

6TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1994 Federal Information Systems Corporation
Federal News Service

FEBRUARY 3, 1994, THURSDAY

SECTION: IN THE NEWS

LENGTH: 4237 words

HEADLINE: REMARKS BY MOTHER THERESA OF CALCUTTA, INDIA
NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST
WASHINGTON HILTON
WASHINGTON, DC

BODY:

MOTHER THERESA: (Extended Applause.) Make us worthy, Lord, to serve our fellow men throughout the world who live and die in poverty and hunger. Give them through our hands this day their daily bread, and by our understanding love, give peace and joy.

Jesus came to give us the good news that God loves us and that He wants us to love one another as He loves each one of us. And to make it easy for us to love one another, Jesus said: Whatever you do to the least, you do it to me. If you give a glass of water, you give it to me. If you receive a little child in my name, you receive me. So, whatever you do to the least, you do it to me. And where does this love begin? In our own family. How does it begin? By praying together. The family that prays together stays together, and if you stay together, you will love each other as God loves each one of you. So teach your children to pray, and pray with them, and you will have the joy and the peace and the unity of Christ's own love living in you.

As we have gathered together here, I think it would be beautiful if we begin with a prayer that expresses very well what Jesus wants us to do for the least. St. Francis of Assisi understood very well these words of Jesus, and in his life very well expressed by prayer. And this prayer, which we say every day after holy communion, always surprises me very much because it is very fitting for each one of us, and I always wonder whether 800 years ago when St. Francis lived, they had the same difficulties that we have today. I think that some of you already have this prayer of peace, so we will pray it together.

Lord, make me a channel of your peace.

You have the prayer with you? Will we say it together?

(The gathering speaks the prayer together.)

Lord, make me a channel of your peace. Where there is hatred, I may make love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy. Oh, Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; not so much to (seek to be understood ?) as to understand; not to (seek love ?) as to love. For it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned; and it is in dying that we are born again to eternal life.

Let us thank God for the opportunity he has given us today to have come here to pray together. We have come here especially to pray for peace, for joy, and for love. We are reminded that Jesus came to bring the goodness to the poor. He had told us what is that goodness when he said, "My peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you." He came not to give the peace of the (world ?), which is only that we don't bother each other; he came to give the peace of heart, which comes from loving, from doing good to others.

Federal News Service, FEBRUARY 3, 1994

And God loved the world so much that he gave his son. It was a giving. God gave his son to the Virgin Mary. And what did she do with him? As soon as Jesus came into Mary's life, immediately she went in haste to give that good news. And as she came into the house of her cousin Elizabeth, scripture tells us that the unborn child, the child in the womb of Elizabeth, leaps with joy. While still in the womb of Mary, Jesus brought peace to John the Baptist, who leaps for joy in the womb of Elizabeth. The unborn was the first one to proclaim the coming of Christ.

And as if that were not enough, as if it was not enough that God's son should become one of us and bring peace and joy while still in the womb of Mary, Jesus also died on the cross to show that great love. He died for you and for me and for that leper and for that man dying of hunger, and that naked person dying in the street, not only of Calcutta but of Africa and all over the world. Our sisters serve these poor people in 105 countries throughout the world. Jesus insisted that we love one another as He loves each one of us. Jesus gave his life to love us, and he tells us that we also have to give whatever it takes to do good to one another. And in the Gospel, Jesus says very clearly, "Love as I have loved you." Jesus died on the cross because that is what it took for him to do good to us, to save us from our selfishness and sin. He gave up everything to the (Father's will ?) to show us that we, too, must be willing to give up everything to do God's will, to love one another as He loves each one of us.

If we are not willing to give whatever it takes to do good to one another, sin is still in us. That is why we, too, must give to each other until it hurts. It is not enough for us to say, "I love God." But I also have to love my neighbor. St. John said that you are a liar if you say you love God and you don't love your neighbor. How can you love God, whom you do not see, if you do not love your neighbor, whom you see, whom you touch, with whom you live? And so it is very important for us to realize that love, to be true, has to hurt. I must be willing to give whatever it takes not to harm other people and, in fact, to do good to them. This requires that I be willing to give until it hurts. Otherwise, there is no true love in me, and I bring injustice, not peace, to those around me.

