called jury nullification and Butler is its latest and perhaps best known advocate. His provocative writings, where he suggests black jurors have a special responsibility to free black defendants of non - violent drug crimes, have raised hackles in courtrooms, newsrooms and law schools around the country.

But Butler says the concept is as old as the republic.

PAUL BUTLER

Courts for a long time have said that nullification is a legal power that jurors have and, in fact, jurors have always exercised that power. For example, during slavery, white northern jurors would acquit black slaves who were charged with the crime of running away.

During prohibition of alcohol, many people who were guilty of possession or distribution of alcohol would be acquitted by jurors who thought that the law was either unfair or dumb.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

(VO) In fact, some instance of jury nullification are considered among the defining moments in establishing our democratic traditions.

In 1670, an English jury refused to convict the Quakers

William Penn

and William Mead (ph) for disturbing the peace and unlawful preaching. Four jurors were imprisoned, but the judge later

let them go, ruling a jury cannot be second - guessed.

In 1735, colonial publisher John Peter Zanger (ph) was acquitted

of the charge of seditious libel, although he was clearly guilty of publishing criticism of the English crown, helping to establish freedom of the press.

And then there are the less glorious examples. All -

white southern juries in the 1960s repeatedly refusing to convict

white killers for the murders of civil rights workers like Medgar Evers.

That's one reason some critics are concerned that the

explosive combination of nullification and race is even being openly discussed.

REGGIE WALTON

And I think it's dangerous because if in our society we start

to use race openly as a basis for decisions being made by the process, as

minorities, we are going to suffer the most. And when you

start going down that slippery slope of letting race become a

factor in deciding whether someone should be held or not held

accountable

for a crime, I think it's very, very dangerous.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

(VO) And Walton and other judges believe on the rise.

Although there's no reliable way to prove this, because jury deliberations are

supposed to be secret, some observers believe that an increasing number of hung juries in many major cities is the result in part of jurors refusing to fully enforce laws they believe to be unfair to African - Americans. The Manhattan Federal Appeals Court was so concerned about this phenomenon that it issued a strong statement last May urging judges to try to prevent nullification.

Writing for the unanimous three - judge panel, Judge Jose Cabranes wrote that, "We categorically reject the idea that in a society committed to the rule of law, jury nullification is desirable or that courts may permit it to occur when it is within their authority to prevent."

(on camera) But advocates of jury nullification say race, just like class or celebrity, is already a factor in criminal justice and if juries feel something is fundamentally unfair, they have the right and the duty to do something about it.

PAUL GRANT, ATTORNEY

Well I think every juror engaged in jury service consults with their own conscience and that's all that jury nullification really is and people have to decide whether they can, in keeping with their own conscience, vote to convict. That's always part of the background.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

(VO) Paul Grant represented Colorado juror Laura Kriho. She was convicted of contempt of court in February after she refused to convict a young woman in a drug case last year. All parties involved are white.

LAURA KRIHO, DEFENDANT

We argued about the evidence in the jury room for about three or four hours and the other jurors became very abusive and very angry towards

realize  
that  
also  
me. And at some point in that I blurted out that do you  
this girl could do time in prison if we convict her. And I  
mentioned the doctrine of jury nullification.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

because she  
(VO) Although Kriho insisted that she wouldn't convict  
didn't think the prosecution made its case, her fellow jurors  
complained to the judge, who then put Kriho on trial. She is  
appealing the conviction.

PAUL GRANT

the  
yourself  
and  
nullification. So  
I  
Even if the court tells you that the law is clear and even if  
facts seem clear, if you in your own heart can't find it in  
to convict, to vote to convict, then you can vote to acquit  
that's just voting your conscience. But that's  
think Laura may have engaged in that and so would every other  
person.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

difficult to  
that  
the  
OJ  
based on  
nullification  
is  
divide  
in  
what  
(on camera) As the Kriho case makes clear, it can be  
decide if jury nullification has even occurred, a question  
becomes all the more complicated when race was a factor. Was  
Simpson criminal verdict an example of jury nullification  
race or was it reasonable doubt? Or, perhaps, jury  
best understood as another example of this nation's racial  
which complicated facts are sometimes all but irrelevant to  
people believe.

TED KOPPEL

And when we come back, two opposing points of view on jury  
nullification, in part two of Michel McQueen's report.  
(Commercial Break)

TED KOPPEL

of  
race -  
against  
While some judges and prosecutors are seeing more incidents  
based jury nullification, the philosophical arguments for and

are being played out in America's law schools. Randall Kennedy is

a Harvard law professor who's written extensively on race and the criminal justice system. Paul Butler is a George Washington University law professor and a former student of Mr Kennedy's.

Both men agree that the vast numbers of African - Americans caught up in the criminal justice system on drug - related charges is a national crisis. But they disagree sharply about jury nullification as a remedy.

Here again, Nightline's Michel McQueen.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

(interviewing) You say in your writings that it is morally right and

morally required to participate in nullification for African - American jurors. How can it be morally right and morally required to

let criminals go free even when you believe that they're guilty?

PAUL BUTLER

The moral part here is -- is it morally right to enforce unjust laws?

And the way that the drug laws are enforced in the United States is in a racially discriminatory way. By and large, white people do not

go to prison for drug crimes. The vast majority of people who are prosecuted and imprisoned for these crimes are African - American and

I think that that's unjust.

RANDALL KENNEDY

I think that we have a flawed system, but it's a system that is basically legitimate. He acts as if black Americans did not participate in any degree in the administration of criminal justice.

One would not know from Professor Butler's article that in many of the major cities in the United States we have presently, or have had recently, black chiefs of police. You would not know from

Professor

Butler's article that we have black jurors, black judges,  
black  
legislators.

PAUL BUTLER

All I'm saying is that race matters, including in the  
administration  
of criminal justice in the United States. So the question is  
whether  
the solution can be color - blind if the problem is not. The  
problem  
is not color - blind. One out of three young African -  
American  
men  
is under criminal justice supervision, not one out of three  
young  
white men.

RANDALL KENNEDY

It is a terrible problem and we should be alarmed. The  
question is  
what do we do. Now, Professor Butler has the idea that we're  
striking a blow for sensible reform by throwing a stick in  
the  
gears  
of justice, by sabotaging the criminal justice system. It  
seems to  
me that that's simply not a sensible response.

MICHEL MCQUEEN

His argument is that African - Americans, because of the  
unique  
history in this country, uniquely have the moral authority, he  
believes, to use this option.

RANDALL KENNEDY

He's making an argument for racial mobilization, black jurors,  
protect your black brothers and sisters who are defendants.  
Well,  
if

it's legitimate for him to engage in that sort of racial  
mobilization, presumably there are going to be a lot of  
people out  
there who are going to say, well, if he can act that way, why  
can't  
I? Why can't white jurors look after their white brothers and  
sisters?

PAUL BUTLER

Historically, when we look at the people who've been  
responsible  
for  
legal change for African - Americans, it's been African -  
American  
people, not at first white people. Now we have many white  
allies  
in  
this effort to eradicate racial discrimination in the criminal

justice system. In time, I think that we will have many more, including the white majority. But I think that historically,

black

people have to be the leaders in self - help.

RANDALL KENNEDY

Well I just disagree with him. We're all Americans. We

should

have

a criminal justice system and our criminal justice system

should

deal

with people equally before the bar of justice.

PAUL BUTLER

I'm confident that 50 years from now we will understand that

this

policy of selectively enforcing drug laws against African -

American

people was wrong and that people who refused to support that

policy,

including jurors who refuse to use their power to selectively discriminate against black people, will be viewed as correct.

TED KOPPEL

Law professors Butler and Kennedy were interviewed by

Nightline's

Michel McQueen.

When we come back, the jury foreman in the trial of

Mayor

Marion

Barry and a former DC public defender.

(Commercial Break)

TED KOPPEL

Joining us here in Washington are Edward Eagles. He served

as jury

foreman in the 1990 drug and perjury trial of Washington, DC

Mayor

Marion Barry. Angela Davis, an associate law professor at

American

University. Ms Davis spent 12 years as a public defender

here in

the

nation's capital.

Mr Eagles, I'd like you to take us inside that jury room

for a

moment. I don't think anyone ever fessed up to jury

nullification

but there is some suspicion that that is what may have gone

on, at

least with regard to some of the counts against Mayor Barry.

Can

you

give us a sense of what it was like in that jury room, what

was

going



on?

EDWARD EAGLES, JURY FOREMAN, MARION BARRY TRIAL  
(Washington) I'll try. Jury nullification, of course, is

largely  
in

the eye of the beholder. Very few, at least certainly not in

the

case of which I was part, did anybody say the evidence argues

one  
way

but by gosh, I'm going to go a different way. That's just

not the

way it happened. People come into the jury room not only

with a

trial in mind, but with their entire life experience and what

they

see as plausible depends more, it seems to me, on what

they've --

what's happened to them before in life than it probably does

in the

actual display of evidence by counsel of both sides.

TED KOPPEL

There is, Professor Davis, in point of fact, if anyone were

to say,

look, I'm going to invoke jury nullification here or invoke

my de

facto right to participate in jury nullification, that in and

of

itself almost negates the process, doesn't it? It's always

silently

done, isn't it?

ANGELA DAVIS, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL

(Washington) Yes, it is. And I think that what Ted mentioned  
earlier happens all the time and it's supposed to happen in

fact.

I

mean, judges tell jurors you don't leave your common sense

out the

front door, you don't leave your life experience at the

door. You

bring it into the jury room. You should use your life

experience

in

this process. They're invited to do that and there's nothing

wrong

with that. That's one of the great things about our jury

system.

It's supposed to work that way.

TED KOPPEL

Mr Eagles, were you conscious of the fact that life

experience,

that

there was in that jury room, in a sense, a racial divide

where the



life experience was so different that what was readily understandable to one group was not as readily understandable to the other?

EDWARD EAGLES

There was a divide, but it was not racial. Of the 12 jurors, 10 were black, two were white. The divide, I would think, was more a socio-economic.

TED KOPPEL

And educational, I would imagine.

EDWARD EAGLES

Yes, as a subset.

TED KOPPEL

And how did that manifest itself?

EDWARD EAGLES

The people who had college experience were much more apt to go with the evidence as presented and, in fact, frankly, be outraged at the idea of drug use. Other people had the feeling that police had invented evidence on other occasions and that they might have done it on this. And, furthermore, there was anger on the other side at what was seen as entrapment.

TED KOPPEL

I guess, Professor Davis, what I have trouble with is the notion that however well meaning, one person's instinct or life experience would be substituted or should be substituted in a courtroom setting for what is meant to be, after all, as fair a system as we've been able to create over the years. I mean, someone may bring a life experience and they're with all of the best intentions, but it has absolutely no relevance in that case.

ANGELA DAVIS

That may happen, but I don't think that happens by and large in criminal cases. And I think that Ted's comment earlier about the more educated people thinking that drug use is bad, well I think that people who don't have as much education also think drug use

is bad.

certain But they also know some other things that people who live in  
communities, because of their socio - economic position,

don't  
know,

and that is they don't know about the way police officers  
behave in

those communities, about the way that they treat people in  
those

communities, about the fact that they do sometimes, not  
always, but

they do sometimes plant drugs, they do sometimes lie, they do  
sometimes abuse people in those communities and that is a

world  
that

many people don't know about.

TED KOPPEL

Does that entitle someone who has experienced anti -  
Catholicism or

anti - Semitism or anti - feminism to bring that into the  
jury room

and substitute it for evidence?

ANGELA DAVIS

No, absolutely not. And that's not what I'm referring to and  
I do

think there's a difference between bringing a prejudice or a  
bias

against a particular group and simply bringing one's life  
experience

in America into the jury room.

TED KOPPEL

No, no, no, you misunderstand me. I was saying the bias  
against a

particular group which has resulted in that group being  
victimized

may very well be the life experience that that person brings  
into

the jury room and if you permit them to substitute that for the  
formality

of the trial and the evidence that's been presented, aren't  
you

going

down a very slippery path, indeed?

ANGELA DAVIS

I think that that may be true, but that's not at all what I'm  
talking

about. I'm not saying that one should come in and say that I  
think

that because I'm African - American regardless of what the  
evidence

in this case shows, that, you know, I should decide  
differently,

unless one wants to engage in jury nullification, as  
Professor  
Butler  
talks about. And I think in certain types of cases, that may  
be  
appropriate, in certain types of cases. But as a general  
rule, I  
don't think that that's necessarily the way that the jury  
system  
should be conducted or is conducted.  
I will say that from my own experience that juries do  
engage  
in  
jury nullification sometimes and that they do it in just  
about the  
right kinds of cases. And when I say right kinds of cases I  
mean  
when I was a public defender, by and large, it was  
misdemeanor  
cases  
where jurors would come up to me after a week - long trial  
involving  
a spat between neighbors or a small amount of drugs and say  
why  
did I  
spend a week here doing this? Could this have been resolved  
short  
of  
this? And so they do send a message to the state that they  
don't  
want

those kinds of cases prosecuted.

TED KOPPEL

Again ...

ANGELA DAVIS

And I think there's nothing wrong with that.

TED KOPPEL

Mr Eagles, if ...

ANGELA DAVIS

And that's very different.

TED KOPPEL

-- if you would bring us around to a conclusion, then, by  
bringing  
your own life experience in the jury room to bear, just close  
it up  
for us, if you would, in terms of what you experienced.

EDWARD EAGLES

It's very important, it seems to me, for any jury  
deliberation to  
stick to the facts. If, in fact, society or elements of  
society  
condone so - called jury nullification, that is, substituting  
one's  
own whims or life experience for facts, then I think we're

nowhere.

That's your slippery rug. On the other hand, is at least you  
address  
the facts. You can address it from your own experience,  
however  
diverse that is, that's good. But at least it's focused on  
the  
facts

and after all, that's the jury role, to find the facts.

TED KOPPEL

And for tonight, that'll have to be the last word. Mr Eagles,  
Professor Davis, thank you both very much indeed. I'll be

back in

a

moment.

(Commercial Break)

TED KOPPEL

Tomorrow, the second of our broadcasts on race and the  
criminal  
justice system in America.

And that's our report for tonight. I'm Ted Koppel in  
Washington. For all of us here at ABC News, good night.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: slate-announce-owner@microsoft.nwnet.com@INET@LNGTWY ( slate-announce-owner@microsoft.nwnet.com@INET@LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-OCT-1997 16:16:30.00

SUBJECT: SLATE News - October 17, 1997

TO: John R. Pfeiffer@EOP ( John R. Pfeiffer@EOP [ OMB ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Hayes@eop ( Richard Hayes@eop [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

For e-mail delivery of Slate send e-mail to  
microsoft-request@microsoft.nwnet.com and on a line by itself in the  
message, type:  
subscribe slateprint

The Premier Institute is the education and government-relations center for Premier Inc., the nation's largest alliance of not-for-profit health-care organizations. Based in Washington, D.C., the institute promotes public policies that support integrated health-care delivery systems and provider-based managed care. You can learn more about their hottest issue, provider-sponsored organizations--a new Medicare managed-care option--in this issue of SLATE.

Oct. 17, 1997

Dear Reader,

Two things are certain: taxes and that people hate paying taxes. But lately the IRS faces more harassment charges than the Navy. Is there a strong case against the taxmen? Jacob Weisberg says no--the IRS hearings are just Republicans playing politics.

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/StrangeBedfellow/97-10-18/StrangeBedfellow.asp>

And to keep up with news from every field of interest, subscribe to Today's Papers from SLATE. Each day you'll receive a short e-mail summary of news from five top papers. Just send e-mail to microsoft-request@microsoft.nwnet.com, and on a line by itself in the message, type: subscribe papers.

Also in this issue of SLATE:

The Taste for Taboo:

Grisly pictures of the Di crash scene--do they exist? Should you care? Charles Paul Freund says macabre photography has always fascinated us, from Abe Lincoln in a coffin to Marilyn Monroe on the autopsy table.  
<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Features/DiPix/DiPix.asp>

#### Dialogue:

Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom wrote "Black and White in America."  
Randall Kennedy reviewed it for SLATE--unfavorably. This week, they go toe-to-toe in a dialogue on race.

<http://www.slate.com/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=Race>

#### Alas, Babylon:

Say you own lots of Microsoft stock (and hey, who doesn't?). When should you finally sell? What are the signs? Bill Barnes tells you.

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Features/MSSStock/MSSStock.asp>

#### Diary:

Ryan Kuehl plays defensive tackle for the Washington Redskins. This week, he also writes for SLATE. Go behind the scenes at practice, in the locker room, and for a big win against the Cowboys. Not every SLATE writer tips the scales at 285.

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=Kuehl>

Plus, David Plotz on "L.A. Times" publisher Mark Willes;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Assessment/97-10-18/Assessment.asp>

Lakshmi Gopalkrishnan on J.M. Coetzee's new memoir;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/BookReview2/97-10-14/BookReview2.asp>

David Edelstein on "Washington Square";

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/MovieReview/97-10-17/MovieReview.asp>

Franklin Foer on the Nation of Islam;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Gist/97-10-18/Gist.asp>

and much more.

You can link from here directly to SLATE's Table of Contents  
and all the SLATE stories and departments not mentioned above:

<http://www.slate.com>

#### Today's Papers;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/TodaysPapers/TodaysPapers.asp>

#### The Week/The Spin;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Spin/97-10-18/Spin.asp>

#### Chatterbox;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/chatterbox/chatterbox.asp>

#### Summary Judgment;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/SummaryJudgment/97-10-15/SummaryJudgment.asp>

#### In Other Magazines;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/OtherMags/97-10-18/Mags.asp>

#### Readme;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Readme/97-10-18/Readme.asp>

Doodlennium;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Doodlennium/97-10-15/Doodlennium.asp>

Dispatches & Dialogues:

Jacob Weisberg from the Thompson hearings;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=FinanceHearings>

Air Time for Candidates;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=Airtime>

Freedom of Speech vs. Workplace Harassment;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=FreeSpeech>

Al Gore;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=AlGore>

Mixed Marriage;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=Interfaith>

Motley Fool on stock analyst Tom Kurlak;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/motleyfool/97-10-16/motleyfool.asp>

Graef Crystal on billionaire CEOs;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/maximumwage/97-10-16/maximumwage.asp>

David Mastio on E. coli;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Features/Ecoli/Ecoli.asp>

Harry Shearer on his nightmare lawsuit;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Features/ShearerLawsuit/ShearerLawsuit.asp>

Randall Kennedy reviews "Black and White in America";

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/BookReview/97-10-14/BookReview.asp>

Michael Isikoff on a new book about Vincent Foster;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/BookReview3/97-10-18/BookReview3.asp>

Justin Davidson on Cecilia Bartoli;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Opera/97-10-16/Opera.asp>

Egghead on life in academia;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Egghead/97-10-18/Egghead.asp>

a Poem by Deborah Garrison;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Poem/97-10-15/Poem.asp>

E-Mail to the Editors;

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Email/97-10-16/Email.asp>



and The Fray.

<http://www.slate.com/redirect/announce.asp?gotoT=/Code/fray/fray.asp>

Sincerely,

Seth Stevenson

P.S. You don't have to keep this letter to yourself. If you have friends (or, for that matter, enemies) who might be interested in SLATE, please forward this announcement to them. We appreciate all the business we can get. Thanks.

To unsubscribe from this SLATE e-mail:

Send e-mail to [microsoft-request@microsoft.nwnet.com](mailto:microsoft-request@microsoft.nwnet.com) and on a line by itself in the message, type:  
unsubscribe slate-announce

To get help for the SLATE mailing lists:

Send e-mail to [microsoft-request@microsoft.nwnet.com](mailto:microsoft-request@microsoft.nwnet.com) and on a line by itself in the message, type:  
help slate

SLATE is at <http://www.slate.com>

You can send technical questions and comments to our tech guy at

[help@slate.com](mailto:help@slate.com), and anything else to [letters@slate.com](mailto:letters@slate.com).===== ATTACHMENT 1

=====

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

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)

id <01IOX3T80AQO00HTGD@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Fri, 17 Oct 1997 16:08:20 -0400 (EDT)

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

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879) id <01IOX3T704NK00O8V0@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Fri,

17 Oct 1997 16:08:17 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from mail6.nwnet.net ([204.202.220.44])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <01IOX3S5D62E000XQF@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Fri,

17 Oct 1997 16:07:37 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from mail5.nwnet.net (mail5.nwnet.net [204.202.220.12])

by nwnet.com (970228885) with ESMTP id LAA13673; Fri,

17 Oct 1997 11:06:24 -0700 (PDT)

Precedence: bulk

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



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kevin S. Moran ( CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-OCT-1997 19:53:51.00

SUBJECT: Have you guys seen these articles?

TO: Andrew J. Mayock ( CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter Rundlet ( CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Slate is hosting an on-line dialogue between Stephan & Abigail Thernstrom and Randall Kennedy concerning Race in America. Might be worth checking out.

<http://www.slate.com/Code/DDD/DDD.asp?file=Race&iMsg=0>

Here are some additional Slate sites involving Race:

<http://www.slate.com/BookReview/97-10-14/BookReview.asp>

<http://www.slate.com/StrangeBedfellow/97-06-21/StrangeBedfellow.asp>

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	From Kevin Moran to Rochester Johnson Re: [No Subject] [partial] (1 page)	10/27/1997	b(6)

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
Automated Records Management System [Email]  
WHO ([Randall Kennedy])  
OA/Box Number: 500000

### FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1995 - 12/23/1997]

2019-1029-F  
jn589

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kevin S. Moran ( CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-OCT-1997 17:51:09.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Rochester M. Johnson ( CN=Rochester M. Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Political Consultants

Paul Begala

(b)(6)

[002]

Al From

DLC  
518 C Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 546-0007

Bill Knapp

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Mark Penn

2201 N Street, NW  
Apartment 15  
Washington, DC 20037  
(202) 331-1115

Doug Schoen

Penn & Schoen  
245 East 92nd Street  
New York, NY 10128  
(212) 534-4000

Bob Squier

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Tom Ochs

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Lisa Linden

Linswn Alschuler & Kaplan, Inc.  
25 West 43rd Street  
New York, NY 10036

(212) 575-4545

Frank Greer

GMMB&A

1010 Wisconsin Avenue, NW

Suite 800

Washington, DC 20007

(202) 338-8700

Stan Greenberg

Greenberg Research Inc.

515 Second Street, NE

Washington, DC 20002

(202) 547-500

James Carville

Carville & Begala

329 Maryland Avenue, NE

Washington, DC 20002

(202) 543-1196

Michael Sheehan

Sheehan Associates

1901 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20056

(202) 452-9440

Henry Sheinkopf

260 West End Avenue

Apartment #12B

New York, NY 10023

(212) 941-6630

Marius Penczner

Dick Morris

Academic Consultants / Others

Bruce Ackerman

3407 Dent Place, NW

Washington, DC 20007

(202) 357-1604

(202) 387-3710

Benjamin Barber

Rutgers University

Department of Political Science

Hickman Hall, Douglas Campus

New Brunswick, NJ 08903

(908) 932-6861

Larry Bartels

Princeton University

Robertson Hall

Princeton, NJ 08544-1013

Sam Beer

Kennedy School of Government

Littauer Room G9

1805 Cambridge Street

Cambridge, MA 02138

(617) 495-3210

Harry Boyte

Hubert Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs  
University of Minnesota  
301 19th Avenue, Sout  
Minneapolis, MN 55433  
(612) 625-9505

Taylor Branch

2806 South Road  
Baltimore, MD 21209

Alan Brinkley

211 Central Park West  
Apartment 6H  
New York, NY 10024  
(212) 854-5220  
(212) 787-0907

Stephen Carter

Yale Law School  
New Haven, CT 06520

Stan Chinburn

Alan Ehrenhalt

Governing Magazine  
2300 North Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
(203) 432-4839 -- TK

Jean Bethke Elshtain

University of Chicago  
Divinity School  
1025 East 58th Street  
Chicago, IL 60637  
(312) 702-1234

Amitai Etzioni

George Washington University  
The German Library  
Room 714J  
2130 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20052

Bill Galston

University of Maryland  
Van Munching Hall, Room 3111  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-6347

Henry Louis Gates

Harvard University  
Department of Afro-American Studies  
1430 Massachusettes Avenue, 4th Floor  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Os Guinness

Trinity Forum  
5210 Lingate Court, Suite B  
Burke, VA 22015

Amy Gutman

Princeton University

9 Nassau Hall  
Princeton 08544  
(609) 258-3029

James Davidson Hunter  
University of Virginia  
Department of Sociology  
548 Cabell Hall  
Charlottesville, VA 22901  
(804) 924-6524

Charles Johnson

Randall Kennedy  
22 May Street  
Boston, MA 0213

or

75 Francis Street  
Boston, MA 02115-6195  
(617) 495-0907

Sheilah Mann  
American Political Science Association  
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas Mann  
The Brookings Institution  
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 797-6050

Jane Mansbridge  
1710 Asbury Avenue  
Evanston, IL 60201  
(708) 491-8726

Will Marshall

Martha Minow  
Harvard Law School  
Cambridge, MA 02138

David Osborne

Thomas Patterson  
Kennedy School of Government  
Joan Shorestein Center  
79 John F. Kennedy Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Samuel Popkin  
University of California - San Diego  
5411 Soledad Road  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
(619) 534-2758

Robert Putnam  
The Kennedy School  
Harvard University  
79 John F. Kennedy Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 496-5373

Wendy Rahn

University of Minnesota  
Department of Political Science  
1414 Social Science Building  
267 19th Avenue, South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Jeremy Rosner

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace  
2400 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1153  
(202) 862-7900

Arthur Schlesinger

City University of New York  
33 West 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 794-5555

Theda Skocpol

66 Huron Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138-6708  
(617) 495-3851

Guy Smith

Smith World Wide  
171 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
(212) 779-2336

Paul Starr

Princeton University  
Department of Sociology  
Greenhill  
Princeton, NJ 08544

Ted Sorenson

Paul Weiss Rifkind Warden & Garrison  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019-6064  
(212) 373-3790

Michael Walzer

School of Social Science  
Institute for Advanced Studies  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
(609) 734-8253

Eddie Williams

William Julius Wilson

Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy  
Kennedy School of Government  
79 John F. Kennedy Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 496-4514

Alan Wolfe

Boston University  
745 Commonwealth Avenue  
6th Floor  
Boston, MA 02215  
(617) 353-2591

Raymond Wolfinger

University of California -- Berkeley  
Department of Political Science  
2538 Channing Way  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Gordon Wood

Brown University  
Department of History  
Providence, RI 02912  
(401) 863-2820

Daniel Yankelovich

Public Agenda Foundation  
424 Westend Avenue, 7F  
New York, NY 10024  
(212) 595-7803

John Zaller

University of California -- Los Angeles  
Department of Political Science  
Los Angeles, CA 90024



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann F. Lewis ( CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-NOV-1997 19:02:14.00

SUBJECT: excuses

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

Ann F. Lewis ( CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Do you know the story of the Little Red Hen ? It's one of my favorites.

We need to begin contacting authors if we hope to get a good mix in Akron on December 3.

My categories are :

# 1: Relatively recent authors , well reviewed, reflect the President's approach . Examples: David Shipler, Jonathan Coleman, perhaps Randall Kennedy , William Julius Wilson, Juan Williams . Chris suggests Patricia Williams or Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot .

# 2. A different point of view: Glenn Loury, Jim Sleeper, Orlando Patterson

# 3. Beyond black and white: A hispanic or asian author, presumably with a point of view similar to # 1. Amy Tan ?

Because I think the list for category # 2 is the smallest ( people with whom we disagree but can count on for a civil and thought provoking conversation ) I would try to fill this slot first and then work on the rest to complement. How do you want to proceed ?

We also need to begin compiling -and vetting --possible on-stage participants (in addition to the 3 students/3 authors who will open). Because of Thanksgiving, we have fewer days for research to work on the vetting. We have a meeting set for Thursday afternoon to get lists of candidates. Meanwhile --to save some time -- Stacie is going to ask the PIR folks who are talking to Akron to begin sending in names as they arrive --not with a guarantee that they'll be included but to get a headstart on the vet. The school has recommended an auditorium with a large stage and 1,00 person capacity for the audience. We will see if we have a nearby advance-type contact who could take a look so we get an early sense of whether its doable.

----- Forwarded by Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP on 11/17/97 06:28 PM -----

edley @ law.harvard.edu  
11/15/97 12:00:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Ann F. Lewis, Sylvia M. Mathews

cc:

Subject: excuses

Here's the problem, which I share with you and Sylvia as friends. My book on race, Not All Black and White, is one of the very best out there, in my view. I'm co-founder of a new think tank on civil rights here at Harvard that is fast becoming the best hope for a replenishment of intellectual capital in the civil rights movement. I'm flying around making speeches on the race initiative, getting standing ovations in weird places like Indiana and Columbia MO. And I'm weary of being treated like chopped liver when the discussion turns to "Who are the intellectuals?"

This, I know, is largely the phenomenon of "staff" always being dissed. And also the phenomenon that some people (including POTUS) seem often to pay more attention to critics than to supporters. But it sticks in my craw that people whose work is less thoughtful than mine get tacked onto lists for presentations, dinners, whatever. It makes me feel as though my ideas would be more likely to get attention if I withdrew from the Initiative and just did my own thing. (And I could get all the attention imaginable just by being feintly critical of what I leave behind. Just that little problem of stomaching my own disloyalty.)

Still, it is doubly frustrating when I look ahead. It is tough for me to contemplate investing an enormous amount of time and energy working on the President's book, instead of working on MY OWN (next) book. I know more people will read something with his name on it, but I also feel as though I'd have more respect for myself than I do when surrounded by people cooing over Cornel West's opaque essays, Steve Winter's naze-gazing, or Randy Kennedy's rush for media attention. Yuck.

Okay, I got it off my chest. This isn't directed at you, really. Indeed, if you picked some authors without checking with me I'd be deeply upset. So thanks.

And, for the record, on December 3rd I'll be co-chairing my own conference on the Latino Civil Rights Crisis, in Los Angeles. A production of my think tank. We will then bring the conference to DC on Friday December 5th in the Brookings auditorium for a replay intended to get maximum media exposure. (And chance of a POTUS or VPOTUS drop-by? Nice opportunity to underscore the GOP strategy of alienating Hispanic voters.)

I'll keep thinking about authors.