It hurt Jesus to love us. We have been created in his image for greater things -- to love and to be loved. We must (put on ?) Christ, as scripture tells us, and so we have been created to love as He loves us. Jesus makes himself the hungry one, the naked one, the homeless one, the unwanted one, and he says, "You did it to me." On the last day he will say to those on his right, "Whatever you did to the least of these, you did to me." And he will also say to those on his left, "Whatever you neglected to do for the least of these, you neglected to do it for me."

When he was dying on the cross, Jesus said, "I thirst." Jesus is thirsting for our love, and this is the test of everyone, poor and rich alike. We all thirst for love of others that they go out of their way to avoid harming us and to do good to us. This is the meaning of true love, to give until it hurts. I can never forget the experience I had in the sitting room where they kept all these old parents of sons and daughters who had just put them into an institution and forgotten them, maybe. I saw that in that home, these old people had everything -- good food, comfortable place, television, everything -- but everyone was looking toward the door. And I did not see a single one with a smile on their face. I turned to a sister and I asked, "Why do these people who have every comfort here, they are there looking toward the door? Why are they not smiling? I'm so used to seeing the smiles on our people. Even the dying ones smile." And Sister said, "This is the way it is nearly every day. They are expecting, they are hoping that the son or the daughter will come to visit

Federal News Service, FEBRUARY 3, 1994

them. They are hurt because they are forgotten."

And see, this neglect to love brings spiritual poverty. Maybe in our own family we have somebody who is feeling lonely, who is feeling sick, who is feeling worried. Are we there? Are we willing to give until it hurts in order to be with our family, or do we put our interests first?

These are the questions we must ask ourselves, especially as we begin this year of the family. We must remember that love begins at home. And we must also remember that the future of humanity passes through the family.

I was surprised in the West to see so many young boys and girls given to drugs, and I tried to find out why, why is it like that, when those in the West have so many more things than those in the East. And the answer was, because there is no one in the family to receive them. Our children depend on us for everything -- their health, their nutrition, their security, their coming to know and love God. For all of this, they look to us with trust, hope and expectation. But often, father and mother are so busy they have no time for their children, or perhaps they are not even married or have given up on their marriage. So the children go to the streets and get involved in drugs and other things. We are talking of love of the child, which is where love and peace must begin -- there, in our own family.

But I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because Jesus said, "If you receive a little child, you receive me." So every abortion is the denial of receiving Jesus, the neglect of receiving Jesus.

(Applause.)

It is really a war against the child, and I hate killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself. And if we accept that the mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another? How do we persuade a woman not to have an abortion? As always, we must persuade her with love. And we remind ourselves that love needs to be willing to give until it hurts.

Jesus gave even his life to love us, so the mother who is thinking of abortion should be helped to love -- that is, to give until it hurts, her plans, her free time, to respect the life of a child, for the child is the greatest gift of God to the family, because it has been created to love and to be loved.

The father of that child, however, must also give until it hurts. By abortion, the mother does not learn to live, but kills even her own child to solve her problem. And by abortion, the father is taught that he does not have to take any responsibility at all for the child he has brought into that world. So that father is likely to put other women into the same trouble. So abortion just leads to more abortion.

Any country that accepts abortion is not teaching its people to love one another but to use any violence to get what they want. This is why the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion. (Applause.)

The beautiful gift God has given our congregation is to fight abortion by adoption. We have given -- (applause) -- we have given already from one house in Calcutta over 3,000 children in adoption, and I can't tell you what joy, what love, what peace those children have brought into those families. It has been a real gift of God for them and for us. I remember one of the little ones got very sick, so I sent for the father and the mother, and I asked them, "Please, give me back the sick child; I will give you a healthy one." And the father looked at me and said, "Mother Teresa, take my life first, then take the child." So beautiful to see so much love, so much joy that little one has brought into that family.

So pray for us that we continue this beautiful gift. And also I offer you -- our sisters who are here. Anybody who doesn't want a child, please give it to me. I want the child. (Applause.)

Federal News Service, FEBRUARY 3, 1994

Let me tell you something beautiful. As I have already told you, by adoption, by care of the mother and adoption for her baby, we have saved thousands of lives. We have sent word to the clinics, to the hospitals and police stations, "Please don't destroy the child; we will take the child." So we always have someone tell the mothers in trouble, "Come, we will take care of you; we will get a home for your child." And we have a tremendous demand from couples who cannot have a child, but I never give a child to a couple who have done something not to have a child. Jesus said, "Anyone who received a child in my name, receives me." By adopting a child, these couples receive Jesus. By aborting a child, a couple refuses to receive Jesus.

Please don't kill the child. I want the child. Please give me the child. I'm willing to accept any child who would be aborted and to give that child to a married couple who will love the child and be loved by the child.

I know that couples have to plan their family, and for that there is natural family planning. The way to plan the family is natural family planning, not contraception. In destroying the power of giving life or loving through contraception, a husband or wife is doing something to self. This turns the attention to self, and so it destroys the gift of love in him and her. In loving, the husband and wife must turn the attention to each other as happens in natural family planning, and not to self as happens in contraception. Once that living love is destroyed by contraception, abortion follows very easily. That's why I never give a child to a family that has used contraception, because if the mother has destroyed the power of loving, how will she love my child?

I also to know that there are great problems in the world, that many spouses do not love each other enough to practice. We cannot solve the problems in the world, but let us never be in the worst problem of all -- to destroy love, to destroy life.

And what this poor person said is very true. These poor people maybe have nothing to eat. Maybe they have not a home to live in. But they can still be great people when they are especially rich and loving one another as God loves each one of them.

When I pick up a person from the streets hungry, I give him a plate of rice, a piece of bread. But a person who is shut out, who feels unwanted, unloved, terrified, the person who has been thrown out of society, that spiritual poverty is much harder to be overcome. And abortion, which often follows from contraception, brings the people to be spiritually poor, and that is the worst poverty and the most difficult to overcome.

Those who are materially poor can be very wonderful people. One evening we went out and we picked up four people from the street, and one of them was in a most terrible condition. I told the sisters, "You take care of the other three; I will take care of the one who looks worse." So I did for her all that my love can do. I put her in bed. And there was such a beautiful smile on her face. She took hold of my hand, and she said one word only: Thank you. And she died. I couldn't help but examine my conscience before her, and I asked what would I say if I were in her place? And my answer was very simple. I would have tried to draw a little attention to myself. I would have said: "I'm hungry. I'm dying. I'm cold. I'm in pain." But she gave me more. She gave me her grateful love. She died with a big smile on her face.

Then there was the man we picked up from the drain half eaten with worms, and after we had brought him to the home, he only said, "I've lived like an animal in the street, but I'm going to die as an angel, loved and cared." Then, after we had removed all the worms from his body, all he said with a big smile, "Sister, I'm going home to God," and he died. It was so wonderful to see the greatness of that man who could speak like that without blaming anybody, without comparing anything, like an angel. This is the greatness of people who are

spiritually rich even when they are materially poor.

We are not social workers. We may be doing social work in the eyes of some people, but we must be contemplatives in the heart of the world, for we must bring that presence of God into your family, for the family that prays together stays together. There is so much hatred, so much misery, and we with our prayer, with our sacrifice, are beginning at home. Love begins at home, and it is not how much we do, but how much love we put into what we do. You see, this is where love beings -- at home in the family.

So, as the example of this family shows, God will never forget us, and there is something you and I can always do. We can keep the joy of loving Jesus in our heart and share that joy with all we come in contact with. Let us make that one point, that no child will be unwanted, unloved, uncared for or killed and thrown away. And give until it hurts -- with a smile.