---

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====  
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.0-4 #6879)

id <01IQ1O9F7LO000JLFG@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Sat, 15 Nov 1997 17:04:56 -0500 (EST)

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

by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.0-4 #6879) id <011Q1O9BWN9C00XGOQ@PMDf.EOP.GOV>; Sat,

15 Nov 1997 17:04:53 -0500 (EST)

Received: from law.harvard.edu ([140.247.200.68])

by STORM.EOP.GOV (PMDf V5.1-7 #6879)

with ESMTP id <011Q1O8QY0G0001CGE@STORM.EOP.GOV>; Sat,

15 Nov 1997 17:04:23 -0500 (EST)

Received: from CEHome.law.harvard.edu (nas5-18.fas.harvard.edu)

by law.harvard.edu with SMTP (1.40.112.8/16.2) id AA097491460; Sat,

15 Nov 1997 17:04:20 -0500

X-Sender: edley@pop.law.harvard.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.2 (16)

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kevin S. Moran ( CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-DEC-1997 09:00:15.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Jordan Tamagni ( CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ UNKNOWN ] )

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Book

William Nothdurft                      Writer

312 2nd Avenue, West  
Suite 605  
Seattle, WA 98119  
(206) 281-7702

Joellen Murphy                      Researcher

1550 North Clarendon Blvd.  
Arlington, VA  
(703) 528-2952

Harold Evans                      Random House President and Publisher

Random House, Inc.  
201 East 50th Street  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 751-2600

Peter Osnos                      Former Random House

Publisher

The 20th Century Fund  
41 East 70th Street  
New York, NY 10021  
(212) 452-7756

Steve Wasserman                      Former Random House

Editorial Director

The Los Angeles Times Book Review  
780 3rd Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 371-1200

Mary Beth Roche                      Random House Public

Relations

Random House, Inc.  
201 East 50th Street  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 751-2600

Bruce Sanford                      Lawyer, Baker & Hostetler

Baker & Hostetler  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 861-1626

Eli Segal                      Project Advisor

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	From Kevin Moran to Jordan Tamagni Re: [No Subject] [partial] (1 page)	12/04/1997	b(6)

### COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records  
Automated Records Management System [Email]  
WHO ([Randall Kennedy])  
OA/Box Number: 500000

### FOLDER TITLE:

[05/14/1995 - 12/23/1997]

2019-1029-F  
jn589

### RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

2315 Bancroft Lane  
Washington, DC  
(202) 322-0108

Kent and Carmen Amos  
Urban Family Institute  
1400 16th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20015  
(202) 234-5437  
(202) 966-6620

Book reference

Marilyn Concepcion  
City Year Program  
285 Columbus Avenue  
Boston, MA 02116  
(617) 927-2500

Book reference

Seamus Heaney  
Harvard University  
Department of English  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 496-6032

Poet

Rev. Terrance Mackey  
P.O. Box 389  
Greeleyville, SC 29056  
(803) 219-3853

Book reference

#### Political Consultants

Paul Begala

(b)(6)

[003]

Al From  
DLC  
518 C Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 546-0007

Bill Knapp  
SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Mark Penn  
2201 N Street, NW  
Apartment 15  
Washington, DC 20037  
(202) 331-1115

Doug Schoen  
Penn & Schoen  
245 East 92nd Street  
New York, NY 10128  
(212) 534-4000

Joel Benenson  
Penn & Schoen  
245 East 92nd Street

New York, NY 10128  
(212) 534-4000

Josh Starr

Penn & Schoen  
245 East 92nd Street  
New York, NY 10128  
(212) 534-4000

Jonothan Gardner

2201 N Street, NW  
Apartment 15  
Washington, DC 20037  
(202) 331-1115

Kinny Zalesne

2201 N Street, NW  
Apartment 15  
Washington, DC 20037  
(202) 331-1115

Bob Squier

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Kaitlyn Sherman

Video Production

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Stacey Millander

Video Production

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Jamie Sterling

Video Production

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Tom Ochs

SKO  
511 2nd Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-4970

Lisa Linden

Linswn Alschuler & Kaplan, Inc.  
25 West 43rd Street  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 575-4545

Frank Greer

GMMB&A  
1010 Wisconsin Avenue, NW  
Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 338-8700

Stan Greenberg

Greenberg Research Inc.  
515 Second Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 547-500

James Carville

Carville & Begala  
329 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 543-1196

Michael Sheehan

Sheehan Associates  
1901 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20056  
(202) 452-9440

Henry Sheinkopf

260 West End Avenue  
Apartment #12B  
New York, NY 10023  
(212) 941-6630

Marius Penczner

Dick Morris

Tom Freedman

3220 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Apartment 108  
Washington, DC 20008  
(202) 237-7832

Mary Smith

1633 « 19th Street, NW  
Apartment A  
Washington, DC 20009  
(202) 387-1686

#### Academic Consultants / Others

Bruce Ackerman

3407 Dent Place, NW  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 357-1604  
(202) 387-3710

Benjamin Barber

Rutgers University  
Department of Political Science  
Hickman Hall, Douglas Campus  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903  
(908) 932-6861

Larry Bartels

Princeton University  
Robertson Hall  
Princeton, NJ 08544-1013

Sam Beer

Kennedy School of Government  
Littauer Room G9



1805 Cambridge Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 495-3210

Harry Boyte

Hubert Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs  
University of Minnesota  
301 19th Avenue, Sout  
Minneapolis, MN 55433  
(612) 625-9505

Taylor Branch

2806 South Road  
Baltimore, MD 21209

Alan Brinkley

211 Central Park West  
Apartment 6H  
New York, NY 10024  
(212) 854-5220  
(212) 787-0907

Stephen Carter

Yale Law School  
New Haven, CT 06520

Stan Chinburn

Alan Ehrenhalt

Governing Magazine  
2300 North Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
(203) 432-4839 -- TK

Jean Bethke Elshtain

University of Chicago  
Divinity School  
1025 East 58th Street  
Chicago, IL 60637  
(312) 702-1234

Amitai Etzioni

George Washington University  
The German Library  
Room 714J  
2130 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20052

Bill Galston

University of Maryland  
Van Munching Hall, Room 3111  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-6347

Henry Louis Gates

Harvard University  
Department of Afro-American Studies  
1430 Massachusetts Avenue, 4th Floor  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Os Guinness

Trinity Forum  
5210 Lingate Court, Suite B

Burke, VA 22015

Amy Gutman

Princeton University  
9 Nassau Hall  
Princeton 08544  
(609) 258-3029

James Davidson Hunter

University of Virginia  
Department of Sociology  
548 Cabell Hall  
Charlottesville, VA 22901  
(804) 924-6524

Charles Johnson

Randall Kennedy

22 May Street  
Boston, MA 0213

or

75 Francis Street  
Boston, MA 02115-6195  
(617) 495-0907

Sheilah Mann

American Political Science Association  
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas Mann

The Brookings Institution  
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 797-6050

Jane Mansbridge

1710 Asbury Avenue  
Evanston, IL 60201  
(708) 491-8726

Will Marshall

Martha Minow

Harvard Law School  
Cambridge, MA 02138

David Osborne

Thomas Patterson

Kennedy School of Government  
Joan Shorestein Center  
79 John F. Kennedy Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Samuel Popkin

University of California - San Diego  
5411 Soledad Road  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
(619) 534-2758

Robert Putnam

The Kennedy School  
Harvard University

79 John F. Kennedy Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 496-5373

Wendy Rahn

University of Minnesota  
Department of Political Science  
1414 Social Science Building  
267 19th Avenue, South  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Jeremy Rosner

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace  
2400 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1153  
(202) 862-7900

Arthur Schlesinger

City University of New York  
33 West 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 794-5555

Theda Skocpol

66 Huron Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138-6708  
(617) 495-3851

Guy Smith

Smith World Wide  
171 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
(212) 779-2336

Paul Starr

Princeton University  
Department of Sociology  
Greenhill  
Princeton, NJ 08544

Ted Sorenson

Paul Weiss Rifkind Warden & Garrison  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019-6064  
(212) 373-3790

Michael Walzer

School of Social Science  
Institute for Advanced Studies  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
(609) 734-8253

Eddie Williams

William Julius Wilson

Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy  
Kennedy School of Government  
79 John F. Kennedy Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
(617) 496-4514

Alan Wolfe

Boston University  
745 Commonwealth Avenue

6th Floor  
Boston, MA 02215  
(617) 353-2591

Raymond Wolfinger  
University of California -- Berkeley  
Department of Political Science  
2538 Channing Way  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Gordon Wood  
Brown University  
Department of History  
Providence, RI 02912  
(401) 863-2820

Daniel Yankelovich  
Public Agenda Foundation  
424 Westend Avenue, 7F  
New York, NY 10024  
(212) 595-7803

John Zaller  
University of California -- Los Angeles  
Department of Political Science  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Geronimo M. Rodriguez Jr ( CN=Geronimo M. Rodriguez Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-DEC-1997 15:19:30.00

SUBJECT: Suggestions for TMLS

TO: Tracyshaw ( Tracyshaw @ mail.utexas.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:  
NAME COMMENTS

Number One Choice: Our folks in African American Outreach have  
volunteered to ask on your behalf.

Thurgood Marshall Jr., Deputy Counsel and Director of Legislative Affairs  
for the Vice President

Number Two Choice: Great speaker! We have contacts to him.

Judge A. Leon Higgobothan Jr., 617-496-3340,

Number Three Choice: He is out of the country but we understand he  
will be back soon. We can forward an invitation  
to his chief of staff.

Congressman Jesse Jackson Jr.

Number Four Choice: The wife of a friend here went to school with  
him.

Cornell West

Number Five Choice: He just wrote a book called "Race, Crime and  
Law". It's a kind of controversial book  
but.....you read it and see what you think.

Randall Kennedy, Professor at Harvard?

Please call me at 202-456-5276 if I can be of help with any of these  
candidates.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barry J. Toiv ( CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-DEC-1997 20:07:37.00

SUBJECT: CORRECTION: 1997-12-19 Complete Transcript of Race Meeting

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Reminder to put this in bins (without announcement) Monday.

----- Forwarded by Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP on 12/19/97

08:07 PM -----

Elizabeth R. Newman  
12/19/97 08:03:21 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: CORRECTION: 1997-12-19 Complete Transcript of Race Meeting

----- Forwarded by Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP on  
12/19/97 07:54 PM -----

SUNTUM\_M @ A1  
12/19/97 06:28:00 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: 1997-12-19 Complete Transcript of Race Meeting

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

December 19, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
IN OUTREACH MEETING

## The Oval Office

2:43 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: First, let me thank you for coming in what must be a busy time for all of you. What I think may be the most productive thing to do, although Governor Kean, since -- (inaudible) -- may interject something here. I think what I'd like to do, to begin is just to hear from you. I'd like to -- on the question of, do you believe that race still matters in America and is still a problem in some ways. And if so, instead of our getting into a big fight about affirmative action -- although if you want to discuss it, we can -- what bothers me is that even I, who think it works in some ways, believe it works only when people -- it works predominantly for people who are at least in a position for it work. A lot of the people that I care most about are totally unaffected by it one way or the other.

So what I'd like to talk about today is that I thought that we could at least begin by just getting a feel for where you are and if you think it's still a problem, and if so, what do you think we ought to do about it. And if you want to talk about affirmative action -- (inaudible) -- but I'm happy to do that.

MR. CONNERLY: I appreciate very much so to be here, and somewhat ironical that, after raising and giving -- (inaudible) -- to Republicans, I'm here at the request of a Democratic President. So I'm grateful to you for the invitation, sir.

I don't -- (inaudible) -- talking about what we call preferences, because that is central to the discussion about race. Yes, there is a problem in America. It's a serious problem. It's one that's complex, multidimensional. It doesn't lend itself to government solution in many cases. But we can't get to the problem of moving this nation forward with respect to the issue of race unless we deal with the perception by a large number of people that there are preferences that are being given to people simply because they check a box and then benefits are conferred on the basis of checking that box.

And the language here is very important. You said in June of this year that we need to have an honest dialogue. Well, up until this point, frankly, many of us think the dialogue has been less than honest from some of those who try to defend what they call affirmative action. I don't want to end all affirmative action, but I want to end every preference that I can find that's based on some trait over which I have no control. And if I want that for myself, I want it for other people as well.

So I don't think, sir, that we can have this dialogue today, which is perhaps one of our best shots at getting our point of view across, without talking about the --

THE PRESIDENT: What do you think we should do? Since there are -- since various racial minorities are represented in

groups of people that are at least not doing very well in this society, in numbers disproportionate to their numbers in the country as a whole, how should we respond to that?

MR. CONNERLY: I think that choice -- school choice is one way to respond to it. I think if we overhaul the K-12 system, which is one way to respond to it. They're trying to do that in California by lowering classroom sizes. We're looking at testing. We're looking at the quality of the teachers. We also have to start looking at ourselves. Are we telling our kids as parents that education is as important as it should be? So I think that there is a major change that needs to take place. But even if we don't make those changes, there is never, in my view, a rationale for discriminating against somebody on the basis of their skin color, regardless of what we want the outcome to be. That's my perspective, and I think it's a perspective that our nation has to hold true to.

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, let me just say this. As a fifth-generation Republican and as one who has worked in this very house under three Republican Presidents, I have a little concern about how my party and how conservatives function around this question. I would hope that we would not be bogged down today in a discussion of affirmative action, per se. Many of those programs and plans will be resolved by the court anyway.

When you said you wanted a conversation on race, we ought to -- not just this group -- but we all ought to talk about race and race relations. Affirmative action and mechanical programs will mean not a whit if we don't start changing attitudes. We don't know each other in this country. We don't know who lives next door to us in condominium buildings, let alone know about their concerns. And we have to, for a while, talk about race and not be bogged down by affirmative action discussion and debate.

Again, the courts will resolve that pretty much in part, but it just seems to me that the moral leadership that can be provided from this room and from all of us needs to be amplified. And one problem I have with my Republican and conservative brothers and sisters, no one ever wants to talk about race. No one ever wants to talk about the things that the people in Akron, my home town, talked about -- the attitudes. You don't know what it's like to stand on a street corner dressed like this and a car comes up -- cluck, and locks the door. These are things that people need to resolve in their minds.



That boy in Akron who said, he's friendly and all the rest, but when he sees a black man dressed a certain way -- this is the kind of leadership government leaders, ministers, college presidents, and many others, can provide. If we continue to allow affirmative action plans to divide us and to serve as a wall, we're not going to get anywhere.

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe you can -- (inaudible) -- and say, let's assume we abolished them all tomorrow and we just had to start all over, what would you do?

MS. CHAVEZ: I'd like to offer some suggestions, Mr. President, because I came here with a notion that you do want affirmative action, that you do understand -- (inaudible) -- affirmative action preferences are part of this debate is because there's a whole world of people out there who believe that they're wrong and that they send the wrong signal from government; that so long as you've got government picking winners and losers on the basis of the color of their skin, that you can't get beyond racism, you can't to the color-blind society.

I think that there are a lot of things we can do to reach those disadvantaged persons that you were talking about -- people who are socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged -- because that's who those programs were initially aimed at. And I think it can be done in race -- (inaudible) -- ways.

I work at college admissions, for example, Mr. President, and I brought you some studies that my organization has done that shows not only that there are preferences in place in admissions, but that those preferences hurt black and Hispanic students, because kids who are admitted to schools under separate standards or the double standards, and who then are just allowed to sink or swim -- a lot of them sink. About 50 percent of them don't graduate from those college programs.

I work at a place like the University of Maryland, which has in place a program not aimed at race, but aimed at students who are the first in their family to attend college. I would have been able to qualify for such a program. A lot of disadvantaged kids out there would. And once those children are identified, they're brought in a summer program; they're given tutoring and special classes in reading, writing and mathematics; they're given study skills; they're given counseling. They're told what courses they should take their first year; they attend a very structured first year. Those kinds of programs would benefit people who are truly educationally and economically disadvantaged -- and more than just giving them a little badge and getting them to school, would help make sure that they get out of school, that they actually get that bachelor's degree, which is what none of the preference programs do.

And I have other examples -- and left you information on them. Because I think all of us in this room want to improve

opportunity for blacks and Hispanics and other disadvantaged people in this society. We are committed to that. Where we come to debate is the best means to achieve that.

MR. CONNERLY: I just want to say also, I hope you haven't invited me here as a conservative. I'm here as an American who has a profound interest in the subject. I don't think you appointed people to your race panel because they were liberal or anything else. You appointed them because you thought they had something to contribute. I didn't come here I don't know how many miles to be here as a voice of a conservative. I left my party label and my ideology outside of this room.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Let me just say this, first of all. I think, if you imagine -- forget about -- think about what the world would look like 30 years from now if things go well -- that is, if all the threats to our collective security -- (inaudible) -- restrained, and trade develops as we hope it should, and we develop a decent education system that embraces virtually everybody -- (inaudible) -- The fact that the United States is -- (inaudible) -- multiethnic country that at some point in the next generation, in the next 50 years will, for the first time in its history, not have a majority of people of European origin, I think will make it an even more fascinating, even more interesting, and even more prosperous and successful place if we're not consumed or limited or handicapped in some ways because of our racial differences.

So, to me, this -- I'm looking at this through the perspective of the future that I want to see our country make for itself. And I don't think anyone has all the answers about how we should make that future.

If you look at -- there is no question that -- if you just African American kids in -- (inaudible) -- the middle class is growing and a lot of good things have happened. But there is also no question that there are still pockets where crime is greater, incarceration rates are horrendous, that education systems are not working. And even the people who do have some level, who are highly industrious and are dying to get into business very often don't have access to credit and don't have access to the networks.

Affirmative action originally I think on the economic side was a kind of networking thing, and on the education side it was designed to do what -- the Maryland program you just described. I think if there was ever a -- (inaudible) -- in college education -- we ought to be focusing on people who are educationally disadvantaged without -- (inaudible) -- preparation and continuing support that they need. The schools that have done that are much better.

MR. THERNSTROM: Mr. President, I think Mr. Garrett made two comments, and while I do think we may not know each other in some absolute sense, but we know each other across racial lines much more than we did a generation ago. I mean, the data is really quite stunning. A generation ago, only one-fifth of white people said they

had any black friends; today 87 percent do. Eighty-seven percent of blacks say they have white friends. The rate of interracial dating has gone up spectacularly. The rate of interracial marriage, though still low, has gone up dramatically. So I do think there is much more positive change than is often thought.

And second, I do have to say that the Akron dialogue that Mr. Garrett speaks so favorably of I found very troubling and very one-sided. And I think very few American whites would have been deeply moved by that, because it involved the recitation by a series of blacks, Hispanics of painful experiences. There was no opportunity to question those experiences and say, hey, are you sure that was racism; maybe it was X, Y, or Z.

And then in one case where a white student talked about a racial concern, a racial fear, it was immediately reduced to, you know, was that your personal experience? Have you ever been mugged? If not, then you must have been watching too much television.

Now, Reverend Jackson, years ago, made a very powerful statement about precisely this when he said, walking down the street late at night, and I turn around and see over my shoulder and see they are whites following me, I'm relieved. There's a very powerful statement. It is a reality that certain neighborhoods, predominantly black neighborhoods in inner cities are very dangerous places at night. And they are very dangerous places largely because there are black criminals who are committing criminal acts. And I don't think we can begin to discuss race relations honestly unless we in fact express -- whites express those fears and they can be dealt with, they can be discussed, but they shouldn't be dismissed.

And just one other point, which picks up on something Angela Oh said I gather at a race relations meeting long ago -- we do have to think of this as a multiracial or multiethnic problem, not just black and white. And it's often assumed, mistakenly, that the problem is white prejudice against blacks, Asians and Hispanics. In fact, some careful studies show that blacks have stronger negative stereotypes about both Hispanics and Asians than whites do, but Asians have stronger negative stereotypes about both groups than whites do, and that Hispanics have stronger negative stereotypes. And as those population elements grow, we're going to have a larger problem that will have to be addressed. It isn't just a matter of white racism that has to be combatted.

THE PRESIDENT: But if what you say is true -- you say the crime problem is disproportionately African American; that's like saying the college population is disproportionately white or the business population is disproportionately white. That doesn't justify an affirmative action program to -- (inaudible) -- like Section VIII of the SBA program.

The other day we had a group of African American journalists in here. Every man in the crowd, to a person -- there were, like, 20 of them here -- every man in that office, every

single, solitary one, had been stopped by the police when he was doing nothing, for no reason other than the fact that he was black. And you say that's because there's a rational fear because of the fact that what occurs in some neighborhoods. Nonetheless, that is a race-based public policy. I'm just saying, it's not as simple as --

MS. THERNSTROM: No, we agree with that. We agree with that. It's unacceptable to me.

MR. THERNSTROM: But doesn't it happen in Detroit, in Atlanta, in other states where --

THE PRESIDENT: All I'm saying is it's very difficult to get these things out of our society. And you just made one reason why. Let me give you another example. Because of the -- a lot of work that's been done by a lot of people, there's been a dramatic increase in the capacity of the United States to limit the inflow of drugs into the country from the South by land and sea. But the consequence of that -- Mexico, which is a big, open country, has had enormous amounts of money invested there to try to undermine what little infrastructure there was to deter the influx of drugs. Five hundred million dollars was spent last year alone trying to bribe Mexican police.

Now, as a result, over half of the cocaine in the country comes across the Mexican border. So, all right, fast forward. What do you do if you're a local police officer with a drug problem? That's what this whole profiling is about -- (inaudible) -- people who are Hispanic if they're driving through town. That's an affirmative action program. That's a race-based affirmative action program. So how do you --

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, some of us are opposed to that. I mean, Randall Kennedy has written, I think, very eloquently on exactly that issue. And those of us who oppose race preferences when they benefit groups are also opposed to them when they harm groups.

THE PRESIDENT: If you were running a police force, and you were trying to figure out how to deal with the drug problem, and you had a lot of people who were coming through your town on an interstate, and you had a limited amount of resources, and you couldn't stop every car, which cars would you stop?

MS. THERNSTROM: Every third car and come up with some of the criminals that way. I mean, I think police departments have to be held to the same standard that I want to see employers and universities and everybody else. I don't think we can make exceptions.

MR. CANADY: And it is inherently pernicious for our government to classify people on the basis of their race. And that sends a powerful message from the government to the people that we should judge one another on that basis. That's exactly the wrong thing for us to be saying. And that is the sort of government policy



that reinforces a prejudice in our society and keeps us -- instead of going in the right direction toward unity, it keeps us caught in this dilemma that we are in now.

Our suggestion is that we've just got to get the government out of this business. Racial classifications in certain contexts were established with good intentions. And I think all of us would recognize that. We recognize that they were established in an attempt to overcome a history of discrimination and an attempt to come up with an effective means of combatting discrimination.

But our experience tells us that whenever the government gets involved in this business of classifying people based on race, the government is doing something harmful. And if our history as Americans, from the very beginning of this country, from the day the Declaration of Independence was promulgated to today, if it tells us anything, it should be that our government has no business dividing the American people into groups based on their race. It is something that is contrary to our fundamental ideals -- ideals we've never fully lived up to, but ideals that are the core of what it means to be American.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Could I ask a question, Mr. President? If you lived in a community that was 50 percent white, 50 percent black, and for a variety of historic reasons the level of income, educational attainment, and so forth was lower among the blacks in that community, and the police force was 100 percent white, and the problems of the kind that we all deplore took place and other problems took place, and the community decided that the police force would be better able to do its job if blacks were much more represented on the police force, because then the police force would have a much greater ability to relate to the community effectively and to do its job -- under those circumstances, do you think that the community would be justified in making affirmative action efforts to open up a lot more positions on the police force for blacks?

MR. CANADY: Let me say two things in response to that. Number one, I believe in community policing. I actually supported the President's crime bill back in the first Congress I was here And I believe that the concept of community policing is important. One thing that you can do to have affective community policing is require that the people who are involved in that live in the communities they police. Now, that's the kind of policy I can support. You don't have to classify people based on their race to do that and to be affective in community policing.

But this idea that we should hire people because they're going to be more -- based on their race because they're going to be more sensitive to certain -- and more acceptable to certain people that they're serving can be replicated in our history in the south when people -- employers said, well, I'd like to hire some black people, but my customers wouldn't accept that. That is offensive. It was more than offensive, it was morally wrong. And I would suggest to you for the government to classify people -- even in such

a context as that -- simply based on their race is morally offensive and inconsistent with our constitutional traditions.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, if I could just follow up briefly. Of course, I strongly disagree with you. And it seems to me that the case that I've described there presents a really obvious example of how the community as a whole would be better off and the effectiveness of the police force would be enhanced. And to say that it's -- that's there's nothing to the idea that a police force with black representation on the force would have an easier time relating to the black community is, I think, to deny the obvious, with all due respect.

MR. CANADY: Let me give you another example that's directly related to the sort of thing you're talking about. There are some people that contend that you have to take race into account in undercover police work. The theory is that you need black people to serve as undercover agents, and that's the only effective way that can be carried out. Well, you know, it's very interesting that the Drug Enforcement Administration actually had a policy of doing that. And the black drug enforcement agent sued the Drug Enforcement Agency over that very policy because it was discriminating against them. It was putting them in contexts where they were at greater risk, and it was limiting their opportunities for advancement. So what may start out as making some sense from one perspective can end up harming the very people that supposedly will benefit.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me ask you this. You don't quarrel with the fact -- because I think this is very important. This is the problem we have to deal with all the time. You don't quarrel with the fact that, other things being equal, in cities that had a racially diverse -- it would be a good thing if it could be done without race preferences to have a diverse police department.

MR. CANADY: Absolutely. I think we ought to have a police department that can work with --

THE PRESIDENT: But you just said that you like this whole idea of -- that's what we're doing now at HUD. We're actually encouraging police officers to go out and live in the neighborhoods where -- (inaudible) -- let them buy houses for half price if they'll serve in the neighborhoods where they live.

I've thought of that, and every time I go to New York, or any other big city, I always look at the police and see. So let me just say, I'm Irish -- Irish immigrants -- (inaudible) -- many of them, in urban police departments. And many of their children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren are still in urban police departments. And I think -- what I think we have to do is to figure out -- I think part of this problem will go away if we ask ourselves, are the criteria by which we are making this decision, whatever this decision is, really relevant. Are we really -- whether it's college

admission -- are we keeping score in the right way here.

But it seems to me that we have a vested interest in the objectives. If we agree that we need an integrated police department, and that it would be better --

MR. THERNSTROM: We'd like to have an integrated police department.

THE PRESIDENT: -- that we would like to have one, and that our society would function better if we had one, then we should ask ourselves, okay, how are we going to get there.

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, with all due respect to the Vice President, the example he gave, I don't think you could find me a concrete example of such a place in urban America today. I've looked at the statistics. I don't have them off the top of my head, but I've written columns on this and I have looked them up, and statistics show that there are significant numbers of black and Hispanic police officers.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Partly because of affirmative action.

MS. CHAVEZ: It may not be proportional representation, but it is close to proportional. What I would look at is first and foremost, are you discriminating in that police department. And I think every person in this room is adamantly in favor of vigorous enforcement of the civil rights law. And sure, there are employers out there, including public employers, who discriminate And we have to root out that kind of discrimination.

And then you do engage in outreach. You do create training programs. You do go into high schools and try and recruit people and get them ready so that they will be able to be prepared to take the test to become a police officer. Those are all things that you can do. And they are all things we approve of.

MR. THERNSTROM: But I do question the need for diversity defined narrowly in terms of skin color. I mean, I live in an almost all white community, so are we saying that the people of Lexington feel more comfortable being policed by whites, and there's some terrific black Africans for the police force, sorry, you go back to Roxbury, or something, we don't like your color? And I can think of communities with large numbers of Asians, but where Asian families are very strongly oriented turning out physicists and physicians, and the like, and not very interested in law enforcement.

Now, the notion that some large element of the population have no one in that kind of position is perhaps repellent, but once we start thinking of, well, 28 percent Asians -- got to be pretty close to 28 percent -- I think that -- and for that matter, I mean, after all, half the population is female. Should half of all our police forces be female?

GOVERNOR KEAN: No, I was just going to say a couple of things. One is, I think it is a goal of this country, and should be a goal, that if we're going to be successful in the next century, with the amount of immigration we have coming in now and being assimilated, that we've got to get to know each other as people.

As a college president, I can tell you the largest scholarship program in our state is based, not actually on race, but on poverty. But, in effect, because so many people who are Hispanic or African American who live in the poor areas it becomes a program where we take into our colleges -- (inaudible) -- people who we would not -- (inaudible) -- and then we mentor all the way through. I can tell you from the point of view of Drew University -- (inaudible) -- very high standards that we admit a number of those people who would have no chance for admittance under normal standards. And a number of them -- most of them get through. Almost of them get through. And a number of them graduate with high honors and go on to top graduate schools in the country. Those are the people who wouldn't have a chance otherwise.

So there's something -- the other thing we want to do is establish -- get to know each other better. We've got in my state too many segregated schools because of neighborhoods and too many colleges -- people from different races and groups for their own choice for whatever reason don't get together. As college presidents we found two things -- I think there's a lesson here -- two areas where race disappears as a criteria for friendship. One is athletics -- play together on a team for a couple of years and you see the dining room and you see the people in different places, friendly, inviting each other to their homes, eating together. The other is -- (inaudible) -- those kind of things. Again, people are away from their --

And the lessons I get from them are, first of all, that our criteria for creating opportunity in this country -- (inaudible) -- a lot of people of ability are not getting into the system of higher education and should be, and many of them happen to be -- (inaudible) -- because they are poor -- (inaudible) -- The second is that if we could find ways of getting people to work on common projects that racial division seem to disappear and friendships occur. And once that happens, people -- (inaudible) --

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, I totally agree. One of the things I'm doing -- and I'm based here in Washington and just stepped down as the Chairman of the Board of Howard University, and this semester have been teaching a course at Harvard University in the Kennedy School on the politics of race. One of the things, though, I'm going to do in Akron, where I go to on weekends, is build a \$2 million family life center in the heart of the ghetto, and get Jewish rabbis and Jewish synagogues to come in with me on this project, so that on the black side we can try to work on this ill feeling toward Jews. This is not being done in Washington. It's not being done with federal money. It's being done in the locality --



Just to do what you just said. We have to get to know each other.

If you don't know each other, if you don't know about each other -- if you're white and you're not going to go see *Amistad*, if you're white and you're not going to see *Roots* -- which is why Alex Haley wrote it -- he didn't write it for my benefit, he wanted to show a lot of white people the reason I'm this color is something that they ought to understand, that a tenth generation ago, a white man could be my cousin. These are the kinds of things that we simply must do in terms of attitude and atmosphere.

And then let me just finally say, I know the government -- we all know the government cannot impose upon the media in this country. But one of the things you're Advisory Council may want to do is convene some meetings in a very nice and positive way with media people and remind them that they are a great part of this attitude, effect. A woman out in Virginia six months ago had six black babies, sextuplets. Never got mentioned anywhere. Didn't get a dime from any corporation, diapers or anything. Then this woman out in Iowa has seven and she's in more magazines than you are.

Now, you're going to tell me that there's not something inherently wrong with that? And it wasn't until some of us ministers kicked up a fuss that now some of the corporations are starting. These are the kinds of things that affect people's attitudes.

MR. CONNERLY: The threshold is seven. (Laughter.)

DR. GARRETT: Because it was close.