As you know, we have a number of homes here in the United States where people need tender love and care. This is the joy of sharing. Come and share. We have the young people suffering with AIDS. They need that love and care. But such beautiful -- I've never yet seen a young man or anybody die displeased or angry or frightened. They're merely going home to God. Such a beautiful smile always. So let us pray that we have the gift of sharing the joy with others and loving until it hurts.

Also I talk so much giving with a smile, once a professor from the United States asked me, "Are you married?" And I said yes. And I find it sometimes very difficult to smile as my spouse, Jesus, because he can be very demanding sometimes. (Laughter.) This is really something true, and there is where love comes, when it is demanding and yet we can give it with joy. One of the most demanding things for me is traveling everywhere and this publicity. I have said to Jesus that, if I don't go to heaven for anything else, I will be going to heaven for all the traveling, with all the publicity, because it has purified me and sacrificed me and made me really ready to go home to die. (Laughter.)

If we remember that God loves us and that we can love others as he loves us, then America can become the sign of peace for the whole world, the sign of joy from where a sign of care for the weakest and the weak, the unborn child, must go out to the world. If you become a burning light of justice and peace in the world, then really you will be true to what the founders of this country stood for. This is love one another as God loves each one of us. And where does this love begin? In our own home. How does it begin? By praying together.

Pray for us that we continue God's work with great love. The sisters, the brothers, and the fathers, lay missionaries to charity and co-workers, we are all one heart full of love, that we may bring a joy of loving everywhere we go. And my prayer for you is to love one another, for this peace and joy in the family, that you may grow in holiness. Holiness is not the luxury of the few. It is a simple duty for you and for me. Because Jesus has very clearly said, "Be ye holy as the Father in heaven is holy." So let us pray for each other that we grow in love for each other and to this love become holy as Jesus wants us to be, for he died out of love for us.

One day I met a lady who was dying of cancer in a most terrible condition, and I told her -- I said, "You know, this terrible pain is only the kiss of Jesus, a sign that have you come so close to Jesus on the cross that he can kiss you." And she joined her hands together and said, "Mother Teresa, please tell Jesus to stop kissing me." (Laughter.)

So pray for us that we continue God's work with great love, and I will pray for you, for all your families. And also I want to thank the families who have been so generous in giving their daughters to us to consecrate their life to Jesus by the vow of poverty, chastity, obedience, and by giving wholehearted through service to the poorest of the poor. This is our fourth vow in our

Federal News Service, FEBRUARY 3, 1994

congregation, and we have a novitiate in San Francisco where we have many beautiful vocations who are wanting to give their whole life to Jesus in the service of the poorest of the poor.

So once more I thank you for giving your children to God. And pray for us that we continue God's work with great love.

God bless you all. (Applause.)

SEN. HEFLIN: Amen. Mother Teresa, you are truly a pencil in God's hand. Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska, the co-chairman of the Senate Prayer Group, will now introduce the president. Ted Stevens has long been an active member of our Senate Prayer Group. He's served as chairman in the past, and his personal testimony when he leads our Wednesday morning sessions are always inspiring. Senator Stevens? (Applause.)

SEN. TED STEVENS (R-AK): Mr. President, Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Gore, and those who have come up to be united in prayer, you know, when the Senate prayer breakfast comes to a close, we stand around tables, and they're just like yours now, and hold the hand of the senator on either side of us, and we are truly united in prayer. You need that. Why don't you stand up? And we will do the same thing right now. Let us join together in silent prayer not only for the president and the vice president and their families and Mother Teresa, but all who have worked so hard to make this international prayer breakfast such a success this year. Let's just have a silent prayer for a few moments.

(Pause for silent prayer.)

And now it is my great privilege and high honor to introduce to you William Jefferson Clinton, the president of the United States. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Thank you very much.

Thank you very much, Senator Stevens. Ladies and gentlemen, you have to forgive me. My voice has not quite returned.

The vice president said earlier that being on the same program with Mother Teresa reminded him of the basketball player who scored one point in a game where Michael Jordan scored 68, and then he said for the rest of his life, "Well, we scored 69 points together." I feel like the guy who comes in with five seconds left to go, where the team's gotten a 40-point lead and all I have to do is hold the ball until the buzzer rings. (Laughter, applause.)