MS. THERNSTROM: But, you know, there isn't anybody in this room who would deny that we've got a long ways to go down the road to racial equality. And there's nobody in this room who would deny that there's a lot of racism still in this society. I mean, the question from me is the trend lines. Have we been walking in the right direction, and do we continue to walk in the right direction. And those trend lines look very good. And I think that one of the things we need to do in having a decent racial dialogue is not only to get beyond race, but also to get beyond emoting over race. And there is much too much emoting and there is much too much name-calling as well.

And there's a distortion of information that for me is absolutely mindboggling. I mean, I was on the Jesse Jackson show the Sunday before last. Jesse Jackson says to me, Abigail, black graduates of Harvard College still can't get jobs. And I said, Jesse, Jesse -- I think that this whole conversation could come together to a much greater degree if we can move off the anecdotes, the pain, and on to the landscape of what do we know.

And a lot of what we know is simply denied about how far we have come. If you can get the landscape right, then you can say, look, we have the following problems still: 27 percent of black families still in poverty. That's not much different than 1970.

That's a catastrophic problem. We still have -- we have a racial gap in academic performance such that black kids in 12th grade are reading on the average four years behind white and Asian kids. That stacks the deck against those kids for the rest of their lives.

The solution to that isn't preferences; the solution -- and the solution to the police force -- we'll have a diverse police force tomorrow if we can close that gap in academic performance such that you've got -- so that you give police exams and there is no racial disparity.

I think, Mr. President, you've said some wonderful things on education. I'd like to push you further on them. But to me, that is absolutely the key. I think it's a national scandal that we are even one kid fall through the cracks.

THE PRESIDENT: I do, too. I think what Chicago has done, tells everybody that you've got to go summer school if you don't measure up and if you don't measure up a second time, you can't go ahead -- your self-esteem will be hurt more when you're 50 and you can't read than when you're 16 and you have to stay back another year. I think that's great.

But let me just say, first of all, I think what you generally just said is absolutely right. The reason I wanted you to come here today is that I hope there will be another series of meetings where we'll get even more diverse group -- I mean, diverse by opinion. Because what I'm trying to get to is -- here's my theory about this -- I think if we could ever get to the point where we would ask ourselves, can we agree on the objective, and then talk about what means will work, and then look at the things we don't like and say, well, do they do any good; and what harm did it do.

For example, what I think about affirmative action, a lot of these economic -- let's just take economic affirmative action. What I honestly believe is that it did a profound amount of good for the people who got into the programs who might never have had a chance to be successful business men or women. But I believe the problems with it are twofold. Number one is, once you get in and you start doing it, it's hard to graduate out. This whole theory about graduating out and moving through, going out into the private sector -- that theory never really worked very well. And we ought to fess up; those of us who were for it ought to say that's one of the problems that didn't work.

The other problem is it doesn't reach the vast majority of the people who have a problem because it doesn't reach down into basically the isolated urban areas with people in the economic underclass.

So if we say, okay -- you know, we can all say, okay, here are the facts -- it was a pretty good thing, but it didn't do everything it was supposed to do, so should we argue about getting rid of it, should be argue about doing something else, should we

argue about what's going to happen to these people? I mean, I think there's a lot to be said for that.

Let me go back to what Steve said about the composition of the police force when you got into the tete-a-tete with the Vice President. Let me just mention three things because Governor Kean mentioned this. The seven white septuplets were delivered by two African American women doctors. Two days later, two black kids were rescued in a Chicago fire by a white fireman. Nobody feels anything but good about that. Why is that? Or why do all these rich white Republicans pay to go down and watch some black guys play basketball at the MCI Center? I would argue there is something that all these things share in common that don't necessarily get answered in the police -- (inaudible) --

One is, in the case pro basketball, here I am, I don't have a doubt in the world that if I'd been good enough I could have played pro basketball. I know it. If I'd been good enough, by God, I could have played. I was short, fat, and slow by today's standards. (Laughter.) I couldn't play. Doesn't have anything to do with my race. I don't have a doubt in the world. If I have a child, I don't have a doubt in the world that my child can play if he or she is good enough. So that's the first threshold. Without regard to race -- I think we could all agree with that. In whatever setting, people have to know, if they're good enough, they can play. And if they need a hand up to prepare themselves, they can get it.

The second thing is, in the case of the black women doctors who delivered the septuplets -- which is not always the case in the case of police -- which is why I agree with the Vice President -- the community, which was of a different race -- there was no question about whether they could do their job in a way that would be fair to everybody. In the case of the white fireman who risked his life to go in and get the last two black kids in the Chicago fire -- he made a statement that was louder than any words I will ever utter, that he was in tune with the people in that community. He was in tune enough that he was willing to lay his life down to save those two little children. Nobody will ever care again whether that guy is on their fire or sitting idly out in front of the fire station, as I hope he will be.

So there's two criteria. One is can you play if you're good enough, whatever the thing is. Two is, does everybody in the community have confidence that the people in the position, whatever they are, have sufficient concern about them, are consistently involved with them, that whatever is supposed to be done is going to get done.

I think in the case of the fireman, and the doctors and the basketball players, the answer is yes. I think in the case -- huge numbers of urban police departments, huge numbers of the business sector, huge sections of higher education -- you can't say that the answer is yes. That's why I'm hung up about it. But I don't think that -- I think the reason that I'd get frustrated if the

debate is only about affirmative action is, if we win 100 percent of the debate, we're talking about 10 percent of the people. If you win 100 percent of the debate, we're still just talking about 10 percent of the people. What about everybody else?

MS. CHAVEZ: That has been our argument.

MS. THERNSTROM: But, why don't you have confidence that we can train policemen the way we train firemen so that when a policeman show up at the door, it doesn't matter what the race of that policeman is?

THE PRESIDENT: What I don't have confidence in is that in the police department's where there is not affirmative action that there is a selection process that is not race-based.

MS. THERNSTROM: Why not go after the problem instead -- it's like college admissions -- instead of going after the problem of the failure of our schools in the K-12 years, we say, okay, we're going to shut our eyes to that problem and we're going to preferentially admit them in hope something --

THE PRESIDENT: What about all the people who are sitting around waiting for that to happen? Are we just going to let them drift away?

MS. CHAO: -- very complicated, and there is really a problem on both sides. I think you and the Vice President obviously have demonstrated you care deeply about this problem. And I think you should be applauded, from my point of view, in terms of showing that you care, offering some leadership, and talking about this issue. I think it's enormously complicated. But I do want to say you, as the President of this country, have an enormous opportunity to really lead this country on a new millennium, as you put it, of race relations, and that is that people are judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

What has bothered me so far about the debate is that it's very much a monochromatic kind of debate. It has been about African Americans, and it's been about whites. And certainly there has been a great deal that has contributed to the current status of these two races, but if we really talk about a diversified nation, in which there is richness and diversity, we have to talk about other people.

And I'm not pushing for Asian Americans or Latino-Hispanic Americans, but that's what you get pretty much into when you start talking about color -- will it be white or black, then it's Asian Americans, and then it's Hispanic Americans. And actually, most of the time Asian Americans don't even rate. They don't even get into the debate. It's primarily whites, African Americans, Latinos, and that's it.

I'm very concerned about this whole issue about who gets to be let in to whatever program there is. And affirmative action, as enunciated by you and the Vice President speaks of compassion and good intentions and you care, and you want good things to happen. But what happens when good programs in the process hurt other people? And I just think about Asian Americans. I came here as an immigrant. I didn't speak a word of English. I came when I was 8 years old. My father held three jobs. I learned English at night, after 11:00 p.m., when he came back from work. And that's how I learned English.

And imagine what it's like not to speak English, and then arriving here and two months later having all these little monsters and goblins ring at your door bell -- (laughter) -- and stick something in your face to get candy. It was Halloween. We didn't know that. (Laughter.)

But what kept us through those days was -- what kept us through those days, you know, was a sense of empowerment that I think you and the Vice President want for Americans, and that you want to empower people, but you can't empower people by these artificial programs that occur too late.

What held my family and me together during those very, very hard times is we just knew we would never be in this condition forever. And that hope sustained us, incredibly so, through all those years. And then, also, we just knew that if we worked hard and that if we are together as a family that we would indeed be all right.

And so that's only my personal example and my personal experience, but I think it's applicable to many others. And there's stories upon stories of immigrants who come to this country with no experience of being an American, who don't speak the language, who don't understand the culture, and what they really want is just an equal opportunity. And what happens when that equal opportunity is no longer a level playing field, but with the best of intentions it's being turned into something that is unfair to them?

Right now, for example, your administration is talking a great deal about changing standards -- college admission standards because -- (inaudible) -- where test scores don't really matter. You don't really need test scores to succeed -- which is true. On the other hand, you can't neglect it altogether.

I went to Harvard, and I was kicked off of the Harvard Alumni Board. And for an Asian American that's a big admission. We don't get kicked very many -- at least we don't admit it. (Laughter.) But at Harvard, Asian Americans are an over-represented minority as they are in many, many college and universities.

MS. THERNSTROM: Eighteen percent --

MS. CHAO: And if you are to -- that's still an



over-representation because we're only two percent of the population. So we're way over. And what happens is if you're a white child going to Harvard, you have 17 percent chance; if you are African American, you have almost 30 percent chance; if you are a Latino American, 25 percent chance; if you're an Asian American child, you have an 11 percent.

And so for all those new immigrants who come here and work so hard, they find that the rules are being changed all the time. First of all, you have to get involved in extracurricular activities. Oh, great -- okay. So now Asian American parents have caught on and they're getting all their kids to be yearbook editors, doing all this -- now, they're changing it to where they need leadership qualities. What does that mean -- leadership qualities?

I'm on this very large corporation's scholarship program, and we fund scholarships -- \$16,000 a year -- to high school students. These kids -- Asian American kids -- don't do well because they don't excel under this new category called leadership. They're not outspoken. I listened for a long time before I jumped in here myself. But they're not aggressive. They're not voluble, and so that's all taken against them.

So our world is very complicated. There are cultural differences. And I want people to understand cultural differences. And we should relish and delight and celebrate in each other's cultural background. That's what it means to be an American.

But when programs like affirmative action are set up -- and there again, we're not against it. I'm not against outreach. I think we've got to do more aggressive outreach. But when the standards were lowered, that's a real problem. I think the things that we must be focusing on, you as a President have so much authority in this. We've got to emphasize education. Asian American families are not any smarter. They just emphasize education so much more.

When Korean -- I'm going to digress a little bit -- when Korean grocers are being harassed by African American activists, no white politician, no politician came to their defense. And I think we have to somehow think about how do we structure family and make it stronger so that the family can sustain and develop the kind of nurturing background we want for all Americans.

And so I think we've got to work on families, we got to work on education -- there's a whole slew of new initiatives that I hope we can take a look at. But this land is a land of opportunity. Somehow we've become victims also. A lot of times there's emoting, as Abigail says, and there's a lot of blaming. And we've become in many ways a nation of whiners, we whine a lot. And some of these programs I think cater to -- (inaudible) --

But again, I think it's a great opportunity for you to direct the path for the next millennium. And it's one in which we ought to really, all Americans, focus on issues of opportunity, economic opportunity -- these are the things that we should --

MR. CONNERLY: I suspect that the time does not equal the supply of ideas we wanted to give you, and I just wanted to share with you some things that you can read to cure insomnia.

But there are some specific things I want to suggest to you. The one hopeful thing that I wanted from this dialogue about race was structure. We've been talking about it, certainly my state now, for about four years, in a very intense way, the University of California and with Proposition 209. But all too often there is no structure to it. It's ad hominem attacks. It's questioning the motives of people.

And, Chris, I want to talk to you a little later, because there is something on a Web page there that calls me a counter-revolutionary, a minority counter-revolutionary. And they had it attributed it to you.

And I think that for us to get beyond where we are now, there need to be some structure to the dialogue. And we've got to stop playing the race card. We have to stop calling each other names, stop questioning motives. And I submit to you, sir, that one thing that might help move this panel forward is to take the whole subject of affirmative action off their plate. Let them deal with the broader subject of race absent the issue of preferences, because we're not going to solve that one anyway. And as a result of the belief that many of us have that the panel is not objectively constructed, to be candid with you, it's fun to pollute all of the other things that they might do. So my suggestion, respectfully, is to just take that out of their hands.

The second thing is I think that the time frame that is self-imposed ought to be extended because the ball has been fumbled a little bit, candidly, until now, and the discussion is just now getting -- beginning to happen in earnest. And if it comes to an end on June 4th, I think that's going to be premature, candidly. So I would strongly suggest that you extend it another six months or so, so that the debate can unfold in the fullness of time as it seems not to be unfolding.

MS. THERNSTROM: But the board itself is so monolithic in its voice, and as far as I can tell -- I mean, yes, Lisa Graham Keegan was there yesterday and William Bennett was there yesterday, but those were exceptions. And for instance Gary Orfield was there saying, once again that schools are more segregated than ever before, which I regard as junk social science. I mean, it's just not sustained by the data.

MR. THERNSTROM: He defines a segregated school as one that's 25 percent Asian, 25 percent black, 25 percent Hispanic, 25 percent white -- you need a white majority school for it to be not segregated. And that's backwards. The tables of his latest report are all defined in terms of --

GOVERNOR KEAN: -- offensive yesterday -- whenever it was, the day before yesterday -- that was a good meeting, and it was not monolithic.

MS. THERNSTROM: But there needs to be -- there are two camps, there needs to be a spectrum of scholarly voices --

GOVERNOR KEAN: Where do you put Deb Myer?

MS. THERNSTROM: Deborah Myer?

GOVERNOR KEAN: Yes.

MS. THERNSTROM: Well, I think that you're right; she's a very complicated -- you know, I'm a big admirer of hers.

GOVERNOR KEAN: So am I. People like that were on the panel.

MS. THERNSTROM: That's good. I didn't realize she was there, because in general -- I didn't realize she was at that meeting --

MR. THERNSTROM: This last case seems to have been more diverse than --

DR. GARRETT: But, Abigail, you're sitting in the Oval Office of the land with the President listening to you. Now, what I would like to know, as a lifelong Republican conservative -- some days, some days not -- if you want to use those silly terms -- what are you going to do? Don't tell me about studies and figures. Fine. Let us all acknowledge those. But it doesn't help one bit to write books, to write studies, and the people are still milling around suffering.

This President deserves to have the concrete recommendations. Asian Americans, what's to keep them from having dialogue and building centers with blacks and Jews and others? You see, you talk about this, but I have seen precious few who are against affirmative action get out there and start something.

MS. THERNSTROM: If we can describe properly the racial landscape, including the problems -- of course, the fact that 85 percent of black children who are in poverty are in single-parent households, for instance -- if we can describe the racial landscape and agree on what it looks like, then we can move forward on that basis. But I have to tell you that social scientists are no better than the man on the street in recommending policies. They are very



good at analyzing what the picture looks like. Saying what we should do is a different mountain to climb, and I don't think --

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead. Lynn, you haven't talked enough.

MS. MARTIN: As I age, I'm less able to speak for groups of people, especially before I went back to teaching. Now I find I'm not as sure of anything -- (inaudible) -- but I do think it's true that a majority of Americans -- you talk about the man in the street -- I think they're already a lot farther along than I think anybody has given them credit. I think most blacks, most whites, most Asians, most -- everyone, men and women want it, which gives a President, this President enormous opportunities. And it also, I think, from some of my experiences over the last two years, indicates that there should be a couple of smaller things that we can all enjoy successfully. But that's very important to people -- some of the more complex things that one has to do.

But there have to be some measurable successes that everybody agrees that, hey, that's a good thing, and we all did it. I've worked a little more with gender, but if you get a group of women together and a group of men, they can look at exactly the same thing -- (inaudible) -- the difference is phenomenal. It doesn't mean facts are different, but it does mean perceptions are different. And we have to work part of the time at perception. We have to keep moving beyond -- the more times you can make people know their thinking the same, the better. And I came to a different conclusion -- it's almost opposed to the anti-anecdote. I decided to check over the last 10 years what had happened to me, because I'm older, I believe, than I think almost everybody in this room.

MS. THERNSTROM: I doubt it.

Q I look older. At least I will say that. But I grew up as a northerner thinking you all were the bad guys, which was a very nice way to grow up. I mean, in fact, I didn't know any blacks and Hispanics, never crossed by brain that many -- you know, that somehow there was something a little strange here. It was the southerners -- it was very comfortable -- (inaudible) -- intellectually, you didn't have to challenge anything. The last few years, and this is late in my life, just as in my 30s I got male friends -- not dates, friends, for the first time, very different thing. I now have, mostly acquaintances, but some friends, and my God, they've added to my life. And maybe we don't say that often enough.

The reason most American businesses are supporting affirmative action has nothing -- well, one hopes it has something to do with they want to feel good -- the reason they want to do it has to do with they think it's a business imperative and business is going to be better than global enterprise -- (inaudible) -- that I think -- enjoying the idea of how much better -- (inaudible) -- because of this. So that, sure, there's some tough stuff, and sure

there's some other things -- I think people still write checklists, to an extent. And if we can check off a couple of things in the next few years -- the only thing I would ask now is don't set a goal -- I mean Abraham Lincoln didn't get -- Martin Luther King didn't -- don't have small dreams but have some reasonable goals.

THE PRESIDENT: One thing -- let me just ask you all to think about this because I agree -- one of the things I do agree with what Ward said is that I -- before you came in here I was holding my head saying, oh my God, those people are coming in here and we've got to stay here for four hours -- but let me -- nearly everybody agrees that the laws that are on the books against discrimination based on race against individuals should be enforced.

MS. TERNSTROM: Everybody agrees with that.

MS. CHAVEZ: Everybody in this room.

THE PRESIDENT: We are grossly under -- we have never properly funded the EEOC, but to be fair, we also need to look at --and this may be kind of a bridge between what we've been arguing about and what we agree on -- there's a lot of interest -- and Chris is getting me some information on this -- about trying to develop some sort of way the EEOC can get rid of its backlog in part by drawing up consent orders that would go beyond litigation and would change the way people treat their employees. Not necessarily on a race, not a race-based treatment, but the way you develop, the way you recruit, the way you reach out -- and one of the -- to go back to Lynn's checklist -- one of the things we would like to get everybody to agree to is a certain approach on that -- on kind of a comprehensive approach and getting rid of the accumulated back log of race claims and where you go from there.

The other think I would just like to say, because I know we're going to have to wrap up pretty soon, is I agree with you, we need a structure for the discussion which permits us to continue to talk, sharply identify in a non-rhetorical way our differences and ask if there is some way to build on this so we can actually get something done.

I talked to J.C. Watson -- he called me last night and I was out of pocket and I called him this morning and we talked for 20 or 30 minutes because he was -- (inaudible) -- and it was an interesting conversation. I just think if you're willing, I'm willing to make this not a one-shot deal, but to continue to work on this. I really sympathize with how the immigrant -- Asian immigrant -- particularly first generation Asians feel with the shift in --

MS. CHAO: We're just learning rules and goddamn it, they change them on us. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: The real issue here is, if you go back there's a lot of thought been given in the private schools -- (inaudible) -- great one to talk about -- that a lot of these private

universities are thinking, okay, now, what if the colleges, if all the public institutions end affirmative action in their admission process, and they don't really -- and the state doesn't come up with a comprehensive alternative they'd like, where you've got all the colleges maybe taking over public schools, in effect, in terms of their college prep. So you get to -- you maintain the diversity of student body population with non-race-based policies. Then will the private institution basically have to carry the burden of educating a more diverse student body, or unless we're going to resegregate higher education like we once had.

So there's a reexamination on about whether -- I'm not saying that what you said is how you described it, that that's the right way to do it, but there is a genuine, I think, reassessment about whether test scores plus grades should be the only predictor of success in college and success -- the only definer of merit, and whether we can assume that there is somehow an absolute character to that. As a matter of fact, the test scores were -- -- (inaudible) -- pretty good rough indicator.

But, you know, look at what Texas is doing. I mean, it's this desperate attempt, I think -- I don't mean it's -- desperate sounds critical, I'm not being critical. But people are looking around and trying to find a way to honor America, be fair, and still have a society where everybody's got a chance. Keep in mind, go back to basketball and our view of the doctors in Iowa, the people have got to believe everybody had a chance.

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, whatever the criteria that you come up with, I don't believe that it is good public policy or fair to say you're going to have different rules for different groups. And I think that's -- you know, I'm not saying SAT scores are the end all, or SAT and GPAs, but when you come up with a criteria, that criteria has to be equally applied to every individual, and that you can't decide that if your name is Chavez and you go to apply, or one of your children does, you get judged under a different criteria. That's what we have now. And I think that was what --

THE PRESIDENT: You wouldn't be opposed to affirmative efforts that were not race-based, would you?

MS. CHAVEZ: That's right. I wouldn't be because --

THE PRESIDENT: And if they're not race-based, they --

MS. CHAVEZ: If they're not raced-based, if they're aimed at educational disadvantage, social disadvantage, economic disadvantage, and if they are aimed at that, they have to be more than just letting people in the door, because there is a reason why we use test scores and GPAs to let people into higher education. It is because they are good predictors of success.

And one of the things, and, Thad, this is where I



disagree with you -- one of the things I've been most adamant about opposing racial preferences for is that they allow us to sweep under the rug the kind of skills differences that Abby and Steve -- (inaudible) -- they allow us the easy out. They allow the companies -- oh, sure, oh, yes, we have 80 percent Hispanics and 12 percent blacks and other in proportion group represented here. What they don't tell you is that they're shuffled off to the EEO offices of human resources or someplace else, and in colleges they flunk out, or they end up being bounced down to a school that they probably would have done well in if they had gotten in on their own merit.

I mean, this is the problem and it sends a terrible message to my children. I have to tell you, I resent it deeply as a Mexican American woman that -- as the mother of three sons, that my children are assumed not to be able to make it under the same standards as your children. And I just don't think that it is right. And it does something that is very corrosive to minorities to be telling them we don't expect you to meet the same standards.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I'd like to say something else, Mr. President. I disagree with what I've heard here, but it's a great learning opportunity and I think the dialogue validates the President's decision to invite all of you to come into the Oval Office.

Mr. Connerly began by talking about traits over which we have no control. I think that what the debate really is about is traits over which we do have control. Specifically, I think there is a vulnerability in human nature to prejudice. I think we have the ability to overcome it. But I think that it is naive in the extreme. And I don't say that pejoratively; I'm just saying that this is my personal view. I think it is naive in the extreme to assert that there is no persistent vulnerability to prejudice -- rooted in human nature, prejudice based on race and ethnicity -- and other characteristics as well.

Let me just finish, please, and then you can ask me a yes or no question. (Laughter.)

Let me just finish. If you look at the world around us right now, what we intervene to help stop in Bosnia demonstrated that prejudice based on race and ethnicity led to an unleashing of evil. I that evil lies coiled in the human soul and all of us faces spiritual challenge throughout our lives. And I think that racial differences can serve as a trigger for unleashing hatred. And I think that people are prone to be with people like themselves, to hire people to look like themselves, to live near people who look like themselves. And yet in our society when we have this increasing diversity, we have a community value, a national interest in helping to overcome this inherent vulnerability to prejudice.

What happened to Chinese in Shanghai 50 years ago last week,\* happened in part because of the enhanced vulnerability to that explosion of hatred across ethnic lines. What happened in Rwanda

between the Hutus and the Tutsis happened in significant part because the explosion of hatred was triggered by this ethnic difference -- the differences in educational levels, the historical differences, the history of domination of one over the other also played important roles. But to deny that there is this factor called race that is persistent is, I think, just wrong.

Now, Steve, when you said -- or seemed to imply that there's no reason, rationally based, for an African American neighborhood to feel any differently about a police force that's 100 percent white than they would feel if there was representation of blacks on the police force. That, it seems to me is just profoundly wrong.

My view, in contrast, is that just as it seems obvious that the police force in that situation will be more effective in doing its job if it is representative of the community, it is also obvious that a university is going to provide a more valuable educational experience if the students there are going to be able to come into contact with people from different ethnic groups so that the next generation of Lynn Martins -- thoughtful, intelligent, commitment, desiring change, don't wait until the sixth decade of life to have their lives experience --

MS. MARTIN: No, no, fifth decade -- (laughter).

THE VICE PRESIDENT: -- to have their lives enriched by that extra experience. And the nation as a whole, I believe, is enriched if we overcome this tendency. Now, to say that there's progress is to say that a lot of the things we have been doing have worked. A lot of the extra affirmative efforts that have resulted in these police forces becoming more diverse -- I mean, they didn't get that way by accident. They got that way --

MS. MARTIN: They got that way because they passed laws against discrimination.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: No, that's not true either. They got there partly because there was enforcement of laws against discrimination, but mostly because there were affirmative efforts in the hiring decisions to go out and get people from the other communities to come into the police forces. The same thing is true in a lot of the categories of progress that you measure. To say there's progress is not to say if we stop these efforts, things are going to continue in the same direction. If we stop these efforts, we could see the United States lose its ability to lead the world away from this vulnerability to ethnic prejudice and racial --

MR. CANADY: But, Mr. Vice President, none of us are suggesting that we stop all of these efforts. We believe in the outreach efforts that have gone on. We believe we should actually intensify those efforts. What we have a problem with is classifying people on the basis of their race and telling some people they're going to lose because they belong to a non-preferred group, and other

people they're going to win because they belong to a preferred group. We believe that that is harmful to everyone, because it sends the kind of message I talked about earlier and it's inconsistent with our ideas.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me ask you a question. One of the things that tickled me about -- since I grew up in the south, in addition to being bloodied by Atlanta people -- (inaudible) -- on the race problem in the country, we were all so obsessed with athletics. One of the things that tickled me about the California affirmative action vote was that there was -- preference vote -- is that there was an exception made for athletes. So you can give a preference for athletes to get into Berkeley, so Berkeley can have a nice football team and a nice basketball team.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Alumni giving.

THE PRESIDENT: But the A student who doesn't get into Berkeley, the Asian A student who doesn't get into Berkeley is just as hurt because he didn't get in so everybody could be tickled at the next basketball game as he would have been hurt if some A student who grew up in a black family in Oakland and didn't go to a high school and therefore didn't make quite as high a score on the college board -- he still loses the opportunity. He just loses it to a basketball player instead of a kid with thick glasses who struggled late at night in Oakland to make good grades, but didn't quite make a high enough college board score to get in. What's the difference? Why is it justified? Why is athletic discrimination so wonderful and the race discrimination --

Q Well, you can get rid of it. If you want to sign an executive order --

Q And alumni discrimination as well.

MR. CONNERLY: Mr. President, I have to say that this has been a great party until now, but just as we're -- the clock is ticking, we're ready to go out the door, you ruined my weekend with those very -- (laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Is that not true? If it's not true, I don't want to falsely accuse you.

MR. CONNERLY: Very loaded questions, very loaded statements that command far more than the five or 10 minutes we have left. Our founders -- they talked for hours about human nature as the basis of what kind of government we were going to develop. And it's frightening to me -- it is truly frightening to me, at the characterization of human nature, Mr. Vice President, that you portray, because it suggests that we cannot rise above it.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: No, I said specifically, we can.

MR. CONNERLY: -- unless government is there demanding,



demanding that we be held accountable. The presumption of our people, the presumption of our nation is that we're good people, that we can be fair, and that we will do the right thing. There are going to be some that are going to do wrong, and we'll bring those into line. But it's not that we are prone to do bad. And the whole question here about athletes and alumni -- my God, any of us can be athletes or alumni. It has nothing to do with our skin color.

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't say anything about alumni.

MR. CONNERLY: Well, he did. But there are just certain traits here that we as a society are making a judgment about --

THE PRESIDENT: The only point I made -- (laughter) -- don't get our two speeches mixed up. The only point I'm trying to make is, if you ever have any -- if you decide what the criteria of academic merit is, and let's say you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards -- this is the only point, I'm making a narrow point. If you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards, and then you decide -- you make a decision, which I think you could make a compelling argument is a legitimate decision, that athletics is an important part of university life, that it enriches the lives of all the other students who are there. You can make that argument, but the point is, once you make that argument, that's the argument you could also make for having a racially diverse student body. I was making a very -- I'm not making a wholesale assault.

Now, here's my problem with this whole deal, I know we've got to go. So I want to give you a chance to say -- what we really before, which is, how do we give structure to this and what do you think the next step should be? And I'll give anybody else a chance. Look, when I was a governor, I became the first governor in the history of the country to sponsor legislation to require -- (inaudible) -- certified.

I believe I passed the first law requiring kids in the whole state to have to pass an exam before they could actually go onto high school, because I didn't like the high school graduation -- I thought that was closing the barn door after the cattle left. The reason I have consistently supported affirmative action programs -- but I really have tried to change them and make them work -- is not because -- I basically think all that stuff you said is right. I am sick and tired of people telling me poor minority kids who live in desperate circumstances, that they can't make it. I think they should be told they can make it, but they have to work harder to make it. And then I think we should give them a hand up to make it. I am tired of that.

The reason I have supported affirmative action programs is very different, is I have done it because I didn't want to see all these kids be sacrificed to a principle I agree with, because the practice of life would not be fixed in time to give them a chance --number one.

And number two, I have had the feeling about police departments and fire departments and business environments and university admissions that I felt about the athletes -- that I really thought that the institutions were better off and the white majority or whoever else, was better off if there was some inter-mixing because of the world they're going to live in.

But I am always -- I think we should all be uncomfortable, those of us who support this -- for giving something to somebody when we deprive somebody that was otherwise more deserving by the traditional criteria of getting it. But I think on balance, that's why I've been very strongly -- but I have never wanted to not have high standards, not be demanding, not do things. I mean, I've paid a pretty good price for this -- (inaudible) -- and I'm not ashamed of having done it. I think that the kids in my state are better off because of it.

But we need to figure out a way to recognize that what we'd really like is for people without regard to their race to be able to do the kind of business, go to the kind of schools, have the kind of public service jobs and live in the kind of integrated environment that they choose if that is the choice they make, because there would be no differences in traditional measures of merit and how they did, so that people would be making their own choices and having their own choices. I think that's -- we all agree that that's the world we want.

So I'd like to know what you think the next step should be. If you want to stay involved in this; you want to keep talking to us; you want to keep working with us; and you want to get some more -- different kind of people in here. What do you think we ought to do now?

GOVERNOR KEAN: Can I say something on the Race Commission -- when the President asked me to sit on this, the first time he asked, I said no. And I finally said yes because I was totally convinced, first of all, that this was the only President in my lifetime, though not a President of my own party, who's willing to take this on, to really try to establish some sort of a dialogue and try to make progress on this; and secondly, because I thought there was a chance -- maybe not a big chance, but a chance -- we could do some real good.

I was among those who was very critical of the commission at its first couple of meetings, because -- (inaudible) -- talking to each other and was not listening to adverse opinions, and therefore we weren't serving this President very well. It's our job -- not to write a report for the commission, our job is to advise this President on some of the best ideas we can find in the country so that this will hopefully be part of his legacy.

So this race commission is going to open up the dialogue -- (inaudible) -- be listening to all sorts of ideas from every end



of the political spectrum in the hopes that we can bring good ideas to this President so that he can succeed in an initiative which I believe the country very much wants him to succeed in. So whatever has gone on in the past, I hope you will be open to the commission, that you will give ideas to us. And we will make sure that the best of the ideas are passed on to the President or this group can pass it on directly.

MS. THERNSTROM: I think that this has been a really wonderful meeting. And I'm very grateful to you for having invited us. But I do also have the feeling that if we were to continue it, that we really might get someplace.

THE PRESIDENT: That's what I think.

MS. THERNSTROM: Yes. We're feeling each other here. We're kind of making -- it's a first kind of stiff beginning, but that we might really --

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I resemble that remark.  
(Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: If you all are willing to do it and you will help us figure out a way to structure it, I'll do it. Let me

just give you -- I'll just give you one -- outside this door, probably sitting there -- I don't know if she's still there -- is my diarist for the White House who has lately been in the paper because -- (laughter) -- her name is Janis Kearnes. Her daddy was a sharecropper, and her mother a domestic. And they had 17 children -- 13 of them have college degrees. Five of them are lawyers. And all 17 of them have a first name that starts with the letter J.  
(Laughter.) Most of them went to school in Arkansas. One of them went all the way to Harvard. And some of them had affirmative action and some of them didn't, and they all did fine.

Look, somewhere in here there's a way that we can get to where we're trying to do -- stop talking past each other and start working together. I cannot believe that 90 percent of the people in this country don't want the same kind of country in terms of racial matters. And I will do my best to find a way for us to move beyond the -- (inaudible) -- honestly and respectfully state our differences and figure out away to work together. Because it is obvious, if you do not believe that there is any inherent -- (inaudible) -- among people based on race, then the differences we have today must have been rooted in the mistakes that have been made in the past or the breakdown of social institutions or personal institutions like the family, the education system, and the networking of people in business and others. There has to be a way to rebuild those institutions, and we have to do it together.

I think it would be a shame if we didn't try to do this together. I'm trying to put this beyond partisan politics. I'm not

trying to use you. I said that deal about the athletics, because I might have voted for the athletic thing, too, but I've always been with the races like athletics and not different from athletics. That's all. So we need to go.

If you have -- in addition to your suggestions, which Governor Kean is for, I want to know if you've got process ideas about how we can discipline this debate and to move it forward.

END

4:00 P.M. EST

\* Following the meeting, the Vice President noted that the events to which he referred took place in Nanjing 60 years ago.

#### Message Sent

To:

---

Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP  
Lori E. Abrams/WHO/EOP  
Jeannetta P. Allen/WHO/EOP  
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP  
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP  
Eli G. Attie @ OVP @ EOP  
Patrick Aylward/PIR/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP  
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Marsha E. Berry/WHO/EOP  
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP  
Alexander L. Boyle/PIR/EOP  
Lanny A. Breuer/WHO/EOP  
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP  
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Allison Balderston/OPD/EOP  
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP  
Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP  
Phillip Caplan/WHO/EOP  
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP @ EOP  
David K. Chai/PIR/EOP  
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP  
Steven A. Cohen/WHO/EOP  
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP

Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP  
Lanny J. Davis/WHO/EOP  
Elliot J. Diringier/CEQ/EOP  
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP  
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP  
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP  
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP  
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP  
Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP  
Karen C. Fahle/WHO/EOP  
Julie A. Fernandes/OPD/EOP  
Karen E. Finney/WHO/EOP  
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP  
Ben A. Freeland/WHO/EOP  
Jeremy M. Gaines/WHO/EOP  
Grace A. Garcia/PIR/EOP  
Jessica L. Gibson/WHO/EOP  
Adam W. Goldberg/WHO/EOP  
Jason S. Goldberg/WHO/EOP  
Peter D. Greenberger/WHO/EOP  
Donald Goldberg/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP  
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP  
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP  
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP  
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Michele Jolin/CEA/EOP  
James M. Teague/WHO/EOP  
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP  
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP  
William R. Kincaid/OPD/EOP  
Allison J. King/PIR/EOP  
Joshua A. King/WHO/EOP  
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP  
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP  
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP @ EOP  
Heidi Kukis @ OVP @ EOP  
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP  
Christopher J. Lavery/WHO/EOP  
Anne H. Lewis/OPD/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP  
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP  
Michael D. Malone/WHO/EOP  
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP  
Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP  
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP  
Estela Mendoza/WHO/EOP  
R. Scott Michaud/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP

Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP  
Tamara Monosoff/PIR/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Jonathan Murchinson/WHO/EOP  
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP  
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP  
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP  
Michael V. Terrell/CEQ/EOP  
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP  
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP  
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP  
Neera Tanden/WHO/EOP  
Michael A. O'Mary/OPD/EOP  
Jonathan Orszag/OPD/EOP  
Peter R. Orszag/OPD/EOP  
Kristen E. Panerali/OPD/EOP  
Carole A. Parmelee/WHO/EOP  
Sally P. Paxton/WHO/EOP  
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP  
Peter O'Keefe/WHO/EOP  
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP  
Victoria Radd/WHO/EOP  
Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP  
Charles F. Ruff/WHO/EOP  
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP  
Evan Ryan/WHO/EOP  
Roger V. Salazar/OVP @ OVP  
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP  
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP  
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP  
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP  
Douglas S. Sheorn/WHO/EOP  
June Shih/WHO/EOP  
David Shipley/WHO/EOP  
Robert M. Shireman/OPD/EOP  
Jake Siewert/OPD/EOP  
Joshua Silverman/WHO/EOP  
Brian D. Smith/WHO/EOP  
Craig T. Smith/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP  
Maria E. Soto/PIR/EOP  
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP  
Aviva Steinberg/WHO/EOP  
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP  
Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP  
Diane A. Stumpf/ONDCP/EOP  
Michael J. Sullivan/WHO/EOP  
Jonathan H. Schnur @ OVP @ EOP  
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP  
Sylvia M. Mathews/WHO/EOP  
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP  
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp @ eop

Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP  
Amy W. Tobe/WHO/EOP  
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP  
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP  
Paul A. Tuchmann/WHO/EOP  
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP  
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp @ cop  
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP  
Angelina Walker @ ovp @ cop  
Glen M. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP  
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP  
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP  
William H. White Jr./WHO/EOP  
meglynn @ usia.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
SUNTUM\_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
SUNTUM\_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
princej @ panet.us-state.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
COGDELL\_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY  
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY  
BARBUSCHAK\_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
BARTHOLOME\_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
BARTHOLOW\_T @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
CROWLEY\_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
CUTLER\_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
DICKY\_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
GRAY\_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
GRIBBEN\_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
HAAS\_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
JOHNSON\_WC @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
LIZIK\_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
MOFFETT\_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
PR\_U=TDIXON @ PR\_L=AVUOEBOB @ MRP @ LNGTWY  
RILEY\_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
NAPLAN\_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
SMITH\_BD @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
TCSmith @ dol.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
WEINER\_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
WOZNIAC\_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
julie\_green @ ed.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
usia01 @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY  
1=US @ 2=WESTERN UNION @ 3= @ 5=ATT.COM @ \*ELN\62955104 @ MRX @ LNGTWY  
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com @ INET @ LNGTWY  
INFOMGT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com @ INET @ LNGTWY  
usnwire @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY

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

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum ( SUNTUM\_M ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-DEC-1997 16:48:21.21

SUBJECT: part two: seven pages

TO: Nanda Chitre ( CHITRE\_N ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee ( Nanda  
Chitre@eop@lngtwy@eopmrx ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Darby E. Stott ( Darby E. Stott@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman ( Elizabeth R. Newman@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:  
PRINTER FONT 12 POINT COURIER  
CONTINUED TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT'S OUTREACH MEETING

The other day we had a group of African American journalists in here. Every man in the crowd, to a person -- there were, like, 20 of them here -- every man in that office, every single, solitary one, had been stopped by the police when he was doing nothing, for no reason other than the fact that he was black. And you say that's because there's a rational fear because of the fact that what occurs in some neighborhoods. Nonetheless, that is a race

-based public policy. I'm just saying, it's not as simple as --

MS. THERNSTROM: No, we agree with that. We agree with that. It's unacceptable to me.

MR. THERNSTROM: But doesn't it happen in Detroit, in Atlanta, in other states where --

THE PRESIDENT: All I'm saying is it's very difficult to get these things out of our society. And you just made one reason why. Let me give you another example. Because of the -- a lot of work that's been done by a lot of people, there's been a dramatic increase in the capacity of the United States to limit the inflow of drugs into the country from the South by land and sea. But the consequence of that -- Mexico, which is a big, open country, has had enormous amounts of money invested there to try to undermine what little infrastructure there was to deter the influx of drugs. Five hundred million dollars was spent last year alone trying to bribe Mexican police.

Now, as a result, over half of the cocaine in the



country comes across the Mexican border. So, all right, fast forward. What do you do if you're a local police officer with a drug problem? That's what this whole profiling is about -- (inaudible) -- people who are Hispanic if they're driving through town. That's an affirmative action program. That's a race

-based affirmative action program. So how do you --

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, some of us are opposed to that. I mean, Randall Kennedy has written, I think, very eloquently on exactly that issue. And those of us who oppose race preferences when they benefit groups are also opposed to them when they harm groups.

THE PRESIDENT: If you were running a police force, and you were trying to figure out how to deal with the drug problem, and you had a lot of people who were coming through your town on an interstate, and you had a limited amount of resources, and you couldn't stop every car, which cars would you stop?

MS. THERNSTROM: Every third car and come up with some of the criminals that way. I mean, I think police departments have to be held to the same standard that I want to see employers and universities and everybody else. I don't think we can make exceptions.

MR., CANADY: And it is inherently pernicious for our government to classify people on the basis of their race. And that sends a powerful message from the government to the people that we should judge one another on that basis. That's exactly the wrong thing for us to be saying. And that is the sort of government policy that reinforces a prejudice in our society and keeps us -- instead of going in the right direction toward unity, it keeps us caught in this dilemma that we are in now.

Our suggestion is that we've just got to get the government out of this business. Racial classifications in certain contexts were established with good intentions. And I think all of us would recognize that. We recognize that they were established in an attempt to overcome a history of discrimination and an attempt to come up with an effective means of combatting discrimination.

But our experience tells us that whenever the government gets involved in this business of classifying people based on race, the government is doing something harmful. And if our history as Americans, from the very beginning of this country, from the day the Declaration of Independence was promulgated to today, if it tells us anything, it should be that our government has no business dividing the American people into groups based on their race. It is something that is contrary to our fundamental ideals -- ideals we've never fully lived up to, but ideals that are the core of what it means to be American.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Could I ask a question, Mr. President? If you lived in a community that was 50 percent white, 50

percent black, and for a variety of historic reasons the level of income, educational attainment, and so forth was lower among the blacks in that community, and the police force was 100 percent white, and the problems of the kind that we all deplore took place and other problems took place, and the community decided that the police force would be better able to do its job if blacks were much more represented on the police force, because then the police force would have a much greater ability to relate to the community effectively and to do its job -- under those circumstances, do you think that the community would be justified in making affirmative action efforts to open up a lot more positions on the police force for blacks?

MR. CANADY: Let me say two things in response to that. Number one, I believe in community policing. I actually supported the President's crime bill back in the first Congress I was here And I believe that the concept of community policing is important. One thing that you can do to have affective community policing is require that the people who are involved in that live in the communities they police. Now, that's the kind of policy I can support. You don't have to classify people based on their race to do that and to be affective in community policing.

But this idea that we should hire people because they're going to be more -- based on their race because they're going to be more sensitive to certain -- and more acceptable to certain people that they're serving can be replicated in our history in the south when people -- employers said, well, I'd like to hire some black people, but my customers wouldn't accept that. That is offensive. It was more than offensive, it was morally wrong. And I would suggest to you for the government to classify people -- even in such a context as that -- simply based on their race is morally offensive and inconsistent with our constitutional traditions.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, if I could just follow up briefly. Of course, I strongly disagree with you. And it seems to me that the case that I've described there presents a really obvious example of how the community as a whole would be better off and the effectiveness of the police force would be enhanced. And to say that it's -- that's there's nothing to the idea that a police force with black representation on the force would have an easier time relating to the black community is, I think, to deny the obvious, with all due respect.

MR. CANADY: Let me give you another example that's directly related to the sort of thing you're talking about. There are some people that contend that you have to take race into account in undercover police work. The theory is that you need black people to serve as undercover agents, and that's the only effective way that can be carried out. Well, you know, it's very interesting that the Drug Enforcement Administration actually had a policy of doing that. And the black drug enforcement agent sued the Drug Enforcement Agency over that very policy because it was discriminating against them. It was putting them in contexts where they were at greater risk, and it was limiting their opportunities for advancement. So what may start out as making some sense from one perspective can end up harming the



very people that supposedly will benefit.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me ask you this. You don't quarrel with the fact -- because I think this is very important. This is the problem we have to deal with all the time. You don't quarrel with the fact that, other things being equal, in cities that had a racially diverse -- it would be a good thing if it could be done without race preferences to have a diverse police department.

MR. CANADY: Absolutely. I think we ought to have a police department that can work with --

THE PRESIDENT: But you just said that you like this whole idea of -- that's what we're doing now at HUD. We're actually encouraging police officers to go out and live in the neighborhoods where -- (inaudible) -- let them buy houses for half price if they'll serve in the neighborhoods where they live.

I've thought of that, and every time I go to New York, or any other big city, I always look at the police and see. So let me just say, I'm Irish -- Irish immigrants -- (inaudible) -- many of them, in urban police departments. And many of their children and grandchildren and great

-grandchildren are still in urban police departments. And I think -- what I think we have to do is to figure out -- I think part of this problem will go away if we ask ourselves, are the criteria by which we are making this decision, whatever this decision is, really relevant. Are we really -- whether it's college admission -- are we keeping score in the right way here.

But it seems to me that we have a vested interest in the objectives. If we agree that we need an integrated police department, and that it would be better --

MR. TERNSTROM: We'd like to have an integrated police department.

THE PRESIDENT: -- that we would like to have one, and that our society would function better if we had one, then we should ask ourselves, okay, how are we going to get there.

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, with all due respect to the Vice President, the example he gave, I don't think you could find me a concrete example of such a place in urban America today. I've looked at the statistics. I don't have them off the top of my head, but I've written columns on this and I have looked them up, and statistics show that there are significant numbers of black and Hispanic police officers.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Partly because of affirmative action.

MS. CHAVEZ: It may not be proportional representation, but it is close to proportional. What I would look at is first and foremost, are you discriminating in that police department. And I think every person in this room is adamantly in favor of vigorous enforcement of the civil rights law. And sure, there are employers out there, including public employers, who discriminate And we have to root out that kind of discrimination.

And then you do engage in outreach. You do create training programs. You do go into high schools and try and recruit people and get them ready so that they will be able to be prepared to

take the test to become a police officer. Those are all things that you can do. And they are all things we approve of.

MR. THERNSTROM: But I do question the need for diversity defined narrowly in terms of skin color. I mean, I live in an almost all white community, so are we saying that the people of Lexington feel more comfortable being policed by whites, and there's some terrific black Africans for the police force, sorry, you go back to Roxbury, or something, we don't like your color? And I can think of communities with large numbers of Asians, but where Asian families are very strongly oriented turning out physicists and physicians, and the like, and not very interested in law enforcement.

Now, the notion that some large element of the population have no one in that kind of position is perhaps repellent, but once we start thinking of, well, 28 percent Asians -- got to be pretty close to 28 percent -- I think that -- and for that matter, I mean, after all, half the population is female. Should half of all our police forces be female?

GOVERNOR KEAN: No, I was just going to say a couple of things. One is, I think it is a goal of this country, and should be a goal, that if we're going to be successful in the next century, with the amount of immigration we have coming in now and being assimilated, that we've got to get to know each other as people.

As a college president, I can tell you the largest scholarship program in our state is based, not actually on race, but on poverty. But, in effect, because so many people who are Hispanic or African American who live in the poor areas it becomes a program where we take into our colleges -- (inaudible) -- people who we would not -- (inaudible) -- and then we mentor all the way through. I can tell you from the point of view of Drew University -- (inaudible)

-very high standards that we admit a number of those people who would have no chance for admittance under normal standards. And a number of them -- most of them get through. Almost of them get through. And a number of them graduate with high honors and go on to top graduate schools in the country. Those are the people who wouldn't have a chance otherwise.

So there's something -- the other thing we want to do is establish -- get to know each other better. We've got in my state too many segregated schools because of neighborhoods and too many colleges -- people from different races and groups for their own choice for whatever reason don't get together. As college presidents we found two things -- I think there's a lesson here -- two areas where race disappears as a criteria for friendship. One is athletics -- play together on a team for a couple of years and you see the dining room and you see the people in different places, friendly, inviting each other to their homes, eating together. The other is -- (inaudible) -- those kind of things. Again, people are away from

their --

And the lessons I get from them are, first of all, that our criteria for creating opportunity in this country -- (inaudible) -- a lot of people of ability are not getting into the system of higher education and should be, and many of them happen to be -- (inaudible) -- because they are poor -- (inaudible) -- The second is that if we could find ways of getting people to work on common projects that racial division seem to disappear and friendships occur. And once that happens, people -- (inaudible) --

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, I totally agree. One of the things I'm doing -- and I'm based here in Washington and just stepped down as the Chairman of the Board of Howard University, and this semester have been teaching a course at Harvard University in the Kennedy School on the politics of race. One of the things, though, I'm going to do in Akron, where I go to on weekends, is build a \$2 million family life center in the heart of the ghetto, and get Jewish rabbis and Jewish synagogues to come in with me on this project, so that on the black side we can try to work on this ill feeling toward Jews. This is not being done in Washington. It's not being done with federal money. It's being done in the locality -- Just to do what you just said. We have to get to know each other.

If you don't know each other, if you don't know about each other -- if you're white and you're not going to go see Amistad, if you're white and you're not going to see Roots -- which is why Alex Haley wrote it -- he didn't write it for my benefit, he wanted to show a lot of white people the reason I'm this color is something that they ought to understand, that a tenth generation ago, a white man could be my cousin. These are the kinds of things that we simply must do in terms of attitude and atmosphere.

And then let me just finally say, I know the government -- we all know the government cannot impose upon the media in this country. But one of the things your Advisory Council may want to do is convene some meetings in a very nice and positive way with media people and remind them that they are a great part of this attitude, effect. A woman out in Virginia six months ago had six black babies, sextuplets. Never got mentioned anywhere. Didn't get a dime from any corporation, diapers or anything. Then this woman out in Iowa has seven and she's in more magazines than you are.

Now, you're going to tell me that there's not something inherently wrong with that? And it wasn't until some of us ministers kicked up a fuss that now some of the corporations are starting. These are the kinds of things that affect people's attitudes.

MR. CONNERLY: The threshold is seven. (Laughter.)

DR. GARRETT: Because it was close.

MS. THERNSTROM: But, you know, there isn't anybody in this room who would deny that we've got a long ways to go down the

road to racial equality. And there's nobody in this room who would deny that there's a lot of racism still in this society. I mean, the question from me is the trend lines. Have we been walking in the right direction, and do we continue to walk in the right direction. And those trend lines look very good. And I think that one of the things we need to do in having a decent racial dialogue is not only to get beyond race, but also to get beyond emoting over race. And there is much too much emoting and there is much too much name

-calling as well.

And there's a distortion of information that for me is absolutely mindboggling. I mean, I was on the Jesse Jackson show the Sunday before last. Jesse Jackson says to me, Abigail, black graduates of Harvard College still can't get jobs. And I said, Jesse, Jesse -- I think that this whole conversation could come together to a much greater degree if we can move off the anecdotes, the pain, and on to the landscape of what do we know.

And a lot of what we know is simply denied about how far we have come. If you can get the landscape right, then you can say, look, we have the following problems still: 27 percent of black families still in poverty. That's not much different than 1970. That's a catastrophic problem. We still have -- we have a racial gap in academic performance such that black kids in 12th grade are reading on the average four years behind white and Asian kids. That stacks the deck against those kids for the rest of their lives.

The solution to that isn't preferences; the solution -- and the solution to the police force -- we'll have a diverse police force tomorrow if we can close that gap in academic performance such that you've got -- so that you give police exams and there is no racial disparity.

I think, Mr. President, you've said some wonderful things on education. I'd like to push you further on them. But to me, that is absolutely the key. I think it's a national scandal that we are even one kid fall through the cracks.

THE PRESIDENT: I do, too. I think what Chicago has done, tells everybody that you've got to go summer school if you don't measure up and if you don't measure up a second time, you can't go ahead -- your self

-esteem will be hurt more when you're 50 and you can't read than when you're 16 and you have to stay back another year. I think that's great.

But let me just say, first of all, I think what you generally just said is absolutely right. The reason I wanted you to come here today is that I hope there will be another series of meetings where we'll get even more diverse group -- I mean, diverse by opinion. Because what I'm trying to get to is -- here's my theory about this -- I think if we could ever get to the point where we would ask ourselves, can we agree on the objective, and then talk about what means will work, and then look at the things we don't like and say, well, do they do any good; and what harm did it do.

For example, what I think about affirmative action, a



lot of these economic -- let's just take economic affirmative action. What I honestly believe is that it did a profound amount of good for the people who got into the programs who might never have had a chance to be successful business men or women. But I believe the problems with it are twofold. Number one is, once you get in and you start doing it, it's hard to graduate out. This whole theory about graduating out and moving through, going out into the private sector -- that theory never really worked very well. And we ought to fess up; those of us who were for it ought to say that's one of the problems that didn't work.

The other problem is it doesn't reach the vast majority of the people who have a problem because it doesn't reach down into basically the isolated urban areas with people in the economic underclass.

So if we say, okay -- you know, we can all say, okay, here are the facts -- it was a pretty good thing, but it didn't do everything it was supposed to do, so should we argue about getting rid of it, should we argue about doing something else, should we argue about what's going to happen to these people? I mean, I think there's a lot to be said for that.

Let me go back to what Steve said about the composition of the police force when you got into the tete

-a

-tete with the Vice

President. Let me just mention three things because Governor Kean mentioned this. The seven white septuplets were delivered by two African American women doctors. Two days later, two black kids were rescued in a Chicago fire by a white fireman. Nobody feels anything but good about that. Why is that? Or why do all these rich white Republicans pay to go down and watch some black guys play basketball at the MCI Center? I would argue there is something that all these things share in common that don't necessarily get answered in the police -- (inaudible) --

One is, in the case pro basketball, here I am, I don't have a doubt in the world that if I'd been good enough I could have played pro basketball. I know it. If I'd been good enough, by God, I could have played. I was short, fat, and slow by today's standards. (Laughter.) I couldn't play. Doesn't have anything to do with my race. I don't have a doubt in the world. If I have a child, I don't have a doubt in the world that my child can play if he or she is good enough. So that's the first threshold. Without regard to race -- I think we could all agree with that. In whatever setting, people have to know, if they're good enough, they can play. And if they need a hand up to prepare themselves, they can get it.

The second thing is, in the case of the black women doctors who delivered the septuplets -- which is not always the case in the case of police -- which is why I agree with the Vice President -- the community, which was of a different race -- there was no question about whether they could do their job in a way that would be

fair to everybody. In the case of the white fireman who risked his life to go in and get the last two black kids in the Chicago fire -- he made a statement that was louder than any words I will ever utter, that he was in tune with the people in that community. He was in tune enough that he was willing to lay his life down to save those two little children. Nobody will ever care again whether that guy is on their fire or sitting idly out in front of the fire station, as I hope he will be.

So there's two criteria. One is can you play if you're good enough, whatever the thing is. Two is, does everybody in the community have confidence that the people in the position, whatever they are, have sufficient concern about them, are consistently involved with them, that whatever is supposed to be done is going to get done.

I think in the case of the fireman, and the doctors and the basketball players, the answer is yes. I think in the case -- huge numbers of urban police departments, huge numbers of the business sector, huge sections of higher education -- you can't say that the answer is yes. That's why I'm hung up about it. But I don't think that -- I think the reason that I'd get frustrated if the debate is only about affirmative action is, if we win 100 percent of the debate, we're talking about 10 percent of the people. If you win 100 percent of the debate, we're still just talking about 10 percent of the people. What about everybody else?

MS. CHAVEZ: That has been our argument.

MS. TERNSTROM: But, why don't you have confidence that we can train policemen the way we train firemen so that when a policeman shows up at the door, it doesn't matter what the race of that policeman is?

THE PRESIDENT: What I don't have confidence in is that in the police department's where there is not affirmative action that there is a selection process that is not race

-based.

MS. TERNSTROM: Why not go after the problem instead -- it's like college admissions -- instead of going after the problem of the failure of our schools in the K

-12 years, we say, okay, we're going to shut our eyes to that problem and we're going to preferentially admit them in hope something --

THE PRESIDENT: What about all the people who are sitting around waiting for that to happen? Are we just going to let them drift away?

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

CREATOR: Margaret M. Suntum ( SUNTUM\_M ) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:19-DEC-1997 15:48:50.64

SUBJECT: first five pages

TO: Elizabeth R. Newman ( Elizabeth R. Newman@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Darby E. Stott ( Darby E. Stott@eop@LNGTWY@EOPMRX )  
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nanda Chitre ( CHITRE\_N ) Autoforward to: Remote Addressee ( Nanda  
Chitre@eop@lngtwy@eopmr ) (WHO)  
READ:NOT READ

TEXT:  
PRINTER FONT 10\_POINT\_COURIER  
BOTTOM ODD  
MORE  
PRINTER FONT 12\_POINT\_COURIER

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release December 19, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
IN OUTREACH MEETING

The Oval Office

2:43 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: First, let me thank you for coming in what must be a busy time for all of you. What I think may be the most productive thing to do, although Governor Kean, since -- (inaudible) -- may interject something here. I think what I'd like to do, to begin is just to hear from you. I'd like to -- on the question of, do you believe that race still matters in America and is still a problem in some ways. And if so, instead of our getting into a big fight about affirmative action -- although if you want to discuss it, we can -- what bothers me is that even I, who think it works in some ways, believe it works only when people -- it works predominantly for people who are at least in a position for it work. A lot of the people that I care most about are totally unaffected by



it one way or the other.

So what I'd like to talk about today is that I thought that we could at least begin by just getting a feel for where you are and if you think it's still a problem, and if so, what do you think we ought to do about it. And if you want to talk about affirmative action -- (inaudible) -- but I'm happy to do that.

MR. CONNERLY: I appreciate very much so to be here, and somewhat ironical that, after raising and giving -- (inaudible) -- to Republicans, I'm here at the request of a Democratic President. So I'm grateful to you for the invitation, sir.

I don't -- (inaudible) -- talking about what we call preferences, because that is central to the discussion about race. Yes, there is a problem in America. It's a serious problem. It's one that's complex, multidimensional. It doesn't lend itself to government solution in many cases. But we can't get to the problem of moving this nation forward with respect to the issue of race unless we deal with the perception by a large number of people that there are preferences that are being given to people simply because they check a box and then benefits are conferred on the basis of checking that box.

And the language here is very important. You said in June of this year that we need to have an honest dialogue. Well, up until this point, frankly, many of us think the dialogue has been less than honest from some of those who try to defend what they call affirmative action. I don't want to end all affirmative action, but I want to add every preference that I can find that's based on some trait over which I have no control. And if I want that for myself, I want it for other people as well.

So I don't think, sir, that we can have this dialogue BOTTOM EVEN MORE today, which is perhaps one of our best shots at getting our point of view across, without talking about the --

THE PRESIDENT: What do you think we should do? Since there are -- since various racial minorities are represented in

TOP EVEN  
- \p -

BOTTOM EVEN MORE  
groups of people that are at least not doing very well in this society, in numbers disproportionate to their numbers in the country as a whole, how should we respond to that?

MR. CONNERLY: I think that choice -- school choice is one way to respond to it. I think if we overhaul the K

-12 system,

which is one way to respond to it. They're trying to do that in California by lowering classroom sizes. We're looking at testing. We're looking at the quality of the teachers. We also have to start looking at ourselves. Are we telling our kids as parents that education is as important as it should be? So I think that there is a major change that needs to take place. But even if we don't make those changes, there is never, in my view, a rationale for discriminating against somebody on the basis of their skin color, regardless of what we want the outcome to be. That's my perspective, and I think it's a perspective that our nation has to hold true to.

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, let me just say this. As a fifth

-generation Republican and as one who has worked in this very house under three Republican Presidents, I have a little concern about how my party and how conservatives function around this question. I would hope that we would not be bogged down today in a discussion of affirmative action, per se. Many of those programs and plans will be resolved by the court anyway.

When you said you wanted a conversation on race, we ought to -- not just this group -- but we all ought to talk about race and race relations. Affirmative action and mechanical programs will mean not a whit if we don't start changing attitudes. We don't know each other in this country. We don't know who lives next door to us in condominium buildings, let alone know about their concerns. And we have to, for a while, talk about race and not be bogged down by affirmative action discussion and debate.

Again, the courts will resolve that pretty much in part, but it just seems to me that the moral leadership that can be provided from this room and from all of us needs to be amplified. And one problem I have with my Republican and conservative brothers and sisters, no one ever wants to talk about race. No one ever wants to talk about the things that the people in Akron, my home town, talked about -- the attitudes. You don't know what it's like to stand on a street corner dressed like this and a car comes up -- cluck, and locks the door. These are things that people need to resolve in their minds.

That boy in Akron who said, he's friendly and all the rest, but when he sees a black man dressed a certain way -- this is the kind of leadership government leaders, ministers, college presidents, and many others, can provide. If we continue to allow affirmative action plans to divide us and to serve as a wall, we're not going to get anywhere.

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe you can -- (inaudible) -- and say. let's assume we abolished them all tomorrow and we just had to start all over, what would you do?

MS. CHAVEZ: I'd like to offer some suggestions, Mr. President, because I came here with a notion that you do want affirmative action, that you do understand -- -- (inaudible)

-  
-affirmative action preferences are part of this debate is because

there's a whole world of people out there who believe that they're wrong and that they send the wrong signal from government; that so long as you've got government picking winners and losers on the basis of the color of their skin, that you can't get beyond racism, you can't to the color

-blind society.

I think that there are a lot of things we can do to reach those disadvantaged persons that you were talking about -- TOP ODD  
- \p -

BOTTOM ODD  
MORE

people who are socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged -- because that's who those programs were initially aimed at. And I think it can be done in race -- (inaudible) -- ways.

I work at college admissions, for example, Mr. President, and I brought you some studies that my organization has done that shows not only that there are preferences in place in admissions, but that those preferences hurt black and Hispanic students, because kids who are admitted to schools under separate standards or the double standards, and who then are just allowed to sink or swim -- a lot of them sink. About 50 percent of them don't graduate from those college programs.

I work at a place like the University of Maryland, which has in place a program not aimed at race, but aimed at students who are the first in their family to attend college. I would have been able to qualify for such a program. A lot of disadvantaged kids out there would. And once those children are identified, they're brought in a summer program; they're given tutoring and special classes in reading, writing and mathematics; they're given study skills; they're given counseling. They're told what courses they should take their first year; they attend a very structured first year. Those kinds of programs would benefit people who are truly educationally and economically disadvantaged -- and more than just giving them a little badge and getting them to school, would help make sure that they get out of school, that they actually get that bachelor's degree, which is what none of the preference programs do.

And I have other examples -- and left you information on them. Because I think all of us in this room want to improve opportunity for blacks and Hispanics and other disadvantaged people in this society. We are committed to that. Where we come to debate is the best means to achieve that.

MR. CONNERLY: I just want to say also, I hope you haven't invited me here as a conservative. I'm here as an American who has a profound interest in the subject. I don't think you appointed people to your race panel because they were liberal or anything else. You appointed them because you thought they had something to contribute. I didn't come here I don't know how many

miles to be here as a voice of a conservative. I left my party label and my ideology outside of this room.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Let me just say this, first of all. I think, if you imagine -- forget about -- think about what the world would look like 30 years from now if things go well -- that is, if all the threats to our collective security -- (inaudible) -- restrained, and trade develops as we hope it should, and we develop a decent education system that embraces virtually everybody -- (inaudible) -- The fact that the United States is -- (inaudible) -- multiethnic country that at some point in the next generation, in the next 50 years will, for the first time in its history, not have a majority of people of European origin, I think will make it an even more fascinating, even more interesting, and even more prosperous and successful place if we're not consumed or limited or handicapped in some ways because of our racial differences.

So, to me, this -- I'm looking at this through the perspective of the future that I want to see our country make for itself. And I don't think anyone has all the answers about how we should make that future.

If you look at -- there is no question that -- if you just African American kids in -- (inaudible) -- the middle class is growing and a lot of good things have happened. But there is also no question that there are still pockets where crime is greater, incarceration rates are horrendous, that education systems are not working. And even the people who do have some level, who are highly industrious and are dying to get into business very often don't have access to credit and don't have access to the networks.

Affirmative action originally I think on the economic side was a kind of networking thing, and on the education side it was designed to do what -- the Maryland program you just described. I think if there was ever a -- (inaudible) -- in college education -- we ought to be focusing on people who are educationally disadvantaged without -- (inaudible) -- preparation and continuing support that they need. The schools that have done that are much better.

MR. THERNSTROM: Mr. President, I think Mr. Garrett made two comments, and while I do think we may not know each other in some absolute sense, but we know each other across racial lines much more than we did a generation ago. I mean, the data is really quite stunning. A generation ago, only one

-fifth of white people said they had any black friends; today 87 percent do. Eighty

-seven percent of blacks say they have white friends. The rate of interracial dating has gone up spectacularly. The rate of interracial marriage, though still low, has gone up dramatically. So I do think there is much more positive change than is often thought.

And second, I do have to say that the Akron dialogue that Mr. Garrett speaks so favorably of I found very troubling and very one

-sided. And I think very few American whites would have been deeply moved by that, because it involved the recitation by a series of blacks, Hispanics of painful experiences. There was no opportunity to question those experiences and say, hey, are you sure that was racism; maybe it was X, Y, or Z.

And then in one case where a white student talked about a racial concern, a racial fear, it was immediately reduced to, you know, was that your personal experience? Have you ever been mugged? If not, then you must have been watching too much television.

Now, Reverend Jackson, years ago, made a very powerful statement about precisely this when he said, walking down the street late at night, and I turn around and see over my shoulder and see they are whites following me, I'm relieved. There's a very powerful statement. It is a reality that certain neighborhoods, predominantly black neighborhoods in inner cities are very dangerous places at night. And they are very dangerous places largely because there are black criminals who are committing criminal acts. And I don't think we can begin to discuss race relations honestly unless we in fact express -- whites express those fears and they can be dealt with, they can be discussed, but they shouldn't be dismissed.

And just one other point, which picks up on something Angela Oh said I gather at a race relations meeting long ago -- we do have to think of this as a multiracial or multiethnic problem, not just black and white. And it's often assumed, mistakenly, that the problem is white prejudice against blacks, Asians and Hispanics. In fact, some careful studies show that blacks have stronger negative stereotypes about both Hispanics and Asians than whites do, but Asians have stronger negative stereotypes about both groups than whites do, and that Hispanics have stronger negative stereotypes. And as those population elements grow, we're going to have a larger problem that will have to be addressed. It isn't just a matter of white racism that has to be combatted.

THE PRESIDENT: But if what you say is true -- you say the crime problem is disproportionately African American; that's like saying the college population is disproportionately white or the business population is disproportionately white. That doesn't justify an affirmative action program to -- (inaudible) -- like Section VIII of the SBA program.

The other day we had a group of African American journalists in here. Every man in the crowd, to a person -- there were, like, 20 of them here -- every man in that office, every single, solitary one, had been stopped by the police when he was doing nothing, for no reason other than the fact that he was black. And you say that's because there's a rational fear because of the fact that what occurs in some neighborhoods. Nonetheless, that is a race

-based public policy. I'm just saying, it's not as simple as --

MS. TERNSTROM: No, we agree with that. We agree with that. It's unacceptable to me.



MR. THERNSTROM: But doesn't it happen in Detroit, in Atlanta, in other states where --

THE PRESIDENT: All I'm saying is it's very difficult to get these things out of our society. And you just made one reason why. Let me give you another example. Because of the -- a lot of work that's been done by a lot of people, there's been a dramatic increase in the capacity of the United States to limit the inflow of drugs into the country from the South by land and sea. But the consequence of that -- Mexico, which is a big, open country, has had enormous amounts of money invested there to try to undermine what little infrastructure there was to deter the influx of drugs. Five hundred million dollars was spent last year alone trying to bribe Mexican police.

Now, as a result, over half of the cocaine in the country comes across the Mexican border. So, all right, fast forward. What do you do if you're a local police officer with a drug problem? That's what this whole profiling is about -- (inaudible) -- people who are Hispanic if they're driving through town. That's an affirmative action program. That's a race

-based affirmative action program. So how do you --

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, some of us are opposed to that. I mean, Randall Kennedy has written, I think, very eloquently on exactly that issue. And those of us who oppose race preferences when they benefit groups are also opposed to them when they harm groups.

THE PRESIDENT: If you were running a police force, and you were trying to figure out how to deal with the drug problem, and you had a lot of people who were coming through your town on an interstate, and you had a limited amount of resources, and you couldn't stop every car, which cars would you stop?

MS. THERNSTROM: Every third car and come up with some of the criminals that way. I mean, I think police departments have to be held to the same standard that I want to see employers and universities and everybody else. I don't think we can make exceptions.

MR., CANADY: And it is inherently pernicious for our government to classify people on the basis of their race. And that sends a powerful message from the government to the people that we should judge one another on that basis. That's exactly the wrong thing for us to be saying. And that is the sort of government policy that reinforces a prejudice in our society and keeps us -- instead of going in the right direction toward unity, it keeps us caught in this dilemma that we are in now.

Our suggestion is that we've just got to get the government out of this business. Racial classifications in certain contexts were established with good intentions. And I think all of

us would recognize that. We recognize that they were established in an attempt to overcome a history of discrimination and an attempt to come up with an effective means of combatting discrimination.

But our experience tells us that whenever the government gets involved in this business of classifying people based on race, the government is doing something harmful. And if our history as Americans, from the very beginning of this country, from the day the Declaration of Independence was promulgated to today, if it tells us anything, it should be that our government has no business dividing the American people into groups based on their race. It is something that is contrary to our fundamental ideals -- ideals we've never fully lived up to, but ideals that are the core of what it means to be American.



RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Peter Rundlet ( CN=Peter Rundlet/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-DEC-1997 14:27:56.00

SUBJECT: CORRECTION: 1997-12-19 Complete Transcript of Race Meeting

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

TEXT:

Dawn, as promised, here's the transcript.

It was great wasting time with you. Have a great break. Merry Christmas  
and all that stuff--

Peter

----- Forwarded by Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP on 12/20/97  
02:26 PM -----

Elizabeth R. Newman  
12/19/97 08:03:21 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc:  
Subject: CORRECTION: 1997-12-19 Complete Transcript of Race Meeting

----- Forwarded by Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP on  
12/19/97 07:54 PM -----

SUNTUM\_M @ A1  
12/19/97 06:28:00 PM  
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message  
cc:  
Subject: 1997-12-19 Complete Transcript of Race Meeting

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
IN OUTREACH MEETING

The Oval Office

2:43 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: First, let me thank you for coming in what must be a busy time for all of you. What I think may be the most productive thing to do, although Governor Kean, since -- (inaudible) -- may interject something here. I think what I'd like to do, to begin is just to hear from you. I'd like to -- on the question of, do you believe that race still matters in America and is still a problem in some ways. And if so, instead of our getting into a big fight about affirmative action -- although if you want to discuss it, we can -- what bothers me is that even I, who think it works in some ways, believe it works only when people -- it works predominantly for people who are at least in a position for it work. A lot of the people that I care most about are totally unaffected by it one way or the other.

So what I'd like to talk about today is that I thought that we could at least begin by just getting a feel for where you are and if you think it's still a problem, and if so, what do you think we ought to do about it. And if you want to talk about affirmative action -- (inaudible) -- but I'm happy to do that.

MR. CONNERLY: I appreciate very much so to be here, and somewhat ironical that, after raising and giving -- (inaudible) -- to Republicans, I'm here at the request of a Democratic President. So I'm grateful to you for the invitation, sir.

I don't -- (inaudible) -- talking about what we call preferences, because that is central to the discussion about race. Yes, there is a problem in America. It's a serious problem. It's one that's complex, multidimensional. It doesn't lend itself to government solution in many cases. But we can't get to the problem of moving this nation forward with respect to the issue of race unless we deal with the perception by a large number of people that there are preferences that are being given to people simply because they check a box and then benefits are conferred on the basis of checking that box.

And the language here is very important. You said in June of this year that we need to have an honest dialogue. Well, up until this point, frankly, many of us think the dialogue has been

less than honest from some of those who try to defend what they call affirmative action. I don't want to end all affirmative action, but I want to end every preference that I can find that's based on some trait over which I have no control. And if I want that for myself, I want it for other people as well.

So I don't think, sir, that we can have this dialogue today, which is perhaps one of our best shots at getting our point of view across, without talking about the --

THE PRESIDENT: What do you think we should do? Since there are -- since various racial minorities are represented in

groups of people that are at least not doing very well in this society, in numbers disproportionate to their numbers in the country as a whole, how should we respond to that?

MR. CONNERLY: I think that choice -- school choice is one way to respond to it. I think if we overhaul the K-12 system, which is one way to respond to it. They're trying to do that in California by lowering classroom sizes. We're looking at testing. We're looking at the quality of the teachers. We also have to start looking at ourselves. Are we telling our kids as parents that education is as important as it should be? So I think that there is a major change that needs to take place. But even if we don't make those changes, there is never, in my view, a rationale for discriminating against somebody on the basis of their skin color, regardless of what we want the outcome to be. That's my perspective, and I think it's a perspective that our nation has to hold true to.

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, let me just say this. As a fifth-generation Republican and as one who has worked in this very house under three Republican Presidents, I have a little concern about how my party and how conservatives function around this question. I would hope that we would not be bogged down today in a discussion of affirmative action, per se. Many of those programs and plans will be resolved by the court anyway.

When you said you wanted a conversation on race, we ought to -- not just this group -- but we all ought to talk about race and race relations. Affirmative action and mechanical programs will mean not a whit if we don't start changing attitudes. We don't know each other in this country. We don't know who lives next door to us in condominium buildings, let alone know about their concerns. And we have to, for a while, talk about race and not be bogged down by affirmative action discussion and debate.

Again, the courts will resolve that pretty much in part, but it just seems to me that the moral leadership that can be provided from this room and from all of us needs to be amplified. And one problem I have with my Republican and conservative brothers

and sisters, no one ever wants to talk about race. No one ever wants to talk about the things that the people in Akron, my home town, talked about -- the attitudes. You don't know what it's like to stand on a street corner dressed like this and a car comes up -- cluck, and locks the door. These are things that people need to resolve in their minds.

That boy in Akron who said, he's friendly and all the rest, but when he sees a black man dressed a certain way -- this is the kind of leadership government leaders, ministers, college presidents, and many others, can provide. If we continue to allow affirmative action plans to divide us and to serve as a wall, we're not going to get anywhere.

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe you can -- (inaudible) -- and say. let's assume we abolished them all tomorrow and we just had to start all over, what would you do?

MS. CHAVEZ: I'd like to offer some suggestions, Mr. President, because I came here with a notion that you do want affirmative action, that you do understand -- -- (inaudible) -- affirmative action preferences are part of this debate is because there's a whole world of people out there who believe that they're wrong and that they send the wrong signal from government; that so long as you've got government picking winners and losers on the basis of the color of their skin, that you can't get beyond racism, you can't to the color-blind society.

I think that there are a lot of things we can do to reach those disadvantaged persons that you were talking about -- people who are socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged -- because that's who those programs were initially aimed at. And I think it can be done in race -- (inaudible) -- ways.

I work at college admissions, for example, Mr. President, and I brought you some studies that my organization has done that shows not only that there are preferences in place in admissions, but that those preferences hurt black and Hispanic students, because kids who are admitted to schools under separate standards or the double standards, and who then are just allowed to sink or swim -- a lot of them sink. About 50 percent of them don't graduate from those college programs.

I work at a place like the University of Maryland, which has in place a program not aimed at race, but aimed at students who are the first in their family to attend college. I would have been able to qualify for such a program. A lot of disadvantaged kids out there would. And once those children are identified, they're brought in a summer program; they're given tutoring and special classes in reading, writing and mathematics; they're given study skills; they're given counseling. They're told what courses they should take their first year; they attend a very structured first year. Those kinds of programs would benefit people who are truly educationally and economically disadvantaged -- and more than just giving them a little

badge and getting them to school, would help make sure that they get out of school, that they actually get that bachelor's degree, which is what none of the preference programs do.

And I have other examples -- and left you information on them. Because I think all of us in this room want to improve opportunity for blacks and Hispanics and other disadvantaged people in this society. We are committed to that. Where we come to debate is the best means to achieve that.

MR. CONNERLY: I just want to say also, I hope you haven't invited me here as a conservative. I'm here as an American who has a profound interest in the subject. I don't think you appointed people to your race panel because they were liberal or anything else. You appointed them because you thought they had something to contribute. I didn't come here I don't know how many miles to be here as a voice of a conservative. I left my party label and my ideology outside of this room.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Let me just say this, first of all. I think, if you imagine -- forget about -- think about what the world would look like 30 years from now if things go well -- that is, if all the threats to our collective security -- (inaudible) -- restrained, and trade develops as we hope it should, and we develop a decent education system that embraces virtually everybody -- (inaudible) -- The fact that the United States is -- (inaudible) -- multiethnic country that at some point in the next generation, in the next 50 years will, for the first time in its history, not have a majority of people of European origin, I think will make it an even more fascinating, even more interesting, and even more prosperous and successful place if we're not consumed or limited or handicapped in some ways because of our racial differences.

So, to me, this -- I'm looking at this through the perspective of the future that I want to see our country make for itself. And I don't think anyone has all the answers about how we should make that future.

If you look at -- there is no question that -- if you just African American kids in -- (inaudible) -- the middle class is growing and a lot of good things have happened. But there is also no question that there are still pockets where crime is greater, incarceration rates are horrendous, that education systems are not working. And even the people who do have some level, who are highly industrious and are dying to get into business very often don't have access to credit and don't have access to the networks.

Affirmative action originally I think on the economic side was a kind of networking thing, and on the education side it was designed to do what -- the Maryland program you just described. I think if there was ever a -- (inaudible) -- in college education -- we ought to be focusing on people who are educationally disadvantaged without -- (inaudible) -- preparation and continuing support that they need. The schools that have done that are much better.



MR. THERNSTROM: Mr. President, I think Mr. Garrett made two comments, and while I do think we may not know each other in some absolute sense, but we know each other across racial lines much more than we did a generation ago. I mean, the data is really quite stunning. A generation ago, only one-fifth of white people said they had any black friends; today 87 percent do. Eighty-seven percent of blacks say they have white friends. The rate of interracial dating has gone up spectacularly. The rate of interracial marriage, though still low, has gone up dramatically. So I do think there is much more positive change than is often thought.

And second, I do have to say that the Akron dialogue that Mr. Garrett speaks so favorably of I found very troubling and very one-sided. And I think very few American whites would have been deeply moved by that, because it involved the recitation by a series of blacks, Hispanics of painful experiences. There was no opportunity to question those experiences and say, hey, are you sure that was racism; maybe it was X, Y, or Z.

And then in one case where a white student talked about a racial concern, a racial fear, it was immediately reduced to, you know, was that your personal experience? Have you ever been mugged? If not, then you must have been watching too much television.

Now, Reverend Jackson, years ago, made a very powerful statement about precisely this when he said, walking down the street late at night, and I turn around and see over my shoulder and see they are whites following me, I'm relieved. There's a very powerful statement. It is a reality that certain neighborhoods, predominantly black neighborhoods in inner cities are very dangerous places at night. And they are very dangerous places largely because there are black criminals who are committing criminal acts. And I don't think we can begin to discuss race relations honestly unless we in fact express -- whites express those fears and they can be dealt with, they can be discussed, but they shouldn't be dismissed.

And just one other point, which picks up on something Angela Oh said I gather at a race relations meeting long ago -- we do have to think of this as a multiracial or multiethnic problem, not just black and white. And it's often assumed, mistakenly, that the problem is white prejudice against blacks, Asians and Hispanics. In fact, some careful studies show that blacks have stronger negative stereotypes about both Hispanics and Asians than whites do, but Asians have stronger negative stereotypes about both groups than whites do, and that Hispanics have stronger negative stereotypes. And as those population elements grow, we're going to have a larger problem that will have to be addressed. It isn't just a matter of white racism that has to be combatted.

THE PRESIDENT: But if what you say is true -- you say the crime problem is disproportionately African American; that's like saying the college population is disproportionately white or the business population is disproportionately white. That doesn't

justify an affirmative action program to -- (inaudible) -- like Section VIII of the SBA program.

The other day we had a group of African American journalists in here. Every man in the crowd, to a person -- there were, like, 20 of them here -- every man in that office, every single, solitary one, had been stopped by the police when he was doing nothing, for no reason other than the fact that he was black. And you say that's because there's a rational fear because of the fact that what occurs in some neighborhoods. Nonetheless, that is a race-based public policy. I'm just saying, it's not as simple as --

MS. THERNSTROM: No, we agree with that. We agree with that. It's unacceptable to me.

MR. THERNSTROM: But doesn't it happen in Detroit, in Atlanta, in other states where --

THE PRESIDENT: All I'm saying is it's very difficult to get these things out of our society. And you just made one reason why. Let me give you another example. Because of the -- a lot of work that's been done by a lot of people, there's been a dramatic increase in the capacity of the United States to limit the inflow of drugs into the country from the South by land and sea. But the consequence of that -- Mexico, which is a big, open country, has had enormous amounts of money invested there to try to undermine what little infrastructure there was to deter the influx of drugs. Five hundred million dollars was spent last year alone trying to bribe Mexican police.

Now, as a result, over half of the cocaine in the country comes across the Mexican border. So, all right, fast forward. What do you do if you're a local police officer with a drug problem? That's what this whole profiling is about -- (inaudible) -- people who are Hispanic if they're driving through town. That's an affirmative action program. That's a race-based affirmative action program. So how do you --

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, some of us are opposed to that. I mean, Randall Kennedy has written, I think, very eloquently on exactly that issue. And those of us who oppose race preferences when they benefit groups are also opposed to them when they harm groups.

THE PRESIDENT: If you were running a police force, and you were trying to figure out how to deal with the drug problem, and you had a lot of people who were coming through your town on an interstate, and you had a limited amount of resources, and you couldn't stop every car, which cars would you stop?

MS. THERNSTROM: Every third car and come up with some of the criminals that way. I mean, I think police departments have to be held to the same standard that I want to see employers and universities and everybody else. I don't think we can make exceptions.



MR., CANADY: And it is inherently pernicious for our government to classify people on the basis of their race. And that sends a powerful message from the government to the people that we should judge one another on that basis. That's exactly the wrong thing for us to be saying. And that is the sort of government policy that reinforces a prejudice in our society and keeps us -- instead of going in the right direction toward unity, it keeps us caught in this dilemma that we are in now.

Our suggestion is that we've just got to get the government out of this business. Racial classifications in certain contexts were established with good intentions. And I think all of us would recognize that. We recognize that they were established in an attempt to overcome a history of discrimination and an attempt to come up with an effective means of combatting discrimination.

But our experience tells us that whenever the government gets involved in this business of classifying people based on race, the government is doing something harmful. And if our history as Americans, from the very beginning of this country, from the day the Declaration of Independence was promulgated to today, if it tells us anything, it should be that our government has no business dividing the American people into groups based on their race. It is something that is contrary to our fundamental ideals -- ideals we've never fully lived up to, but ideals that are the core of what it means to be American.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Could I ask a question, Mr. President? If you lived in a community that was 50 percent white, 50 percent black, and for a variety of historic reasons the level of income, educational attainment, and so forth was lower among the blacks in that community, and the police force was 100 percent white, and the problems of the kind that we all deplore took place and other problems took place, and the community decided that the police force would be better able to do its job if blacks were much more represented on the police force, because then the police force would have a much greater ability to relate to the community effectively and to do its job -- under those circumstances, do you think that the community would be justified in making affirmative action efforts to open up a lot more positions on the police force for blacks?

MR. CANADY: Let me say two things in response to that. Number one, I believe in community policing. I actually supported the President's crime bill back in the first Congress I was here And I believe that the concept of community policing is important. One thing that you can do to have affective community policing is require that the people who are involved in that live in the communities they police. Now, that's the kind of policy I can support. You don't have to classify people based on their race to do that and to be affective in community policing.

But this idea that we should hire people because they're going to be more -- based on their race because they're going to be

more sensitive to certain -- and more acceptable to certain people that they're serving can be replicated in our history in the south when people -- employers said, well, I'd like to hire some black people, but my customers wouldn't accept that. That is offensive. It was more than offensive, it was morally wrong. And I would suggest to you for the government to classify people -- even in such a context as that -- simply based on their race is morally offensive and inconsistent with our constitutional traditions.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, if I could just follow up briefly. Of course, I strongly disagree with you. And it seems to me that the case that I've described there presents a really obvious example of how the community as a whole would be better off and the effectiveness of the police force would be enhanced. And to say that it's -- that's there's nothing to the idea that a police force with black representation on the force would have an easier time relating to the black community is, I think, to deny the obvious, with all due respect.

MR. CANADY: Let me give you another example that's directly related to the sort of thing you're talking about. There are some people that contend that you have to take race into account in undercover police work. The theory is that you need black people to serve as undercover agents, and that's the only effective way that can be carried out. Well, you know, it's very interesting that the Drug Enforcement Administration actually had a policy of doing that. And the black drug enforcement agent sued the Drug Enforcement Agency over that very policy because it was discriminating against them. It was putting them in contexts where they were at greater risk, and it was limiting their opportunities for advancement. So what may start out as making some sense from one perspective can end up harming the very people that supposedly will benefit.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me ask you this. You don't quarrel with the fact -- because I think this is very important. This is the problem we have to deal with all the time. You don't quarrel with the fact that, other things being equal, in cities that had a racially diverse -- it would be a good thing if it could be done without race preferences to have a diverse police department.

MR. CANADY: Absolutely. I think we ought to have a police department that can work with --

THE PRESIDENT: But you just said that you like this whole idea of -- that's what we're doing now at HUD. We're actually encouraging police officers to go out and live in the neighborhoods where -- (inaudible) -- let them buy houses for half price if they'll serve in the neighborhoods where they live.

I've thought of that, and every time I go to New York, or any other big city, I always look at the police and see. So let me just say, I'm Irish -- Irish immigrants -- (inaudible) -- many of

them, in urban police departments. And many of their children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren are still in urban police departments. And I think -- what I think we have to do is to figure out -- I think part of this problem will go away if we ask ourselves, are the criteria by which we are making this decision, whatever this decision is, really relevant. Are we really -- whether it's college admission -- are we keeping score in the right way here.

But it seems to me that we have a vested interest in the objectives. If we agree that we need an integrated police department, and that it would be better --

MR. THERNSTROM: We'd like to have an integrated police department.

THE PRESIDENT: -- that we would like to have one, and that our society would function better if we had one, then we should ask ourselves, okay, how are we going to get there.

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, with all due respect to the Vice President, the example he gave, I don't think you could find me a concrete example of such a place in urban America today. I've looked at the statistics. I don't have them off the top of my head, but I've written columns on this and I have looked them up, and statistics show that there are significant numbers of black and Hispanic police officers.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Partly because of affirmative action.

MS. CHAVEZ: It may not be proportional representation, but it is close to proportional. What I would look at is first and foremost, are you discriminating in that police department. And I think every person in this room is adamantly in favor of vigorous enforcement of the civil rights law. And sure, there are employers out there, including public employers, who discriminate. And we have to root out that kind of discrimination.

And then you do engage in outreach. You do create training programs. You do go into high schools and try and recruit people and get them ready so that they will be able to be prepared to take the test to become a police officer. Those are all things that you can do. And they are all things we approve of.

MR. THERNSTROM: But I do question the need for diversity defined narrowly in terms of skin color. I mean, I live in an almost all white community, so are we saying that the people of Lexington feel more comfortable being policed by whites, and there's some terrific black Africans for the police force, sorry, you go back to Roxbury, or something, we don't like your color? And I can think of communities with large numbers of Asians, but where Asian families are very strongly oriented turning out physicists and physicians, and the like, and not very interested in law enforcement.

Now, the notion that some large element of the population have no one in that kind of position is perhaps repellent, but once we start thinking of, well, 28 percent Asians -- got to be pretty close to 28 percent -- I think that -- and for that matter, I mean, after all, half the population is female. Should half of all our police forces be female?

GOVERNOR KEAN: No, I was just going to say a couple of things. One is, I think it is a goal of this country, and should be a goal, that if we're going to be successful in the next century, with the amount of immigration we have coming in now and being assimilated, that we've got to get to know each other as people.

As a college president, I can tell you the largest scholarship program in our state is based, not actually on race, but on poverty. But, in effect, because so many people who are Hispanic or African American who live in the poor areas it becomes a program where we take into our colleges -- (inaudible) -- people who we would not -- (inaudible) -- and then we mentor all the way through. I can tell you from the point of view of Drew University -- (inaudible) -- very high standards that we admit a number of those people who would have no chance for admittance under normal standards. And a number of them -- most of them get through. Almost of them get through. And a number of them graduate with high honors and go on to top graduate schools in the country. Those are the people who wouldn't have a chance otherwise.

So there's something -- the other thing we want to do is establish -- get to know each other better. We've got in my state too many segregated schools because of neighborhoods and too many colleges -- people from different races and groups for their own choice for whatever reason don't get together. As college presidents we found two things -- I think there's a lesson here -- two areas where race disappears as a criteria for friendship. One is athletics -- play together on a team for a couple of years and you see the dining room and you see the people in different places, friendly, inviting each other to their homes, eating together. The other is -- (inaudible) -- those kind of things. Again, people are away from their --

And the lessons I get from them are, first of all, that our criteria for creating opportunity in this country -- (inaudible) -- a lot of people of ability are not getting into the system of higher education and should be, and many of them happen to be -- (inaudible) -- because they are poor -- (inaudible) -- The second is that if we could find ways of getting people to work on common projects that racial division seem to disappear and friendships occur. And once that happens, people -- (inaudible) --

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, I totally agree. One of the things I'm doing -- and I'm based here in Washington and just stepped down as the Chairman of the Board of Howard University, and this semester have been teaching a course at Harvard University in the Kennedy School on the politics of race. One of the things,



though, I'm going to do in Akron, where I go to on weekends, is build a \$2 million family life center in the heart of the ghetto, and get Jewish rabbis and Jewish synagogues to come in with me on this project, so that on the black side we can try to work on this ill feeling toward Jews. This is not being done in Washington. It's not being done with federal money. It's being done in the locality -- Just to do what you just said. We have to get to know each other.

If you don't know each other, if you don't know about each other -- if you're white and you're not going to go see Amistad, if you're white and you're not going to see Roots -- which is why Alex Haley wrote it -- he didn't write it for my benefit, he wanted to show a lot of white people the reason I'm this color is something that they ought to understand, that a tenth generation ago, a white man could be my cousin. These are the kinds of things that we simply must do in terms of attitude and atmosphere.

And then let me just finally say, I know the government -- we all know the government cannot impose upon the media in this country. But one of the things you're Advisory Council may want to do is convene some meetings in a very nice and positive way with media people and remind them that they are a great part of this attitude, effect. A woman out in Virginia six months ago had six black babies, sextuplets. Never got mentioned anywhere. Didn't get a dime from any corporation, diapers or anything. Then this woman out in Iowa has seven and she's in more magazines than you are.

Now, you're going to tell me that there's not something inherently wrong with that? And it wasn't until some of us ministers kicked up a fuss that now some of the corporations are starting. These are the kinds of things that affect people's attitudes.

MR. CONNERLY: The threshold is seven. (Laughter.)

DR. GARRETT: Because it was close.

MS. THERNSTROM: But, you know, there isn't anybody in this room who would deny that we've got a long ways to go down the road to racial equality. And there's nobody in this room who would deny that there's a lot of racism still in this society. I mean, the question from me is the trend lines. Have we been walking in the right direction, and do we continue to walk in the right direction. And those trend lines look very good. And I think that one of the things we need to do in having a decent racial dialogue is not only to get beyond race, but also to get beyond emoting over race. And there is much too much emoting and there is much too much name-calling as well.

And there's a distortion of information that for me is absolutely mindboggling. I mean, I was on the Jesse Jackson show the Sunday before last. Jesse Jackson says to me, Abigail, black graduates of Harvard College still can't get jobs. And I said, Jesse, Jesse -- I think that this whole conversation could come together to a much greater degree if we can move off the anecdotes,

the pain, and on to the landscape of what do we know.

And a lot of what we know is simply denied about how far we have come. If you can get the landscape right, then you can say, look, we have the following problems still: 27 percent of black families still in poverty. That's not much different than 1970. That's a catastrophic problem. We still have -- we have a racial gap in academic performance such that black kids in 12th grade are reading on the average four years behind white and Asian kids. That stacks the deck against those kids for the rest of their lives.

The solution to that isn't preferences; the solution -- and the solution to the police force -- we'll have a diverse police force tomorrow if we can close that gap in academic performance such that you've got -- so that you give police exams and there is no racial disparity.

I think, Mr. President, you've said some wonderful things on education. I'd like to push you further on them. But to me, that is absolutely the key. I think it's a national scandal that we are even one kid fall through the cracks.

THE PRESIDENT: I do, too. I think what Chicago has done, tells everybody that you've got to go summer school if you don't measure up and if you don't measure up a second time, you can't go ahead -- your self-esteem will be hurt more when you're 50 and you can't read than when you're 16 and you have to stay back another year. I think that's great.

But let me just say, first of all, I think what you generally just said is absolutely right. The reason I wanted you to come here today is that I hope there will be another series of meetings where we'll get even more diverse group -- I mean, diverse by opinion. Because what I'm trying to get to is -- here's my theory about this -- I think if we could ever get to the point where we would ask ourselves, can we agree on the objective, and then talk about what means will work, and then look at the things we don't like and say, well, do they do any good; and what harm did it do.

For example, what I think about affirmative action, a lot of these economic -- let's just take economic affirmative action. What I honestly believe is that it did a profound amount of good for the people who got into the programs who might never have had a chance to be successful business men or women. But I believe the problems with it are twofold. Number one is, once you get in and you start doing it, it's hard to graduate out. This whole theory about graduating out and moving through, going out into the private sector -- that theory never really worked very well. And we ought to fess up; those of us who were for it ought to say that's one of the problems that didn't work.

The other problem is it doesn't reach the vast majority of the people who have a problem because it doesn't reach down into basically the isolated urban areas with people in the economic

underclass.

So if we say, okay -- you know, we can all say, okay, here are the facts -- it was a pretty good thing, but it didn't do everything it was supposed to do, so should we argue about getting rid of it, should we argue about doing something else, should we argue about what's going to happen to these people? I mean, I think there's a lot to be said for that.

Let me go back to what Steve said about the composition of the police force when you got into the tete-a-tete with the Vice President. Let me just mention three things because Governor Kean mentioned this. The seven white septuplets were delivered by two African American women doctors. Two days later, two black kids were rescued in a Chicago fire by a white fireman. Nobody feels anything but good about that. Why is that? Or why do all these rich white Republicans pay to go down and watch some black guys play basketball at the MCI Center? I would argue there is something that all these things share in common that don't necessarily get answered in the police -- (inaudible) --

One is, in the case pro basketball, here I am, I don't have a doubt in the world that if I'd been good enough I could have played pro basketball. I know it. If I'd been good enough, by God, I could have played. I was short, fat, and slow by today's standards. (Laughter.) I couldn't play. Doesn't have anything to do with my race. I don't have a doubt in the world. If I have a child, I don't have a doubt in the world that my child can play if he or she is good enough. So that's the first threshold. Without regard to race -- I think we could all agree with that. In whatever setting, people have to know, if they're good enough, they can play. And if they need a hand up to prepare themselves, they can get it.

The second thing is, in the case of the black women doctors who delivered the septuplets -- which is not always the case in the case of police -- which is why I agree with the Vice President -- the community, which was of a different race -- there was no question about whether they could do their job in a way that would be fair to everybody. In the case of the white fireman who risked his life to go in and get the last two black kids in the Chicago fire -- he made a statement that was louder than any words I will ever utter, that he was in tune with the people in that community. He was in tune enough that he was willing to lay his life down to save those two little children. Nobody will ever care again whether that guy is on their fire or sitting idly out in front of the fire station, as I hope he will be.

So there's two criteria. One is can you play if you're good enough, whatever the thing is. Two is, does everybody in the community have confidence that the people in the position, whatever they are, have sufficient concern about them, are consistently involved with them, that whatever is supposed to be done is going to get done.



I think in the case of the fireman, and the doctors and the basketball players, the answer is yes. I think in the case -- huge numbers of urban police departments, huge numbers of the business sector, huge sections of higher education -- you can't say that the answer is yes. That's why I'm hung up about it. But I don't think that -- I think the reason that I'd get frustrated if the debate is only about affirmative action is, if we win 100 percent of the debate, we're talking about 10 percent of the people. If you win 100 percent of the debate, we're still just talking about 10 percent of the people. What about everybody else?

MS. CHAVEZ: That has been our argument.

MS. THERNSTROM: But, why don't you have confidence that we can train policemen the way we train firemen so that when a policeman show up at the door, it doesn't matter what the race of that policeman is?

THE PRESIDENT: What I don't have confidence in is that in the police department's where there is not affirmative action that there is a selection process that is not race-based.

MS. THERNSTROM: Why not go after the problem instead -- it's like college admissions -- instead of going after the problem of the failure of our schools in the K-12 years, we say, okay, we're going to shut our eyes to that problem and we're going to preferentially admit them in hope something --

THE PRESIDENT: What about all the people who are sitting around waiting for that to happen? Are we just going to let them drift away?

MS. CHAO: -- very complicated, and there is really a problem on both sides. I think you and the Vice President obviously have demonstrated you care deeply about this problem. And I think you should be applauded, from my point of view, in terms of showing that you care, offering some leadership, and talking about this issue. I think it's enormously complicated. But I do want to say you, as the President of this country, have an enormous opportunity to really lead this country on a new millennium, as you put it, of race relations, and that is that people are judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

What has bothered me so far about the debate is that it's very much a monochromatic kind of debate. It has been about African Americans, and it's been about whites. And certainly there has been a great deal that has contributed to the current status of these two races, but if we really talk about a diversified nation, in which there is richness and diversity, we have to talk about other people.

And I'm not pushing for Asian Americans or

Latino-Hispanic Americans, but that's what you get pretty much into when you start talking about color -- will it be white or black, then it's Asian Americans, and then it's Hispanic Americans. And actually, most of the time Asian Americans don't even rate. They don't even get into the debate. It's primarily whites, African Americans, Latinos, and that's it.

I'm very concerned about this whole issue about who gets to be let in to whatever program there is. And affirmative action, as enunciated by you and the Vice President speaks of compassion and good intentions and you care, and you want good things to happen. But what happens when good programs in the process hurt other people? And I just think about Asian Americans. I came here as an immigrant. I didn't speak a word of English. I came when I was 8 years old. My father held three jobs. I learned English at night, after 11:00 p.m., when he came back from work. And that's how I learned English.

And imagine what it's like not to speak English, and then arriving here and two months later having all these little monsters and goblins ring at your door bell -- (laughter) -- and stick something in your face to get candy. It was Halloween. We didn't know that. (Laughter.)

But what kept us through those days was -- what kept us through those days, you know, was a sense of empowerment that I think you and the Vice President want for Americans, and that you want to empower people, but you can't empower people by these artificial programs that occur too late.

What held my family and me together during those very, very hard times is we just knew we would never be in this condition forever. And that hope sustained us, incredibly so, through all those years. And then, also, we just knew that if we worked hard and that if we are together as a family that we would indeed be all right.

And so that's only my personal example and my personal experience, but I think it's applicable to many others. And there's stories upon stories of immigrants who come to this country with no experience of being an American, who don't speak the language, who don't understand the culture, and what they really want is just an equal opportunity. And what happens when that equal opportunity is no longer a level playing field, but with the best of intentions it's being turned into something that is unfair to them?

Right now, for example, your administration is talking a great deal about changing standards -- college admission standards because -- (inaudible) -- where test scores don't really matter. You don't really need test scores to succeed -- which is true. On the other hand, you can't neglect it altogether.

I went to Harvard, and I was kicked off of the Harvard Alumni Board. And for an Asian American that's a big admission. We don't get kicked very many -- at least we don't admit it.

(Laughter.) But at Harvard, Asian Americans are an over-represented minority as they are in many, many college and universities.

MS. THERNSTROM: Eighteen percent --

MS. CHAO: And if you are to -- that's still an over-representation because we're only two percent of the population. So we're way over. And what happens is if you're a white child going to Harvard, you have 17 percent chance; if you are African American, you have almost 30 percent chance; if you are a Latino American, 25 percent chance; if you're an Asian American child, you have an 11 percent.

And so for all those new immigrants who come here and work so hard, they find that the rules are being changed all the time. First of all, you have to get involved in extracurricular activities. Oh, great -- okay. So now Asian American parents have caught on and they're getting all their kids to be yearbook editors, doing all this -- now, they're changing it to where they need leadership qualities. What does that mean -- leadership qualities?

I'm on this very large corporation's scholarship program, and we fund scholarships -- \$16,000 a year -- to high school students. These kids -- Asian American kids -- don't do well because they don't excel under this new category called leadership. They're not outspoken. I listened for a long time before I jumped in here myself. But they're not aggressive. They're not voluble, and so that's all taken against them.

So our world is very complicated. There are cultural differences. And I want people to understand cultural differences. And we should relish and delight and celebrate in each other's cultural background. That's what it means to be an American.

But when programs like affirmative action are set up -- and there again, we're not against it. I'm not against outreach. I think we've got to do more aggressive outreach. But when the standards were lowered, that's a real problem. I think the things that we must be focusing on, you as a President have so much authority in this. We've got to emphasize education. Asian American families are not any smarter. They just emphasize education so much more.

When Korean -- I'm going to digress a little bit -- when Korean grocers are being harassed by African American activists, no white politician, no politician came to their defense. And I think we have to somehow think about how do we structure family and make it stronger so that the family can sustain and develop the kind of nurturing background we want for all Americans.

And so I think we've got to work on families, we got to work on education -- there's a whole slew of new initiatives that I

hope we can take a look at. But this land is a land of opportunity. Somehow we've become victims also. A lot of times there's emoting, as Abigail says, and there's a lot of blaming. And we've become in many ways a nation of whiners, we whine a lot. And some of these programs I think cater to -- (inaudible) --

But again, I think it's a great opportunity for you to direct the path for the next millennium. And it's one in which we ought to really, all Americans, focus on issues of opportunity, economic opportunity -- these are the things that we should --

MR. CONNERLY: I suspect that the time does not equal the supply of ideas we wanted to give you, and I just wanted to share with you some things that you can read to cure insomnia.

But there are some specific things I want to suggest to you. The one hopeful thing that I wanted from this dialogue about race was structure. We've been talking about it, certainly my state now, for about four years, in a very intense way, the University of California and with Proposition 209. But all too often there is no structure to it. It's ad hominem attacks. It's questioning the motives of people.

And, Chris, I want to talk to you a little later, because there is something on a Web page there that calls me a counter-revolutionary, a minority counter-revolutionary. And they had it attributed it to you.

And I think that for us to get beyond where we are now, there need to be some structure to the dialogue. And we've got to stop playing the race card. We have to stop calling each other names, stop questioning motives. And I submit to you, sir, that one thing that might help move this panel forward is to take the whole subject of affirmative action off their plate. Let them deal with the broader subject of race absent the issue of preferences, because we're not going to solve that one anyway. And as a result of the belief that many of us have that the panel is not objectively constructed, to be candid with you, it's fun to pollute all of the other things that they might do. So my suggestion, respectfully, is to just take that out of their hands.

The second thing is I think that the time frame that is self-imposed ought to be extended because the ball has been fumbled a little bit, candidly, until now, and the discussion is just now getting -- beginning to happen in earnest. And if it comes to an end on June 4th, I think that's going to be premature, candidly. So I would strongly suggest that you extend it another six months or so, so that the debate can unfold in the fullness of time as it seems not to be unfolding.

MS. THERNSTROM: But the board itself is so monolithic in its voice, and as far as I can tell -- I mean, yes, Lisa Graham

Keegan was there yesterday and William Bennett was there yesterday, but those were exceptions. And for instance Gary Orfield was there saying, once again that schools are more segregated than ever before, which I regard as junk social science. I mean, it's just not sustained by the data.

MR. THERNSTROM: He defines a segregated school as one that's 25 percent Asian, 25 percent black, 25 percent Hispanic, 25 percent white -- you need a white majority school for it to be not segregated. And that's backwards. The tables of his latest report are all defined in terms of --

GOVERNOR KEAN: -- offensive yesterday -- whenever it was, the day before yesterday -- that was a good meeting, and it was not monolithic.

MS. THERNSTROM: But there needs to be -- there are two camps, there needs to be a spectrum of scholarly voices --

GOVERNOR KEAN: Where do you put Deb Myer?

MS. THERNSTROM: Deborah Myer?

GOVERNOR KEAN: Yes.

MS. THERNSTROM: Well, I think that you're right; she's a very complicated -- you know, I'm a big admirer of hers.

GOVERNOR KEAN: So am I. People like that were on the panel.

MS. THERNSTROM: That's good. I didn't realize she was there, because in general -- I didn't realize she was at that meeting --

MR. THERNSTROM: This last case seems to have been more diverse than --

DR. GARRETT: But, Abigail, you're sitting in the Oval Office of the land with the President listening to you. Now, what I would like to know, as a lifelong Republican conservative -- some days, some days not -- if you want to use those silly terms -- what are you going to do? Don't tell me about studies and figures. Fine. Let us all acknowledge those. But it doesn't help one bit to write books, to write studies, and the people are still milling around suffering.

This President deserves to have the concrete recommendations. Asian Americans, what's to keep them from having dialogue and building centers with blacks and Jews and others? You see, you talk about this, but I have seen precious few who are against affirmative action get out there and start something.

MS. THERNSTROM: If we can describe properly the racial



landscape, including the problems -- of course, the fact that 85 percent of black children who are in poverty are in single-parent households, for instance -- if we can describe the racial landscape and agree on what it looks like, then we can move forward on that basis. But I have to tell you that social scientists are no better than the man on the street in recommending policies. They are very good at analyzing what the picture looks like. Saying what we should do is a different mountain to climb, and I don't think --

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead. Lynn, you haven't talked enough.

MS. MARTIN: As I age, I'm less able to speak for groups of people, especially before I went back to teaching. Now I find I'm not as sure of anything -- (inaudible) -- but I do think it's true that a majority of Americans -- you talk about the man in the street -- I think they're already a lot farther along than I think anybody has given them credit. I think most blacks, most whites, most Asians, most -- everyone, men and women want it, which gives a President, this President enormous opportunities. And it also, I think, from some of my experiences over the last two years, indicates that there should be a couple of smaller things that we can all enjoy successfully. But that's very important to people -- some of the more complex things that one has to do.

But there have to be some measurable successes that everybody agrees that, hey, that's a good thing, and we all did it. I've worked a little more with gender, but if you get a group of women together and a group of men, they can look at exactly the same thing -- (inaudible) -- the difference is phenomenal. It doesn't mean facts are different, but it does mean perceptions are different. And we have to work part of the time at perception. We have to keep moving beyond -- the more times you can make people know their thinking the same, the better. And I came to a different conclusion -- it's almost opposed to the anti-anecdote. I decided to check over the last 10 years what had happened to me, because I'm older, I believe, than I think almost everybody in this room.

MS. TERNSTROM: I doubt it.

Q I look older. At least I will say that. But I grew up as a northerner thinking you all were the bad guys, which was a very nice way to grow up. I mean, in fact, I didn't know any blacks and Hispanics, never crossed by brain that many -- you know, that somehow there was something a little strange here. It was the southerners -- it was very comfortable -- (inaudible) -- intellectually, you didn't have to challenge anything. The last few years, and this is late in my life, just as in my 30s I got male friends -- not dates, friends, for the first time, very different thing. I now have, mostly acquaintances, but some friends, and my God, they've added to my life. And maybe we don't say that often enough.

The reason most American businesses are supporting



affirmative action has nothing -- well, one hopes it has something to do with they want to feel good -- the reason they want to do it has to do with they think it's a business imperative and business is going to be better than global enterprise -- (inaudible) -- that I think -- enjoying the idea of how much better -- (inaudible) -- because of this. So that, sure, there's some tough stuff, and sure there's some other things -- I think people still write checklists, to an extent. And if we can check off a couple of things in the next few years -- the only thing I would ask now is don't set a goal -- I mean Abraham Lincoln didn't get -- Martin Luther King didn't -- don't have small dreams but have some reasonable goals.

THE PRESIDENT: One thing -- let me just ask you all to think about this because I agree -- one of the things I do agree with what Ward said is that I -- before you came in here I was holding my head saying, oh my God, those people are coming in here and we've got to stay here for four hours -- but let me -- nearly everybody agrees that the laws that are on the books against discrimination based on race against individuals should be enforced.

MS. THERNSTROM: Everybody agrees with that.

MS. CHAVEZ: Everybody in this room.

THE PRESIDENT: We are grossly under -- we have never properly funded the EEOC, but to be fair, we also need to look at --and this may be kind of a bridge between what we've been arguing about and what we agree on -- there's a lot of interest -- and Chris is getting me some information on this -- about trying to develop some sort of way the EEOC can get rid of its backlog in part by drawing up consent orders that would go beyond litigation and would change the way people treat their employees. Not necessarily on a race, not a race-based treatment, but the way you develop, the way you recruit, the way you reach out -- and one of the -- to go back to Lynn's checklist -- one of the things we would like to get everybody to agree to is a certain approach on that -- on kind of a comprehensive approach and getting rid of the accumulated back log of race claims and where you go from there.

The other think I would just like to say, because I know we're going to have to wrap up pretty soon, is I agree with you, we need a structure for the discussion which permits us to continue to talk, sharply identify in a non-rhetorical way our differences and ask if there is some way to build on this so we can actually get something done.

I talked to J.C. Watson -- he called me last night and I was out of pocket and I called him this morning and we talked for 20 or 30 minutes because he was -- (inaudible) -- and it was an interesting conversation. I just think if you're willing, I'm willing to make this not a one-shot deal, but to continue to work on this. I really sympathize with how the immigrant -- Asian immigrant -- particularly first generation Asians feel with the shift in --

MS. CHAO: We're just learning rules and goddamn it, they change them on us. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: The real issue here is, if you go back there's a lot of thought been given in the private schools -- (inaudible) -- great one to talk about -- that a lot of these private universities are thinking, okay, now, what if the colleges, if all the public institutions end affirmative action in their admission process, and they don't really -- and the state doesn't come up with a comprehensive alternative they'd like, where you've got all the colleges maybe taking over public schools, in effect, in terms of their college prep. So you get to -- you maintain the diversity of student body population with non-race-based policies. Then will the private institution basically have to carry the burden of educating a more diverse student body, or unless we're going to resegregate higher education like we once had.

So there's a reexamination on about whether -- I'm not saying that what you said is how you described it, that that's the right way to do it, but there is a genuine, I think, reassessment about whether test scores plus grades should be the only predictor of success in college and success -- the only definer of merit, and whether we can assume that there is somehow an absolute character to that. As a matter of fact, the test scores were -- -- (inaudible) -- pretty good rough indicator.

But, you know, look at what Texas is doing. I mean, it's this desperate attempt, I think -- I don't mean it's -- desperate sounds critical, I'm not being critical. But people are looking around and trying to find a way to honor America, be fair, and still have a society where everybody's got a chance. Keep in mind, go back to basketball and our view of the doctors in Iowa, the people have got to believe everybody had a chance.

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, whatever the criteria that you come up with, I don't believe that it is good public policy or fair to say you're going to have different rules for different groups. And I think that's -- you know, I'm not saying SAT scores are the end all, or SAT and GPAs, but when you come up with a criteria, that criteria has to be equally applied to every individual, and that you can't decide that if your name is Chavez and you go to apply, or one of your children does, you get judged under a different criteria. That's what we have now. And I think that was what --

THE PRESIDENT: You wouldn't be opposed to affirmative efforts that were not race-based, would you?

MS. CHAVEZ: That's right. I wouldn't be because --

THE PRESIDENT: And if they're not race-based, they --

MS. CHAVEZ: If they're not raced-based, if they're aimed at educational disadvantage, social disadvantage, economic

disadvantage, and if they are aimed at that, they have to be more than just letting people in the door, because there is a reason why we use test scores and GPAs to let people into higher education. It is because they are good predictors of success.

And one of the things, and, Thad, this is where I disagree with you -- one of the things I've been most adamant about opposing racial preferences for is that they allow us to sweep under the rug the kind of skills differences that Abby and Steve -- (inaudible) -- they allow us the easy out. They allow the companies -- oh, sure, oh, yes, we have 80 percent Hispanics and 12 percent blacks and other in proportion group represented here. What they don't tell you is that they're shuffled off to the EEO offices of human resources or someplace else, and in colleges they flunk out, or they end up being bounced down to a school that they probably would have done well in if they had gotten in on their own merit.

I mean, this is the problem and it sends a terrible message to my children. I have to tell you, I resent it deeply as a Mexican American woman that -- as the mother of three sons, that my children are assumed not to be able to make it under the same standards as your children. And I just don't think that it is right. And it does something that is very corrosive to minorities to be telling them we don't expect you to meet the same standards.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I'd like to say something else, Mr. President. I disagree with what I've heard here, but it's a great learning opportunity and I think the dialogue validates the President's decision to invite all of you to come into the Oval Office.

Mr. Connerly began by talking about traits over which we have no control. I think that what the debate really is about is traits over which we do have control. Specifically, I think there is a vulnerability in human nature to prejudice. I think we have the ability to overcome it. But I think that it is naive in the extreme. And I don't say that pejoratively; I'm just saying that this is my personal view. I think it is naive in the extreme to assert that there is no persistent vulnerability to prejudice -- rooted in human nature, prejudice based on race and ethnicity -- and other characteristics as well.

Let me just finish, please, and then you can ask me a yes or no question. (Laughter.)

Let me just finish. If you look at the world around us right now, what we intervene to help stop in Bosnia demonstrated that prejudice based on race and ethnicity led to an unleashing of evil. I that evil lies coiled in the human soul and all of us faces spiritual challenge throughout our lives. And I think that racial differences can serve as a trigger for unleashing hatred. And I think that people are prone to be with people like themselves, to hire people to look like themselves, to live near people who look like themselves. And yet in our society when we have this increasing

diversity, we have a community value, a national interest in helping to overcome this inherent vulnerability to prejudice.

What happened to Chinese in Shanghai 50 years ago last week,\* happened in part because of the enhanced vulnerability to that explosion of hatred across ethnic lines. What happened in Rwanda between the Hutus and the Tutsis happened in significant part because the explosion of hatred was triggered by this ethnic difference -- the differences in educational levels, the historical differences, the history of domination of one over the other also played important roles. But to deny that there is this factor called race that is persistent is, I think, just wrong.

Now, Steve, when you said -- or seemed to imply that there's no reason, rationally based, for an African American neighborhood to feel any differently about a police force that's 100 percent white than they would feel if there was representation of blacks on the police force. That, it seems to me is just profoundly wrong.

My view, in contrast, is that just as it seems obvious that the police force in that situation will be more effective in doing its job if it is representative of the community, it is also obvious that a university is going to provide a more valuable educational experience if the students there are going to be able to come into contact with people from different ethnic groups so that the next generation of Lynn Martins -- thoughtful, intelligent, commitment, desiring change, don't wait until the sixth decade of life to have their lives experience --

MS. MARTIN: No, no, fifth decade -- (laughter).

THE VICE PRESIDENT: -- to have their lives enriched by that extra experience. And the nation as a whole, I believe, is enriched if we overcome this tendency. Now, to say that there's progress is to say that a lot of the things we have been doing have worked. A lot of the extra affirmative efforts that have resulted in these police forces becoming more diverse -- I mean, they didn't get that way by accident. They got that way --

MS. MARTIN: They got that way because they passed laws against discrimination.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: No, that's not true either. They got there partly because there was enforcement of laws against discrimination, but mostly because there were affirmative efforts in the hiring decisions to go out and get people from the other communities to come into the police forces. The same thing is true in a lot of the categories of progress that you measure. To say there's progress is not to say if we stop these efforts, things are going to continue in the same direction. If we stop these efforts, we could see the United States lose its ability to lead the world away from this vulnerability to ethnic prejudice and racial --

MR. CANADY: But, Mr. Vice President, none of us are suggesting that we stop all of these efforts. We believe in the outreach efforts that have gone on. We believe we should actually intensify those efforts. What we have a problem with is classifying people on the basis of their race and telling some people they're going to lose because they belong to a non-preferred group, and other people they're going to win because they belong to a preferred group. We believe that that is harmful to everyone, because it sends the kind of message I talked about earlier and it's inconsistent with our ideas.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me ask you a question. One of the things that tickled me about -- since I grew up in the south, in addition to being bloodied by Atlanta people -- (inaudible) -- on the race problem in the country, we were all so obsessed with athletics. One of the things that tickled me about the California affirmative action vote was that there was -- preference vote -- is that there was an exception made for athletes. So you can give a preference for athletes to get into Berkeley, so Berkeley can have a nice football team and a nice basketball team.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Alumni giving.

THE PRESIDENT: But the A student who doesn't get into Berkeley, the Asian A student who doesn't get into Berkeley is just as hurt because he didn't get in so everybody could be tickled at the next basketball game as he would have been hurt if some A student who grew up in a black family in Oakland and didn't go to a high school and therefore didn't make quite as high a score on the college board -- he still loses the opportunity. He just loses it to a basketball player instead of a kid with thick glasses who struggled late at night in Oakland to make good grades, but didn't quite make a high enough college board score to get in. What's the difference? Why is it justified? Why is athletic discrimination so wonderful and the race discrimination --

Q Well, you can get rid of it. If you want to sign an executive order --

Q And alumni discrimination as well.

MR. CONNERLY: Mr. President, I have to say that this has been a great party until now, but just as we're -- the clock is ticking, we're ready to go out the door, you ruined my weekend with those very -- (laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Is that not true? If it's not true, I don't want to falsely accuse you.

MR. CONNERLY: Very loaded questions, very loaded statements that command far more than the five or 10 minutes we have left. Our founders -- they talked for hours about human nature as the basis of what kind of government we were going to develop. And it's frightening to me -- it is truly frightening to me, at the



characterization of human nature, Mr. Vice President, that you portray, because it suggests that we cannot rise above it.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: No, I said specifically, we can.

MR. CONNERLY: -- unless government is there demanding, demanding that we be held accountable. The presumption of our people, the presumption of our nation is that we're good people, that we can be fair, and that we will do the right thing. There are going to be some that are going to do wrong, and we'll bring those into line. But it's not that we are prone to do bad. And the whole question here about athletes and alumni -- my God, any of us can be athletes or alumni. It has nothing to do with our skin color.

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't say anything about alumni.

MR. CONNERLY: Well, he did. But there are just certain traits here that we as a society are making a judgment about --

THE PRESIDENT: The only point I made -- (laughter) -- don't get our two speeches mixed up. The only point I'm trying to make is, if you ever have any -- if you decide what the criteria of academic merit is, and let's say you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards -- this is the only point, I'm making a narrow point. If you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards, and then you decide -- you make a decision, which I think you could make a compelling argument is a legitimate decision, that athletics is an important part of university life, that it enriches the lives of all the other students who are there. You can make that argument, but the point is, once you make that argument, that's the argument you could also make for having a racially diverse student body. I was making a very -- I'm not making a wholesale assault.

Now, here's my problem with this whole deal, I know we've got to go. So I want to give you a chance to say -- what we really before, which is, how do we give structure to this and what do you think the next step should be? And I'll give anybody else a chance. Look, when I was a governor, I became the first governor in the history of the country to sponsor legislation to require -- (inaudible) -- certified.

I believe I passed the first law requiring kids in the whole state to have to pass an exam before they could actually go onto high school, because I didn't like the high school graduation -- I thought that was closing the barn door after the cattle left. The reason I have consistently supported affirmative action programs -- but I really have tried to change them and make them work -- is not because -- I basically think all that stuff you said is right. I am sick and tired of people telling me poor minority kids who live in desperate circumstances, that they can't make it. I think they should be told they can make it, but they have to work harder to make it. And then I think we should give them a hand up to make it. I am tired of that.



The reason I have supported affirmative action programs is very different, is I have done it because I didn't want to see all these kids be sacrificed to a principle I agree with, because the practice of life would not be fixed in time to give them a chance --number one.

And number two, I have had the feeling about police departments and fire departments and business environments and university admissions that I felt about the athletes -- that I really thought that the institutions were better off and the white majority or whoever else, was better off if there was some inter-mixing because of the world they're going to live in.

But I am always -- I think we should all be uncomfortable, those of us who support this -- for giving something to somebody when we deprive somebody that was otherwise more deserving by the traditional criteria of getting it. But I think on balance, that's why I've been very strongly -- but I have never wanted to not have high standards, not be demanding, not do things. I mean, I've paid a pretty good price for this -- (inaudible) -- and I'm not ashamed of having done it. I think that the kids in my state are better off because of it.

But we need to figure out a way to recognize that what we'd really like is for people without regard to their race to be able to do the kind of business, go to the kind of schools, have the kind of public service jobs and live in the kind of integrated environment that they choose if that is the choice they make, because there would be no differences in traditional measures of merit and how they did, so that people would be making their own choices and having their own choices. I think that's -- we all agree that that's the world we want.

So I'd like to know what you think the next step should be. If you want to stay involved in this; you want to keep talking to us; you want to keep working with us; and you want to get some more -- different kind of people in here. What do you think we ought to do now?

GOVERNOR KEAN: Can I say something on the Race Commission -- when the President asked me to sit on this, the first time he asked, I said no. And I finally said yes because I was totally convinced, first of all, that this was the only President in my lifetime, though not a President of my own party, who's willing to take this on, to really try to establish some sort of a dialogue and try to make progress on this; and secondly, because I thought there was a chance -- maybe not a big chance, but a chance -- we could do some real good.

I was among those who was very critical of the commission at its first couple of meetings, because -- (inaudible) -- talking to each other and was not listening to adverse opinions, and therefore we weren't serving this President very well. It's our job

-- not to write a report for the commission, our job is to advise this President on some of the best ideas we can find in the country so that this will hopefully be part of his legacy.

So this race commission is going to open up the dialogue -- (inaudible) -- be listening to all sorts of ideas from every end of the political spectrum in the hopes that we can bring good ideas to this President so that he can succeed in an initiative which I believe the country very much wants him to succeed in. So whatever has gone on in the past, I hope you will be open to the commission, that you will give ideas to us. And we will make sure that the best of the ideas are passed on to the President or this group can pass it on directly.

MS. THERNSTROM: I think that this has been a really wonderful meeting. And I'm very grateful to you for having invited us. But I do also have the feeling that if we were to continue it, that we really might get someplace.

THE PRESIDENT: That's what I think.

MS. THERNSTROM: Yes. We're feeling each other here. We're kind of making -- it's a first kind of stiff beginning, but that we might really --

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I resemble that remark.  
(Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: If you all are willing to do it and you will help us figure out a way to structure it, I'll do it. Let me

just give you -- I'll just give you one -- outside this door, probably sitting there -- I don't know if she's still there -- is my diarist for the White House who has lately been in the paper because -- (laughter) -- her name is Janis Kearnes. Her daddy was a sharecropper, and her mother a domestic. And they had 17 children -- 13 of them have college degrees. Five of them are lawyers. And all 17 of them have a first name that starts with the letter J.  
(Laughter.) Most of them went to school in Arkansas. One of them went all the way to Harvard. And some of them had affirmative action and some of them didn't, and they all did fine.

Look, somewhere in here there's a way that we can get to where we're trying to do -- stop talking past each other and start working together. I cannot believe that 90 percent of the people in this country don't want the same kind of country in terms of racial matters. And I will do my best to find a way for us to move beyond the -- (inaudible) -- honestly and respectfully state our differences and figure out away to work together. Because it is obvious, if you do not believe that there is any inherent -- (inaudible) -- among people based on race, then the differences we have today must have been rooted in the mistakes that have been made in the past or the breakdown of social institutions or personal institutions like the

family, the education system, and the networking of people in business and others. There has to be a way to rebuild those institutions, and we have to do it together.

I think it would be a shame if we didn't try to do this together. I'm trying to put this beyond partisan politics. I'm not trying to use you. I said that deal about the athletics, because I might have voted for the athletic thing, too, but I've always been with the races like athletics and not different from athletics. That's all. So we need to go.

If you have -- in addition to your suggestions, which Governor Kean is for, I want to know if you've got process ideas about how we can discipline this debate and to move it forward.

END

4:00 P.M. EST

\* Following the meeting, the Vice President noted that the events to which he referred took place in Nanjing 60 years ago.

#### Message Sent

To:

---

Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP  
Lori E. Abrams/WHO/EOP  
Jeannetta P. Allen/WHO/EOP  
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP  
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP  
Eli G. Attie @ OVP @ EOP  
Patrick Aylward/PIR/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP  
Kris M Balderston/WHO/EOP  
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP  
David S. Beaubaire/WHO/EOP  
Marsha E. Berry/WHO/EOP  
Antony J. Blinken/NSC/EOP  
Alexander L. Boyle/PIR/EOP  
Lanny A. Breuer/WHO/EOP  
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP  
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP  
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP  
Allison Balderston/OPD/EOP  
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP  
Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP  
Phillip Caplan/WHO/EOP  
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP @ EOP

David K. Chai/PIR/EOP  
Nanda Chitre/WHO/EOP  
Steven A. Cohen/WHO/EOP  
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP  
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP  
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP  
Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP  
Lanny J. Davis/WHO/EOP  
Elliot J. Diringer/CEQ/EOP  
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP  
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP  
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP  
Dorinda A. Salcido/WHO/EOP  
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP  
Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP  
Karen C. Fahle/WHO/EOP  
Julie A. Fernandes/OPD/EOP  
Karen E. Finney/WHO/EOP  
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP  
Ben A. Freeland/WHO/EOP  
Jeremy M. Gaines/WHO/EOP  
Grace A. Garcia/PIR/EOP  
Jessica L. Gibson/WHO/EOP  
Adam W. Goldberg/WHO/EOP  
Jason S. Goldberg/WHO/EOP  
Peter D. Greenberger/WHO/EOP  
Donald Goldberg/WHO/EOP  
Richard L. Hayes/WHO/EOP  
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP  
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP  
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP  
David T. Johnson/NSC/EOP  
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP  
Michele Jolin/CEA/EOP  
James M. Teague/WHO/EOP  
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP  
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP  
William R. Kincaid/OPD/EOP  
Allison J. King/PIR/EOP  
Joshua A. King/WHO/EOP  
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP  
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP  
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP @ EOP  
Heidi Kukis @ OVP @ EOP  
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP  
Christopher J. Lavery/WHO/EOP  
Anne H. Lewis/OPD/EOP  
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP  
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP  
Lisa J. Levin/WHO/EOP  
Michael D. Malone/WHO/EOP  
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP  
Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP  
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP

Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP  
Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP  
Estela Mendoza/WHO/EOP  
R. Scott Michaud/WHO/EOP  
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP  
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP  
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP  
Tamara Monosoff/PIR/EOP  
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP  
Jonathan Murchinson/WHO/EOP  
Melissa M. Murray/WHO/EOP  
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP  
Sean P. Maloney/WHO/EOP  
Michael V. Terrell/CEQ/EOP  
Steven J. Naplan/NSC/EOP  
Mark D. Neschis/WHO/EOP  
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP  
Neera Tanden/WHO/EOP  
Michael A. O'Mary/OPD/EOP  
Jonathan Orszag/OPD/EOP  
Peter R. Orszag/OPD/EOP  
Kristen E. Panerali/OPD/EOP  
Carole A. Parmelee/WHO/EOP  
Sally P. Paxton/WHO/EOP  
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP  
Peter O'Keefe/WHO/EOP  
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP  
Victoria Radd/WHO/EOP  
Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP  
Charles F. Ruff/WHO/EOP  
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP  
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP  
Evan Ryan/WHO/EOP  
Roger V. Salazar/OVP @ OVP  
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP  
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP  
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP  
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP  
Douglas S. Sheorn/WHO/EOP  
June Shih/WHO/EOP  
David Shipley/WHO/EOP  
Robert M. Shireman/OPD/EOP  
Jake Siewert/OPD/EOP  
Joshua Silverman/WHO/EOP  
Brian D. Smith/WHO/EOP  
Craig T. Smith/WHO/EOP  
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP  
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP  
Maria E. Soto/PIR/EOP  
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP  
Aviva Steinberg/WHO/EOP  
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP  
Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP  
Diane A. Stumpf/ONDCCP/EOP

Michael J. Sullivan/WHO/EOP  
Jonathan H. Schnur @ OVP @ EOP  
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP  
Sylvia M. Mathews/WHO/EOP  
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP  
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp @ eop  
Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP  
Amy W. Tobe/WHO/EOP  
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP  
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP  
Paul A. Tuchmann/WHO/EOP  
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP  
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP  
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP  
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp @ eop  
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP  
Angelina Walker @ ovp @ eop  
Glen M. Weiner/WHO/EOP  
Lowell A. Weiss/WHO/EOP  
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP  
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP  
William H. White Jr./WHO/EOP  
meglynn @ usia.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
SUNTUM\_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
SUNTUM\_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
princej @ panet.us-state.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
COGDELL\_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY  
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY  
BARBUSCHAK\_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
BARTHOLOME\_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
BARTHOLOW\_T @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
CROWLEY\_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
CUTLER\_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
DICKY\_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
GRAY\_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
GRIBBEN\_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
HAAS\_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
JOHNSON\_WC @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
LIZIK\_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
MOFFETT\_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
PR\_U=TDIXON @ PR\_L=AVUOEBOB @ MRP @ LNGTWY  
RILEY\_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
NAPLAN\_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
SMITH\_BD @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
TCSmith @ dol.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
WEINER\_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
WOZNIAK\_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
julie\_green @ ed.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY  
usia01 @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY  
1=US @ 2=WESTERN UNION @ 3= @ 5=ATT.COM @ \*ELN\62955104 @ MRX @ LNGTWY  
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com @ INET @ LNGTWY  
INFOMGT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY  
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com @ INET @ LNGTWY



usnwire @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ruby Shamir ( CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-DEC-1997 16:21:24.00

SUBJECT: Transcript of Conservatives Meeting for the Web

TO: HAYMES\_W ( HAYMES\_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [ UNKNOWN ] ) (OA)  
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Barry J. Toiv ( CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )  
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

December 19, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
IN OUTREACH MEETING

The Oval Office

2:43 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: First, let me thank you for coming in what must be a busy time for all of you. What I think may be the most productive thing to do, although Governor Kean, since -- (inaudible) -- may interject something here. I think what I'd like to do, to begin is just to hear from you. I'd like to -- on the question of, do you believe that race still matters in America and is still a problem in some ways. And if so, instead of our getting into a big fight about affirmative action -- although if you want to discuss it, we can -- what bothers me is that even I, who think it works in some ways, believe it works only when people -- it works predominantly for people who are at least in a position for it work. A lot of the people that I care most about are totally unaffected by it one way or the other.

So what I'd like to talk about today is that I thought that we could at least begin by just getting a feel for where you are and if you thinks it's still a problem, and if so, what do you think

we ought to do about it. And if you want to talk about affirmative action -- (inaudible) -- but I'm happy to do that.

MR. CONNERLY: I appreciate very much so to be here, and somewhat ironical that, after raising and giving -- (inaudible) -- to Republicans, I'm here at the request of a Democratic President. So I'm grateful to you for the invitation, sir.

I don't -- (inaudible) -- talking about what we call preferences, because that is central to the discussion about race. Yes, there is a problem in America. It's a serious problem. It's one that's complex, multidimensional. It doesn't lend itself to government solution in many cases. But we can't get to the problem of moving this nation forward with respect to the issue of race unless we deal with the perception by a large number of people that there are preferences that are being given to people simply because they check a box and then benefits are conferred on the basis of checking that box.

And the language here is very important. You said in June of this year that we need to have an honest dialogue. Well, up until this point, frankly, many of us think the dialogue has been less than honest from some of those who try to defend what they call affirmative action. I don't want to end all affirmative action, but I want to end every preference that I can find that's based on some trait over which I have no control. And if I want that for myself, I want it for other people as well.

So I don't think, sir, that we can have this dialogue today, which is perhaps one of our best shots at getting our point of view across, without talking about the --

THE PRESIDENT: What do you think we should do? Since there are -- since various racial minorities are represented in

groups of people that are at least not doing very well in this society, in numbers disproportionate to their numbers in the country as a whole, how should we respond to that?

MR. CONNERLY: I think that choice -- school choice is one way to respond to it. I think if we overhaul the K-12 system, which is one way to respond to it. They're trying to do that in California by lowering classroom sizes. We're looking at testing. We're looking at the quality of the teachers. We also have to start looking at ourselves. Are we telling our kids as parents that education is as important as it should be? So I think that there is a major change that needs to take place. But even if we don't make those changes, there is never, in my view, a rationale for discriminating against somebody on the basis of their skin color, regardless of what we want the outcome to be. That's my perspective, and I think it's a perspective that our nation has to hold true to.

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, let me just say this. As a fifth-generation Republican and as one who has worked in this very house under three Republican Presidents, I have a little concern about how my party and how conservatives function around this question. I would hope that we would not be bogged down today in a discussion of affirmative action, per se. Many of those programs and plans will be resolved by the court anyway.

When you said you wanted a conversation on race, we ought to -- not just this group -- but we all ought to talk about race and race relations. Affirmative action and mechanical programs will mean not a whit if we don't start changing attitudes. We don't know each other in this country. We don't know who lives next door to us in condominium buildings, let alone know about their concerns. And we have to, for a while, talk about race and not be bogged down by affirmative action discussion and debate.

Again, the courts will resolve that pretty much in part, but it just seems to me that the moral leadership that can be provided from this room and from all of us needs to be amplified. And one problem I have with my Republican and conservative brothers and sisters, no one ever wants to talk about race. No one ever wants to talk about the things that the people in Akron, my home town, talked about -- the attitudes. You don't know what it's like to stand on a street corner dressed like this and a car comes up -- cluck, and locks the door. These are things that people need to resolve in their minds.

That boy in Akron who said, he's friendly and all the rest, but when he sees a black man dressed a certain way -- this is the kind of leadership government leaders, ministers, college presidents, and many others, can provide. If we continue to allow affirmative action plans to divide us and to serve as a wall, we're not going to get anywhere.

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe you can -- (inaudible) -- and say. let's assume we abolished them all tomorrow and we just had to start all over, what would you do?

MS. CHAVEZ: I'd like to offer some suggestions, Mr. President, because I came here with a notion that you do want affirmative action, that you do understand -- (inaudible) -- affirmative action preferences are part of this debate is because there's a whole world of people out there who believe that they're wrong and that they send the wrong signal from government; that so long as you've got government picking winners and losers on the basis of the color of their skin, that you can't get beyond racism, you can't to the color-blind society.

I think that there are a lot of things we can do to reach those disadvantaged persons that you were talking about -- people who are socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged -- because that's who those programs were initially

aimed at. And I think it can be done in race -- (inaudible) -- ways.

I work at college admissions, for example, Mr. President, and I brought you some studies that my organization has done that shows not only that there are preferences in place in admissions, but that those preferences hurt black and Hispanic students, because kids who are admitted to schools under separate standards or the double standards, and who then are just allowed to sink or swim -- a lot of them sink. About 50 percent of them don't graduate from those college programs.

I work at a place like the University of Maryland, which has in place a program not aimed at race, but aimed at students who are the first in their family to attend college. I would have been able to qualify for such a program. A lot of disadvantaged kids out there would. And once those children are identified, they're brought in a summer program; they're given tutoring and special classes in reading, writing and mathematics; they're given study skills; they're given counseling. They're told what courses they should take their first year; they attend a very structured first year. Those kinds of programs would benefit people who are truly educationally and economically disadvantaged -- and more than just giving them a little badge and getting them to school, would help make sure that they get out of school, that they actually get that bachelor's degree, which is what none of the preference programs do.

And I have other examples -- and left you information on them. Because I think all of us in this room want to improve opportunity for blacks and Hispanics and other disadvantaged people in this society. We are committed to that. Where we come to debate is the best means to achieve that.

MR. CONNERLY: I just want to say also, I hope you haven't invited me here as a conservative. I'm here as an American who has a profound interest in the subject. I don't think you appointed people to your race panel because they were liberal or anything else. You appointed them because you thought they had something to contribute. I didn't come here I don't know how many miles to be here as a voice of a conservative. I left my party label and my ideology outside of this room.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Let me just say this, first of all. I think, if you imagine -- forget about -- think about what the world would look like 30 years from now if things go well -- that is, if all the threats to our collective security -- (inaudible) -- restrained, and trade develops as we hope it should, and we develop a decent education system that embraces virtually everybody -- (inaudible) -- The fact that the United States is -- (inaudible) -- multiethnic country that at some point in the next generation, in the next 50 years will, for the first time in its history, not have a majority of people of European origin, I think will make it an even more fascinating, even more interesting, and even more prosperous and successful place if we're not consumed or limited or handicapped in some ways because of our racial differences.

So, to me, this -- I'm looking at this through the perspective of the future that I want to see our country make for itself. And I don't think anyone has all the answers about how we should make that future.

If you look at -- there is no question that -- if you just African American kids in -- (inaudible) -- the middle class is growing and a lot of good things have happened. But there is also no question that there are still pockets where crime is greater, incarceration rates are horrendous, that education systems are not working. And even the people who do have some level, who are highly industrious and are dying to get into business very often don't have access to credit and don't have access to the networks.

Affirmative action originally I think on the economic side was a kind of networking thing, and on the education side it was designed to do what -- the Maryland program you just described. I think if there was ever a -- (inaudible) -- in college education -- we ought to be focusing on people who are educationally disadvantaged without -- -- (inaudible) -- preparation and continuing support that they need. The schools that have done that are much better.

MR. THERNSTROM: Mr. President, I think Mr. Garrett made two comments, and while I do think we may not know each other in some absolute sense, but we know each other across racial lines much more than we did a generation ago. I mean, the data is really quite stunning. A generation ago, only one-fifth of white people said they had any black friends; today 87 percent do. Eighty-seven percent of blacks say they have white friends. The rate of interracial dating has gone up spectacularly. The rate of interracial marriage, though still low, has gone up dramatically. So I do think there is much more positive change than is often thought.

And second, I do have to say that the Akron dialogue that Mr. Garrett speaks so favorably of I found very troubling and very one-sided. And I think very few American whites would have been deeply moved by that, because it involved the recitation by a series of blacks, Hispanics of painful experiences. There was no opportunity to question those experiences and say, hey, are you sure that was racism; maybe it was X, Y, or Z.

And then in one case where a white student talked about a racial concern, a racial fear, it was immediately reduced to, you know, was that your personal experience? Have you ever been mugged? If not, then you must have been watching too much television.

Now, Reverend Jackson, years ago, made a very powerful statement about precisely this when he said, walking down the street late at night, and I turn around and see over my shoulder and see they are whites following me, I'm relieved. There's a very powerful statement. It is a reality that certain neighborhoods, predominantly black neighborhoods in inner cities are very dangerous places at night. And they are very dangerous places largely because there are



black criminals who are committing criminal acts. And I don't think we can begin to discuss race relations honestly unless we in fact express -- whites express those fears and they can be dealt with, they can be discussed, but they shouldn't be dismissed.

And just one other point, which picks up on something Angela Oh said I gather at a race relations meeting long ago -- we do have to think of this as a multiracial or multiethnic problem, not just black and white. And it's often assumed, mistakenly, that the problem is white prejudice against blacks, Asians and Hispanics. In fact, some careful studies show that blacks have stronger negative stereotypes about both Hispanics and Asians than whites do, but Asians have stronger negative stereotypes about both groups than whites do, and that Hispanics have stronger negative stereotypes. And as those population elements grow, we're going to have a larger problem that will have to be addressed. It isn't just a matter of white racism that has to be combatted.

THE PRESIDENT: But if what you say is true -- you say the crime problem is disproportionately African American; that's like saying the college population is disproportionately white or the business population is disproportionately white. That doesn't justify an affirmative action program to -- (inaudible) -- like Section VIII of the SBA program.

The other day we had a group of African American journalists in here. Every man in the crowd, to a person -- there were, like, 20 of them here -- every man in that office, every single, solitary one, had been stopped by the police when he was doing nothing, for no reason other than the fact that he was black. And you say that's because there's a rational fear because of the fact that what occurs in some neighborhoods. Nonetheless, that is a race-based public policy. I'm just saying, it's not as simple as --

MS. THERNSTROM: No, we agree with that. We agree with that. It's unacceptable to me.

MR. THERNSTROM: But doesn't it happen in Detroit, in Atlanta, in other states where --

THE PRESIDENT: All I'm saying is it's very difficult to get these things out of our society. And you just made one reason why. Let me give you another example. Because of the -- a lot of work that's been done by a lot of people, there's been a dramatic increase in the capacity of the United States to limit the inflow of drugs into the country from the South by land and sea. But the consequence of that -- Mexico, which is a big, open country, has had enormous amounts of money invested there to try to undermine what little infrastructure there was to deter the influx of drugs. Five hundred million dollars was spent last year alone trying to bribe Mexican police.

Now, as a result, over half of the cocaine in the country comes across the Mexican border. So, all right, fast forward. What do you do if you're a local police officer with a drug

problem? That's what this whole profiling is about -- (inaudible) -- people who are Hispanic if they're driving through town. That's an affirmative action program. That's a race-based affirmative action program. So how do you --

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, some of us are opposed to that. I mean, Randall Kennedy has written, I think, very eloquently on exactly that issue. And those of us who oppose race preferences when they benefit groups are also opposed to them when they harm groups.

THE PRESIDENT: If you were running a police force, and you were trying to figure out how to deal with the drug problem, and you had a lot of people who were coming through your town on an interstate, and you had a limited amount of resources, and you couldn't stop every car, which cars would you stop?

MS. THERNSTROM: Every third car and come up with some of the criminals that way. I mean, I think police departments have to be held to the same standard that I want to see employers and universities and everybody else. I don't think we can make exceptions.

MR., CANADY: And it is inherently pernicious for our government to classify people on the basis of their race. And that sends a powerful message from the government to the people that we should judge one another on that basis. That's exactly the wrong thing for us to be saying. And that is the sort of government policy that reinforces a prejudice in our society and keeps us -- instead of going in the right direction toward unity, it keeps us caught in this dilemma that we are in now.

Our suggestion is that we've just got to get the government out of this business. Racial classifications in certain contexts were established with good intentions. And I think all of us would recognize that. We recognize that they were established in an attempt to overcome a history of discrimination and an attempt to come up with an effective means of combatting discrimination.

But our experience tells us that whenever the government gets involved in this business of classifying people based on race, the government is doing something harmful. And if our history as Americans, from the very beginning of this country, from the day the Declaration of Independence was promulgated to today, if it tells us anything, it should be that our government has no business dividing the American people into groups based on their race. It is something that is contrary to our fundamental ideals -- ideals we've never fully lived up to, but ideals that are the core of what it means to be American.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Could I ask a question, Mr. President? If you lived in a community that was 50 percent white, 50 percent black, and for a variety of historic reasons the level of income, educational attainment, and so forth was lower among the

blacks in that community, and the police force was 100 percent white, and the problems of the kind that we all deplore took place and other problems took place, and the community decided that the police force would be better able to do its job if blacks were much more represented on the police force, because then the police force would have a much greater ability to relate to the community effectively and to do its job -- under those circumstances, do you think that the community would be justified in making affirmative action efforts to open up a lot more positions on the police force for blacks?

MR. CANADY: Let me say two things in response to that. Number one, I believe in community policing. I actually supported the President's crime bill back in the first Congress I was here And I believe that the concept of community policing is important. One thing that you can do to have affective community policing is require that the people who are involved in that live in the communities they police. Now, that's the kind of policy I can support. You don't have to classify people based on their race to do that and to be affective in community policing.

But this idea that we should hire people because they're going to be more -- based on their race because they're going to be more sensitive to certain -- and more acceptable to certain people that they're serving can be replicated in our history in the south when people -- employers said, well, I'd like to hire some black people, but my customers wouldn't accept that. That is offensive. It was more than offensive, it was morally wrong. And I would suggest to you for the government to classify people -- even in such a context as that -- simply based on their race is morally offensive and inconsistent with our constitutional traditions.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, if I could just follow up briefly. Of course, I strongly disagree with you. And it seems to me that the case that I've described there presents a really obvious example of how the community as a whole would be better off and the effectiveness of the police force would be enhanced. And to say that it's -- that's there's nothing to the idea that a police force with black representation on the force would have an easier time relating to the black community is, I think, to deny the obvious, with all due respect.

MR. CANADY: Let me give you another example that's directly related to the sort of thing you're talking about. There are some people that contend that you have to take race into account in undercover police work. The theory is that you need black people to serve as undercover agents, and that's the only effective way that can be carried out. Well, you know, it's very interesting that the Drug Enforcement Administration actually had a policy of doing that. And the black drug enforcement agent sued the Drug Enforcement Agency over that very policy because it was discriminating against them. It was putting them in contexts where they were at greater risk, and it was limiting their opportunities for advancement. So what may start out as making some sense from one perspective can end up harming the very people that supposedly will benefit.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me ask you this. You don't quarrel with the fact -- because I think this is very important. This is the problem we have to deal with all the time. You don't quarrel with the fact that, other things being equal, in cities that had a racially diverse -- it would be a good thing if it could be done without race preferences to have a diverse police department.

MR. CANADY: Absolutely. I think we ought to have a police department that can work with --

THE PRESIDENT: But you just said that you like this whole idea of -- that's what we're doing now at HUD. We're actually encouraging police officers to go out and live in the neighborhoods where -- (inaudible) -- let them buy houses for half price if they'll serve in the neighborhoods where they live.

I've thought of that, and every time I go to New York, or any other big city, I always look at the police and see. So let me just say, I'm Irish -- Irish immigrants -- (inaudible) -- many of them, in urban police departments. And many of their children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren are still in urban police departments. And I think -- what I think we have to do is to figure out -- I think part of this problem will go away if we ask ourselves, are the criteria by which we are making this decision, whatever this decision is, really relevant. Are we really -- whether it's college admission -- are we keeping score in the right way here.

But it seems to me that we have a vested interest in the objectives. If we agree that we need an integrated police department, and that it would be better --

MR. TERNSTROM: We'd like to have an integrated police department.

THE PRESIDENT: -- that we would like to have one, and that our society would function better if we had one, then we should ask ourselves, okay, how are we going to get there.

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, with all due respect to the Vice President, the example he gave, I don't think you could find me a concrete example of such a place in urban America today. I've looked at the statistics. I don't have them off the top of my head, but I've written columns on this and I have looked them up, and statistics show that there are significant numbers of black and Hispanic police officers.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Partly because of affirmative action.

MS. CHAVEZ: It may not be proportional representation, but it is close to proportional. What I would look



at is first and foremost, are you discriminating in that police department. And I think every person in this room is adamantly in favor of vigorous enforcement of the civil rights law. And sure, there are employers out there, including public employers, who discriminate And we have to root out that kind of discrimination.

And then you do engage in outreach. You do create training programs. You do go into high schools and try and recruit people and get them ready so that they will be able to be prepared to take the test to become a police officer. Those are all things that you can do. And they are all things we approve of.

MR. THERNSTROM: But I do question the need for diversity defined narrowly in terms of skin color. I mean, I live in an almost all white community, so are we saying that the people of Lexington feel more comfortable being policed by whites, and there's some terrific black Africans for the police force, sorry, you go back to Roxbury, or something, we don't like your color? And I can think of communities with large numbers of Asians, but where Asian families are very strongly oriented turning out physicists and physicians, and the like, and not very interested in law enforcement.

Now, the notion that some large element of the population have no one in that kind of position is perhaps repellent, but once we start thinking of, well, 28 percent Asians -- got to be pretty close to 28 percent -- I think that -- and for that matter, I mean, after all, half the population is female. Should half of all our police forces be female?

GOVERNOR KEAN: No, I was just going to say a couple of things. One is, I think it is a goal of this country, and should be a goal, that if we're going to be successful in the next century, with the amount of immigration we have coming in now and being assimilated, that we've got to get to know each other as people.

As a college president, I can tell you the largest scholarship program in our state is based, not actually on race, but on poverty. But, in effect, because so many people who are Hispanic or African American who live in the poor areas it becomes a program where we take into our colleges -- (inaudible) -- people who we would not -- (inaudible) -- and then we mentor all the way through. I can tell you from the point of view of Drew University -- (inaudible) -- very high standards that we admit a number of those people who would have no chance for admittance under normal standards. And a number of them -- most of them get through. Almost of them get through. And a number of them graduate with high honors and go on to top graduate schools in the country. Those are the people who wouldn't have a chance otherwise.

So there's something -- the other thing we want to do is establish -- get to know each other better. We've got in my state too many segregated schools because of neighborhoods and too many colleges -- people from different races and groups for their own choice for whatever reason don't get together. As college presidents

we found two things -- I think there's a lesson here -- two areas where race disappears as a criteria for friendship. One is athletics -- play together on a team for a couple of years and you see the dining room and you see the people in different places, friendly, inviting each other to their homes, eating together. The other is -- (inaudible) -- those kind of things. Again, people are away from their --

And the lessons I get from them are, first of all, that our criteria for creating opportunity in this country -- (inaudible) -- a lot of people of ability are not getting into the system of higher education and should be, and many of them happen to be -- (inaudible) -- because they are poor -- (inaudible) -- The second is that if we could find ways of getting people to work on common projects that racial division seem to disappear and friendships occur. And once that happens, people -- (inaudible) --

DR. GARRETT: Mr. President, I totally agree. One of the things I'm doing -- and I'm based here in Washington and just stepped down as the Chairman of the Board of Howard University, and this semester have been teaching a course at Harvard University in the Kennedy School on the politics of race. One of the things, though, I'm going to do in Akron, where I go to on weekends, is build a \$2 million family life center in the heart of the ghetto, and get Jewish rabbis and Jewish synagogues to come in with me on this project, so that on the black side we can try to work on this ill feeling toward Jews. This is not being done in Washington. It's not being done with federal money. It's being done in the locality -- Just to do what you just said. We have to get to know each other.

If you don't know each other, if you don't know about each other -- if you're white and you're not going to go see Amistad, if you're white and you're not going to see Roots -- which is why Alex Haley wrote it -- he didn't write it for my benefit, he wanted to show a lot of white people the reason I'm this color is something that they ought to understand, that a tenth generation ago, a white man could be my cousin. These are the kinds of things that we simply must do in terms of attitude and atmosphere.

And then let me just finally say, I know the government -- we all know the government cannot impose upon the media in this country. But one of the things your Advisory Council may want to do is convene some meetings in a very nice and positive way with media people and remind them that they are a great part of this attitude, effect. A woman out in Virginia six months ago had six black babies, sextuplets. Never got mentioned anywhere. Didn't get a dime from any corporation, diapers or anything. Then this woman out in Iowa has seven and she's in more magazines than you are.

Now, you're going to tell me that there's not something inherently wrong with that? And it wasn't until some of us ministers kicked up a fuss that now some of the corporations are starting. These are the kinds of things that affect people's attitudes.



MR. CONNERLY: The threshold is seven. (Laughter.)

DR. GARRETT: Because it was close.

MS. THERNSTROM: But, you know, there isn't anybody in this room who would deny that we've got a long ways to go down the road to racial equality. And there's nobody in this room who would deny that there's a lot of racism still in this society. I mean, the question from me is the trend lines. Have we been walking in the right direction, and do we continue to walk in the right direction. And those trend lines look very good. And I think that one of the things we need to do in having a decent racial dialogue is not only to get beyond race, but also to get beyond emoting over race. And there is much too much emoting and there is much too much name-calling as well.

And there's a distortion of information that for me is absolutely mindboggling. I mean, I was on the Jesse Jackson show the Sunday before last. Jesse Jackson says to me, Abigail, black graduates of Harvard College still can't get jobs. And I said, Jesse, Jesse -- I think that this whole conversation could come together to a much greater degree if we can move off the anecdotes, the pain, and on to the landscape of what do we know.

And a lot of what we know is simply denied about how far we have come. If you can get the landscape right, then you can say, look, we have the following problems still: 27 percent of black families still in poverty. That's not much different than 1970. That's a catastrophic problem. We still have -- we have a racial gap in academic performance such that black kids in 12th grade are reading on the average four years behind white and Asian kids. That stacks the deck against those kids for the rest of their lives.

The solution to that isn't preferences; the solution -- and the solution to the police force -- we'll have a diverse police force tomorrow if we can close that gap in academic performance such that you've got -- so that you give police exams and there is no racial disparity.

I think, Mr. President, you've said some wonderful things on education. I'd like to push you further on them. But to me, that is absolutely the key. I think it's a national scandal that we are even one kid fall through the cracks.

THE PRESIDENT: I do, too. I think what Chicago has done, tells everybody that you've got to go summer school if you don't measure up and if you don't measure up a second time, you can't go ahead -- your self-esteem will be hurt more when you're 50 and you can't read than when you're 16 and you have to stay back another year. I think that's great.

But let me just say, first of all, I think what you generally just said is absolutely right. The reason I wanted you to come here today is that I hope there will be another series of

meetings where we'll get even more diverse group -- I mean, diverse by opinion. Because what I'm trying to get to is -- here's my theory about this -- I think if we could ever get to the point where we would ask ourselves, can we agree on the objective, and then talk about what means will work, and then look at the things we don't like and say, well, do they do any good; and what harm did it do.

For example, what I think about affirmative action, a lot of these economic -- let's just take economic affirmative action. What I honestly believe is that it did a profound amount of good for the people who got into the programs who might never have had a chance to be successful business men or women. But I believe the problems with it are twofold. Number one is, once you get in and you start doing it, it's hard to graduate out. This whole theory about graduating out and moving through, going out into the private sector -- that theory never really worked very well. And we ought to fess up; those of us who were for it ought to say that's one of the problems that didn't work.

The other problem is it doesn't reach the vast majority of the people who have a problem because it doesn't reach down into basically the isolated urban areas with people in the economic underclass.

So if we say, okay -- you know, we can all say, okay, here are the facts -- it was a pretty good thing, but it didn't do everything it was supposed to do, so should we argue about getting rid of it, should we argue about doing something else, should we argue about what's going to happen to these people? I mean, I think there's a lot to be said for that.

Let me go back to what Steve said about the composition of the police force when you got into the tete-a-tete with the Vice President. Let me just mention three things because Governor Kean mentioned this. The seven white septuplets were delivered by two African American women doctors. Two days later, two black kids were rescued in a Chicago fire by a white fireman. Nobody feels anything but good about that. Why is that? Or why do all these rich white Republicans pay to go down and watch some black guys play basketball at the MCI Center? I would argue there is something that all these things share in common that don't necessarily get answered in the police -- (inaudible) --

One is, in the case pro basketball, here I am, I don't have a doubt in the world that if I'd been good enough I could have played pro basketball. I know it. If I'd been good enough, by God, I could have played. I was short, fat, and slow by today's standards. (Laughter.) I couldn't play. Doesn't have anything to do with my race. I don't have a doubt in the world. If I have a child, I don't have a doubt in the world that my child can play if he or she is good enough. So that's the first threshold. Without regard to race -- I think we could all agree with that. In whatever setting, people have to know, if they're good enough, they can play. And if they need a hand up to prepare themselves, they can get it.

The second thing is, in the case of the black women doctors who delivered the septuplets -- which is not always the case in the case of police -- which is why I agree with the Vice President -- the community, which was of a different race -- there was no question about whether they could do their job in a way that would be fair to everybody. In the case of the white fireman who risked his life to go in and get the last two black kids in the Chicago fire -- he made a statement that was louder than any words I will ever utter, that he was in tune with the people in that community. He was in tune enough that he was willing to lay his life down to save those two little children. Nobody will ever care again whether that guy is on their fire or sitting idly out in front of the fire station, as I hope he will be.

So there's two criteria. One is can you play if you're good enough, whatever the thing is. Two is, does everybody in the community have confidence that the people in the position, whatever they are, have sufficient concern about them, are consistently involved with them, that whatever is supposed to be done is going to get done.

I think in the case of the fireman, and the doctors and the basketball players, the answer is yes. I think in the case -- huge numbers of urban police departments, huge numbers of the business sector, huge sections of higher education -- you can't say that the answer is yes. That's why I'm hung up about it. But I don't think that -- I think the reason that I'd get frustrated if the debate is only about affirmative action is, if we win 100 percent of the debate, we're talking about 10 percent of the people. If you win 100 percent of the debate, we're still just talking about 10 percent of the people. What about everybody else?

MS. CHAVEZ: That has been our argument.

MS. THERNSTROM: But, why don't you have confidence that we can train policemen the way we train firemen so that when a policeman shows up at the door, it doesn't matter what the race of that policeman is?

THE PRESIDENT: What I don't have confidence in is that in the police department's where there is not affirmative action that there is a selection process that is not race-based.

MS. THERNSTROM: Why not go after the problem instead -- it's like college admissions -- instead of going after the problem of the failure of our schools in the K-12 years, we say, okay, we're going to shut our eyes to that problem and we're going to preferentially admit them in hope something --

THE PRESIDENT: What about all the people who are sitting around waiting for that to happen? Are we just going to let them drift away?

MS. CHAO: -- very complicated, and there is really a problem on both sides. I think you and the Vice President obviously have demonstrated you care deeply about this problem. And I think you should be applauded, from my point of view, in terms of showing that you care, offering some leadership, and talking about this issue. I think it's enormously complicated. But I do want to say you, as the President of this country, have an enormous opportunity to really lead this country on a new millennium, as you put it, of race relations, and that is that people are judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

What has bothered me so far about the debate is that it's very much a monochromatic kind of debate. It has been about African Americans, and it's been about whites. And certainly there has been a great deal that has contributed to the current status of these two races, but if we really talk about a diversified nation, in which there is richness and diversity, we have to talk about other people.

And I'm not pushing for Asian Americans or Latino-Hispanic Americans, but that's what you get pretty much into when you start talking about color -- will it be white or black, then it's Asian Americans, and then it's Hispanic Americans. And actually, most of the time Asian Americans don't even rate. They don't even get into the debate. It's primarily whites, African Americans, Latinos, and that's it.

I'm very concerned about this whole issue about who gets to be let in to whatever program there is. And affirmative action, as enunciated by you and the Vice President speaks of compassion and good intentions and you care, and you want good things to happen. But what happens when good programs in the process hurt other people? And I just think about Asian Americans. I came here as an immigrant. I didn't speak a word of English. I came when I was 8 years old. My father held three jobs. I learned English at night, after 11:00 p.m., when he came back from work. And that's how I learned English.

And imagine what it's like not to speak English, and then arriving here and two months later having all these little monsters and goblins ring at your door bell -- (laughter) -- and stick something in your face to get candy. It was Halloween. We didn't know that. (Laughter.)

But what kept us through those days was -- what kept us through those days, you know, was a sense of empowerment that I think you and the Vice President want for Americans, and that you want to empower people, but you can't empower people by these artificial programs that occur too late.

What held my family and me together during those very, very hard times is we just knew we would never be in this condition forever. And that hope sustained us, incredibly so, through all

those years. And then, also, we just knew that if we worked hard and that if we are together as a family that we would indeed be all right.

And so that's only my personal example and my personal experience, but I think it's applicable to many others. And there's stories upon stories of immigrants who come to this country with no experience of being an American, who don't speak the language, who don't understand the culture, and what they really want is just an equal opportunity. And what happens when that equal opportunity is no longer a level playing field, but with the best of intentions it's being turned into something that is unfair to them?

Right now, for example, your administration is talking a great deal about changing standards -- college admission standards because -- (inaudible) -- where test scores don't really matter. You don't really need test scores to succeed -- which is true. On the other hand, you can't neglect it altogether.

I went to Harvard, and I was kicked off of the Harvard Alumni Board. And for an Asian American that's a big admission. We don't get kicked very many -- at least we don't admit it. (Laughter.) But at Harvard, Asian Americans are an over-represented minority as they are in many, many college and universities.

MS. THERNSTROM: Eighteen percent --

MS. CHAO: And if you are to -- that's still an over-representation because we're only two percent of the population. So we're way over. And what happens is if you're a white child going to Harvard, you have 17 percent chance; if you are African American, you have almost 30 percent chance; if you are a Latino American, 25 percent chance; if you're an Asian American child, you have an 11 percent.

And so for all those new immigrants who come here and work so hard, they find that the rules are being changed all the time. First of all, you have to get involved in extracurricular activities. Oh, great -- okay. So now Asian American parents have caught on and they're getting all their kids to be yearbook editors, doing all this -- now, they're changing it to where they need leadership qualities. What does that mean -- leadership qualities?

I'm on this very large corporation's scholarship program, and we fund scholarships -- \$16,000 a year -- to high school students. These kids -- Asian American kids -- don't do well because they don't excel under this new category called leadership. They're not outspoken. I listened for a long time before I jumped in here myself. But they're not aggressive. They're not voluble, and so that's all taken against them.

So our world is very complicated. There are cultural



differences. And I want people to understand cultural differences. And we should relish and delight and celebrate in each other's cultural background. That's what it means to be an American.

But when programs like affirmative action are set up -- and there again, we're not against it. I'm not against outreach. I think we've got to do more aggressive outreach. But when the standards were lowered, that's a real problem. I think the things that we must be focusing on, you as a President have so much authority in this. We've got to emphasize education. Asian American families are not any smarter. They just emphasize education so much more.

When Korean -- I'm going to digress a little bit -- when Korean grocers are being harassed by African American activists, no white politician, no politician came to their defense. And I think we have to somehow think about how do we structure family and make it stronger so that the family can sustain and develop the kind of nurturing background we want for all Americans.

And so I think we've got to work on families, we got to work on education -- there's a whole slew of new initiatives that I hope we can take a look at. But this land is a land of opportunity. Somehow we've become victims also. A lot of times there's emoting, as Abigail says, and there's a lot of blaming. And we've become in many ways a nation of whiners, we whine a lot. And some of these programs I think cater to -- (inaudible) --

But again, I think it's a great opportunity for you to direct the path for the next millennium. And it's one in which we ought to really, all Americans, focus on issues of opportunity, economic opportunity -- these are the things that we should --

MR. CONNERLY: I suspect that the time does not equal the supply of ideas we wanted to give you, and I just wanted to share with you some things that you can read to cure insomnia.

But there are some specific things I want to suggest to you. The one hopeful thing that I wanted from this dialogue about race was structure. We've been talking about it, certainly my state now, for about four years, in a very intense way, the University of California and with Proposition 209. But all too often there is no structure to it. It's ad hominem attacks. It's questioning the motives of people.

And, Chris, I want to talk to you a little later, because there is something on a Web page there that calls me a counter-revolutionary, a minority counter-revolutionary. And they had it attributed it to you.

And I think that for us to get beyond where we are now, there need to be some structure to the dialogue. And we've got to



stop playing the race card. We have to stop calling each other names, stop questioning motives. And I submit to you, sir, that one thing that might help move this panel forward is to take the whole subject of affirmative action off their plate. Let them deal with the broader subject of race absent the issue of preferences, because we're not going to solve that one anyway. And as a result of the belief that many of us have that the panel is not objectively constructed, to be candid with you, it's fun to pollute all of the other things that they might do. So my suggestion, respectfully, is to just take that out of their hands.

The second thing is I think that the time frame that is self-imposed ought to be extended because the ball has been fumbled a little bit, candidly, until now, and the discussion is just now getting -- beginning to happen in earnest. And if it comes to an end on June 4th, I think that's going to be premature, candidly. So I would strongly suggest that you extend it another six months or so, so that the debate can unfold in the fullness of time as it seems not to be unfolding.

MS. THERNSTROM: But the board itself is so monolithic in its voice, and as far as I can tell -- I mean, yes, Lisa Graham Keegan was there yesterday and William Bennett was there yesterday, but those were exceptions. And for instance Gary Orfield was there saying, once again that schools are more segregated than ever before, which I regard as junk social science. I mean, it's just not sustained by the data.

MR. THERNSTROM: He defines a segregated school as one that's 25 percent Asian, 25 percent black, 25 percent Hispanic, 25 percent white -- you need a white majority school for it to be not segregated. And that's backwards. The tables of his latest report are all defined in terms of --

GOVERNOR KEAN: -- offensive yesterday -- whenever it was, the day before yesterday -- that was a good meeting, and it was not monolithic.

MS. THERNSTROM: But there needs to be -- there are two camps, there needs to be a spectrum of scholarly voices --

GOVERNOR KEAN: Where do you put Deb Myer?

MS. THERNSTROM: Deborah Myer?

GOVERNOR KEAN: Yes.

MS. THERNSTROM: Well, I think that you're right; she's a very complicated -- you know, I'm a big admirer of hers.

GOVERNOR KEAN: So am I. People like that were on the panel.

MS. THERNSTROM: That's good. I didn't realize she was

there, because in general -- I didn't realize she was at that meeting

--

MR. THERNSTROM: This last case seems to have been more diverse than --

DR. GARRETT: But, Abigail, you're sitting in the Oval Office of the land with the President listening to you. Now, what I would like to know, as a lifelong Republican conservative -- some days, some days not -- if you want to use those silly terms -- what are you going to do? Don't tell me about studies and figures. Fine. Let us all acknowledge those. But it doesn't help one bit to write books, to write studies, and the people are still milling around suffering.

This President deserves to have the concrete recommendations. Asian Americans, what's to keep them from having dialogue and building centers with blacks and Jews and others? You see, you talk about this, but I have seen precious few who are against affirmative action get out there and start something.

MS. THERNSTROM: If we can describe properly the racial landscape, including the problems -- of course, the fact that 85 percent of black children who are in poverty are in single-parent households, for instance -- if we can describe the racial landscape and agree on what it looks like, then we can move forward on that basis. But I have to tell you that social scientists are no better than the man on the street in recommending policies. They are very good at analyzing what the picture looks like. Saying what we should do is a different mountain to climb, and I don't think --

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead. Lynn, you haven't talked enough.

MS. MARTIN: As I age, I'm less able to speak for groups of people, especially before I went back to teaching. Now I find I'm not as sure of anything -- (inaudible) -- but I do think it's true that a majority of Americans -- you talk about the man in the street -- I think they're already a lot farther along than I think anybody has given them credit. I think most blacks, most whites, most Asians, most -- everyone, men and women want it, which gives a President, this President enormous opportunities. And it also, I think, from some of my experiences over the last two years, indicates that there should be a couple of smaller things that we can all enjoy successfully. But that's very important to people -- some of the more complex things that one has to do.

But there have to be some measurable successes that everybody agrees that, hey, that's a good thing, and we all did it. I've worked a little more with gender, but if you get a group of women together and a group of men, they can look at exactly the same thing -- (inaudible) -- the difference is phenomenal. It doesn't mean facts are different, but it does mean perceptions are different. And we have to work part of the time at perception. We have to keep

moving beyond -- the more times you can make people know their thinking the same, the better. And I came to a different conclusion -- it's almost opposed to the anti-anecdote. I decided to check over the last 10 years what had happened to me, because I'm older, I believe, than I think almost everybody in this room.

MS. THERNSTROM: I doubt it.

Q I look older. At least I will say that. But I grew up as a northerner thinking you all were the bad guys, which was a very nice way to grow up. I mean, in fact, I didn't know any blacks and Hispanics, never crossed by brain that many -- you know, that somehow there was something a little strange here. It was the southerners -- it was very comfortable -- (inaudible) -- intellectually, you didn't have to challenge anything. The last few years, and this is late in my life, just as in my 30s I got male friends -- not dates, friends, for the first time, very different thing. I now have, mostly acquaintances, but some friends, and my God, they've added to my life. And maybe we don't say that often enough.

The reason most American businesses are supporting affirmative action has nothing -- well, one hopes it has something to do with they want to feel good -- the reason they want to do it has to do with they think it's a business imperative and business is going to be better than global enterprise -- (inaudible) -- that I think -- enjoying the idea of how much better -- (inaudible) -- because of this. So that, sure, there's some tough stuff, and sure there's some other things -- I think people still write checklists, to an extent. And if we can check off a couple of things in the next few years -- the only thing I would ask now is don't set a goal -- I mean Abraham Lincoln didn't get -- Martin Luther King didn't -- don't have small dreams but have some reasonable goals.

THE PRESIDENT: One thing -- let me just ask you all to think about this because I agree -- one of the things I do agree with what Ward said is that I -- before you came in here I was holding my head saying, oh my God, those people are coming in here and we've got to stay here for four hours -- but let me -- nearly everybody agrees that the laws that are on the books against discrimination based on race against individuals should be enforced.

MS. THERNSTROM: Everybody agrees with that.

MS. CHAVEZ: Everybody in this room.

THE PRESIDENT: We are grossly under -- we have never properly funded the EEOC, but to be fair, we also need to look at --and this may be kind of a bridge between what we've been arguing about and what we agree on -- there's a lot of interest -- and Chris is getting me some information on this -- about trying to develop some sort of way the EEOC can get rid of its backlog in part by drawing up consent orders that would go beyond litigation and would change the way people treat their employees. Not necessarily on a

race, not a race-based treatment, but the way you develop, the way you recruit, the way you reach out -- and one of the -- to go back to Lynn's checklist -- one of the things we would like to get everybody to agree to is a certain approach on that -- on kind of a comprehensive approach and getting rid of the accumulated back log of race claims and where you go from there.

The other think I would just like to say, because I know we're going to have to wrap up pretty soon, is I agree with you, we need a structure for the discussion which permits us to continue to talk, sharply identify in a non-rhetorical way our differences and ask if there is some way to build on this so we can actually get something done.

I talked to J.C. Watson -- he called me last night and I was out of pocket and I called him this morning and we talked for 20 or 30 minutes because he was -- (inaudible) -- and it was an interesting conversation. I just think if you're willing, I'm willing to make this not a one-shot deal, but to continue to work on this. I really sympathize with how the immigrant -- Asian immigrant -- particularly first generation Asians feel with the shift in --

MS. CHAO: We're just learning rules and goddamn it, they change them on us. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: The real issue here is, if you go back there's a lot of thought been given in the private schools -- (inaudible) -- great one to talk about -- that a lot of these private universities are thinking, okay, now, what if the colleges, if all the public institutions end affirmative action in their admission process, and they don't really -- and the state doesn't come up with a comprehensive alternative they'd like, where you've got all the colleges maybe taking over public schools, in effect, in terms of their college prep. So you get to -- you maintain the diversity of student body population with non-race-based policies. Then will the private institution basically have to carry the burden of educating a more diverse student body, or unless we're going to resegregate higher education like we once had.

So there's a reexamination on about whether -- I'm not saying that what you said is how you described it, that that's the right way to do it, but there is a genuine, I think, reassessment about whether test scores plus grades should be the only predictor of success in college and success -- the only definer of merit, and whether we can assume that there is somehow an absolute character to that. As a matter of fact, the test scores were -- -- (inaudible) -- pretty good rough indicator.

But, you know, look at what Texas is doing. I mean, it's this desperate attempt, I think -- I don't mean it's -- desperate sounds critical, I'm not being critical. But people are looking around and trying to find a way to honor America, be fair, and still have a society where everybody's got a chance. Keep in mind, go back to basketball and our view of the doctors in Iowa, the

people have got to believe everybody had a chance.

MS. CHAVEZ: But, Mr. President, whatever the criteria that you come up with, I don't believe that it is good public policy or fair to say you're going to have different rules for different groups. And I think that's -- you know, I'm not saying SAT scores are the end all, or SAT and GPAs, but when you come up with a criteria, that criteria has to be equally applied to every individual, and that you can't decide that if your name is Chavez and you go to apply, or one of your children does, you get judged under a different criteria. That's what we have now. And I think that was what --

THE PRESIDENT: You wouldn't be opposed to affirmative efforts that were not race-based, would you?

MS. CHAVEZ: That's right. I wouldn't be because --

THE PRESIDENT: And if they're not race-based, they --

MS. CHAVEZ: If they're not race-based, if they're aimed at educational disadvantage, social disadvantage, economic disadvantage, and if they are aimed at that, they have to be more than just letting people in the door, because there is a reason why we use test scores and GPAs to let people into higher education. It is because they are good predictors of success.

And one of the things, and, Thad, this is where I disagree with you -- one of the things I've been most adamant about opposing racial preferences for is that they allow us to sweep under the rug the kind of skills differences that Abby and Steve -- (inaudible) -- they allow us the easy out. They allow the companies -- oh, sure, oh, yes, we have 80 percent Hispanics and 12 percent blacks and other in proportion group represented here. What they don't tell you is that they're shuffled off to the EEO offices of human resources or someplace else, and in colleges they flunk out, or they end up being bounced down to a school that they probably would have done well in if they had gotten in on their own merit.

I mean, this is the problem and it sends a terrible message to my children. I have to tell you, I resent it deeply as a Mexican American woman that -- as the mother of three sons, that my children are assumed not to be able to make it under the same standards as your children. And I just don't think that it is right. And it does something that is very corrosive to minorities to be telling them we don't expect you to meet the same standards.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I'd like to say something else, Mr. President. I disagree with what I've heard here, but it's a great learning opportunity and I think the dialogue validates the President's decision to invite all of you to come into the Oval Office.

Mr. Connerly began by talking about traits over which we



have no control. I think that what the debate really is about is traits over which we do have control. Specifically, I think there is a vulnerability in human nature to prejudice. I think we have the ability to overcome it. But I think that it is naive in the extreme. And I don't say that pejoratively; I'm just saying that this is my personal view. I think it is naive in the extreme to assert that there is no persistent vulnerability to prejudice -- rooted in human nature, prejudice based on race and ethnicity -- and other characteristics as well.

Let me just finish, please, and then you can ask me a yes or no question. (Laughter.)

Let me just finish. If you look at the world around us right now, what we intervene to help stop in Bosnia demonstrated that prejudice based on race and ethnicity led to an unleashing of evil. I think that evil lies coiled in the human soul and all of us faces spiritual challenge throughout our lives. And I think that racial differences can serve as a trigger for unleashing hatred. And I think that people are prone to be with people like themselves, to hire people to look like themselves, to live near people who look like themselves. And yet in our society when we have this increasing diversity, we have a community value, a national interest in helping to overcome this inherent vulnerability to prejudice.

What happened to Chinese in Shanghai 50 years ago last week,\* happened in part because of the enhanced vulnerability to that explosion of hatred across ethnic lines. What happened in Rwanda between the Hutus and the Tutsis happened in significant part because the explosion of hatred was triggered by this ethnic difference -- the differences in educational levels, the historical differences, the history of domination of one over the other also played important roles. But to deny that there is this factor called race that is persistent is, I think, just wrong.

Now, Steve, when you said -- or seemed to imply that there's no reason, rationally based, for an African American neighborhood to feel any differently about a police force that's 100 percent white than they would feel if there was representation of blacks on the police force. That, it seems to me is just profoundly wrong.

My view, in contrast, is that just as it seems obvious that the police force in that situation will be more effective in doing its job if it is representative of the community, it is also obvious that a university is going to provide a more valuable educational experience if the students there are going to be able to come into contact with people from different ethnic groups so that the next generation of Lynn Martins -- thoughtful, intelligent, commitment, desiring change, don't wait until the sixth decade of life to have their lives experience --

MS. MARTIN: No, no, fifth decade -- (laughter).



THE VICE PRESIDENT: -- to have their lives enriched by that extra experience. And the nation as a whole, I believe, is enriched if we overcome this tendency. Now, to say that there's progress is to say that a lot of the things we have been doing have worked. A lot of the extra affirmative efforts that have resulted in these police forces becoming more diverse -- I mean, they didn't get that way by accident. They got that way --

MS. MARTIN: They got that way because they passed laws against discrimination.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: No, that's not true either. They got there partly because there was enforcement of laws against discrimination, but mostly because there were affirmative efforts in the hiring decisions to go out and get people from the other communities to come into the police forces. The same thing is true in a lot of the categories of progress that you measure. To say there's progress is not to say if we stop these efforts, things are going to continue in the same direction. If we stop these efforts, we could see the United States lose its ability to lead the world away from this vulnerability to ethnic prejudice and racial --

MR. CANADY: But, Mr. Vice President, none of us are suggesting that we stop all of these efforts. We believe in the outreach efforts that have gone on. We believe we should actually intensify those efforts. What we have a problem with is classifying people on the basis of their race and telling some people they're going to lose because they belong to a non-preferred group, and other people they're going to win because they belong to a preferred group. We believe that that is harmful to everyone, because it sends the kind of message I talked about earlier and it's inconsistent with our ideas.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me ask you a question. One of the things that tickled me about -- since I grew up in the south, in addition to being bloodied by Atlanta people -- (inaudible) -- on the race problem in the country, we were all so obsessed with athletics. One of the things that tickled me about the California affirmative action vote was that there was -- preference vote -- is that there was an exception made for athletes. So you can give a preference for athletes to get into Berkeley, so Berkeley can have a nice football team and a nice basketball team.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Alumni giving.

THE PRESIDENT: But the A student who doesn't get into Berkeley, the Asian A student who doesn't get into Berkeley is just as hurt because he didn't get in so everybody could be tickled at the next basketball game as he would have been hurt if some A student who grew up in a black family in Oakland and didn't go to a high school and therefore didn't make quite as high a score on the college board -- he still loses the opportunity. He just loses it to a basketball player instead of a kid with thick glasses who struggled late at night in Oakland to make good grades, but didn't quite make a high

enough college board score to get in. What's the difference? Why is it justified? Why is athletic discrimination so wonderful and the race discrimination --

Q Well, you can get rid of it. If you want to sign an executive order --

Q And alumni discrimination as well.

MR. CONNERLY: Mr. President, I have to say that this has been a great party until now, but just as we're -- the clock is ticking, we're ready to go out the door, you ruined my weekend with those very -- (laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Is that not true? If it's not true, I don't want to falsely accuse you.

MR. CONNERLY: Very loaded questions, very loaded statements that command far more than the five or 10 minutes we have left. Our founders -- they talked for hours about human nature as the basis of what kind of government we were going to develop. And it's frightening to me -- it is truly frightening to me, at the characterization of human nature, Mr. Vice President, that you portray, because it suggests that we cannot rise above it.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: No, I said specifically, we can.

MR. CONNERLY: -- unless government is there demanding, demanding that we be held accountable. The presumption of our people, the presumption of our nation is that we're good people, that we can be fair, and that we will do the right thing. There are going to be some that are going to do wrong, and we'll bring those into line. But it's not that we are prone to do bad. And the whole question here about athletes and alumni -- my God, any of us can be athletes or alumni. It has nothing to do with our skin color.

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't say anything about alumni.

MR. CONNERLY: Well, he did. But there are just certain traits here that we as a society are making a judgment about --

THE PRESIDENT: The only point I made -- (laughter) -- don't get our two speeches mixed up. The only point I'm trying to make is, if you ever have any -- if you decide what the criteria of academic merit is, and let's say you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards -- this is the only point, I'm making a narrow point. If you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards, and then you decide -- you make a decision, which I think you could make a compelling argument is a legitimate decision, that athletics is an important part of university life, that it enriches the lives of all the other students who are there. You can make that argument, but the point is, once you make that argument, that's the argument you could also make for having a racially diverse student body. I was making a very -- I'm not making a wholesale

assault.

Now, here's my problem with this whole deal, I know we've got to go. So I want to give you a chance to say -- what we really before, which is, how do we give structure to this and what do you think the next step should be? And I'll give anybody else a chance. Look, when I was a governor, I became the first governor in the history of the country to sponsor legislation to require -- (inaudible) -- certified.

I believe I passed the first law requiring kids in the whole state to have to pass an exam before they could actually go onto high school, because I didn't like the high school graduation -- I thought that was closing the barn door after the cattle left. The reason I have consistently supported affirmative action programs -- but I really have tried to change them and make them work -- is not because -- I basically think all that stuff you said is right. I am sick and tired of people telling me poor minority kids who live in desperate circumstances, that they can't make it. I think they should be told they can make it, but they have to work harder to make it. And then I think we should give them a hand up to make it. I am tired of that.

The reason I have supported affirmative action programs is very different, is I have done it because I didn't want to see all these kids be sacrificed to a principle I agree with, because the practice of life would not be fixed in time to give them a chance --number one.

And number two, I have had the feeling about police departments and fire departments and business environments and university admissions that I felt about the athletes -- that I really thought that the institutions were better off and the white majority or whoever else, was better off if there was some inter-mixing because of the world they're going to live in.

But I am always -- I think we should all be uncomfortable, those of us who support this -- for giving something to somebody when we deprive somebody that was otherwise more deserving by the traditional criteria of getting it. But I think on balance, that's why I've been very strongly -- but I have never wanted to not have high standards, not be demanding, not do things. I mean, I've paid a pretty good price for this -- (inaudible) -- and I'm not ashamed of having done it. I think that the kids in my state are better off because of it.

But we need to figure out a way to recognize that what we'd really like is for people without regard to their race to be able to do the kind of business, go to the kind of schools, have the kind of public service jobs and live in the kind of integrated environment that they choose if that is the choice they make, because there would be no differences in traditional measures of merit and how they did, so that people would be making their own choices and having their own choices. I think that's -- we all agree that that's the world we

want.

So I'd like to know what you think the next step should be. If you want to stay involved in this; you want to keep talking to us; you want to keep working with us; and you want to get some more -- different kind of people in here. What do you think we ought to do now?

GOVERNOR KEAN: Can I say something on the Race Commission -- when the President asked me to sit on this, the first time he asked, I said no. And I finally said yes because I was totally convinced, first of all, that this was the only President in my lifetime, though not a President of my own party, who's willing to take this on, to really try to establish some sort of a dialogue and try to make progress on this; and secondly, because I thought there was a chance -- maybe not a big chance, but a chance -- we could do some real good.

I was among those who was very critical of the commission at its first couple of meetings, because -- (inaudible) -- talking to each other and was not listening to adverse opinions, and therefore we weren't serving this President very well. It's our job -- not to write a report for the commission, our job is to advise this President on some of the best ideas we can find in the country so that this will hopefully be part of his legacy.

So this race commission is going to open up the dialogue -- (inaudible) -- be listening to all sorts of ideas from every end of the political spectrum in the hopes that we can bring good ideas to this President so that he can succeed in an initiative which I believe the country very much wants him to succeed in. So whatever has gone on in the past, I hope you will be open to the commission, that you will give ideas to us. And we will make sure that the best of the ideas are passed on to the President or this group can pass it on directly.

MS. THERNSTROM: I think that this has been a really wonderful meeting. And I'm very grateful to you for having invited us. But I do also have the feeling that if we were to continue it, that we really might get someplace.

THE PRESIDENT: That's what I think.

MS. THERNSTROM: Yes. We're feeling each other here. We're kind of making -- it's a first kind of stiff beginning, but that we might really --

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I resemble that remark.  
(Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: If you all are willing to do it and you will help us figure out a way to structure it, I'll do it. Let me

just give you -- I'll just give you one -- outside this door, probably sitting there -- I don't know if she's still there -- is my diarist for the White House who has lately been in the paper because -- (laughter) -- her name is Janis Kearnes. Her daddy was a sharecropper, and her mother a domestic. And they had 17 children -- 13 of them have college degrees. Five of them are lawyers. And all 17 of them have a first name that starts with the letter J. (Laughter.) Most of them went to school in Arkansas. One of them went all the way to Harvard. And some of them had affirmative action and some of them didn't, and they all did fine.

Look, somewhere in here there's a way that we can get to where we're trying to do -- stop talking past each other and start working together. I cannot believe that 90 percent of the people in this country don't want the same kind of country in terms of racial matters. And I will do my best to find a way for us to move beyond the -- (inaudible) -- honestly and respectfully state our differences and figure out away to work together. Because it is obvious, if you do not believe that there is any inherent -- (inaudible) -- among people based on race, then the differences we have today must have been rooted in the mistakes that have been made in the past or the breakdown of social institutions or personal institutions like the family, the education system, and the networking of people in business and others. There has to be a way to rebuild those institutions, and we have to do it together.

I think it would be a shame if we didn't try to do this together. I'm trying to put this beyond partisan politics. I'm not trying to use you. I said that deal about the athletics, because I might have voted for the athletic thing, too, but I've always been with the races like athletics and not different from athletics. That's all. So we need to go.

If you have -- in addition to your suggestions, which Governor Kean is for, I want to know if you've got process ideas about how we can discipline this debate and to move it forward.

END

4:00 P.M. EST

\* Following the meeting, the Vice President noted that the events to which he referred took place in Nanjing 60 years ago.