First of all, I thank you, Mother Teresa, for your moving words and, more importantly, for the lifetime of commitment, for you have truly lived by what you say, something we would all do well to emulate, and I thank you for that. (Applause.)

Like all of you, I was so moved by the profession of faith and the experiences of Mother Teresa that almost anything that any of us could say would be anti-climactic. However, I would like to make these points as briefly as I can, for we come here to pray for those in authority, those given by the people of the United States under our Constitution and laws the responsibility and the opportunity of making decisions every day which affect all of us.

First I say that this prayer breakfast is an important time to reaffirm that in this nation where we have freedom of religion, we need not seek freedom from religion. The genius of the book which I have -- (applause) -- the genius of the book which I have promoted almost shamelessly for the last several months, "The Culture of Disbelief," by Professor Stephen Carter, is that very point, that we should all seek to know and to do God's will, even when we differ.

Second, if we really seek to do that, it requires certain personal characteristics that very frankly all of us in this room who have ever been elected to anything have abandoned from time to time, including me. It requires, first, that we be humble, that we know that even as we seek to do God's will, we remember what President Lincoln said, "The Almighty has his own

Federal News Service, FEBRUARY 3, 1994

purposes, and we are not capable of fully knowing them."

It requires, second, that we be honest and that we be fair. Sometimes I think the commandment we most like to overlook in this city is thou shalt not bear false witness.

Third, it requires that we give our bitterness and our resentments up. I was thinking of this when Mother Teresa told the story of the person who died in her arms, saying simply, "Thank you" -- not "I'm cold, I'm hungry," a simple thank you -- someone with more cause to be resentful, more cause to be bitter, more cause to be angry than anyone in this room could ever be bitter or angry or resentful because of what one of us has said or done to the other and still dying with a simple "thank you."

Somehow we all have to give up our resentments. We have to find the courage and the faiths to forgive ourselves and to forgive our foes. And if we cannot, we will surely fail.

And finally, that will permit us to do what Mother Teresa has done: to focus every day on other people. If Christ said we would all be judged by how we treated the least of these -- the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the strangers, the imprisoned -- how can we meet that test in a town where we all spend so much time obsessed with ourselves and how we stand on the totem pole and how we look in the morning paper? Five years from now it will be nothing. Five hundred years from now the papers will be dust. And all that will endure is the strength and the integrity and the beauty of what we felt and what we did.

Today this headline is in our papers: "19 Children Found Amid Squalor in Chicago Apartment". Not in Calcutta, but in Chicago. Nineteen children living amid human waste and cockroaches, fighting a dog for food.

I say to you, we will always have our differences, we will never know the whole truth. Of course that is true. But if we have learned today again that we must seek to know the will of God and live by it, that to do it we have give up our bitterness and our resentment, we have to learn to forgive ourselves and one another and we have to fight, as hard as it is, to be honest and fair, and if we can be focused on others and not ourselves, realizing that we did not get one whit of power from the Constitution and laws from the framers to do anything for ourselves, it all comes for the purpose of helping others, then perhaps we can do honor to the faiths and to the God who has brought us all here today. Thank you, and God bless you all. (Applause.)

SEN. HEFLIN: Amen, amen, amen. This has been a great experience.

END

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 3, 1994

13TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1994 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

February 4, 1994, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: FIRST SECTION; PAGE A16

LENGTH: 404 words

HEADLINE: Abortion, Contraception Condemned;
Mother Teresa's Prayer Audience Includes Clinton, Gore

SERIES: Occasional

BYLINE: Gustav Niebuhr, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

Mother Teresa yesterday condemned abortion and contraception at the annual National Prayer Breakfast that included President Clinton, Vice President Gore and a host of congressional leaders.

The nun, 83, who is known for her work with impoverished and ill persons in Calcutta, said that the "greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion," and added that "every abortion is the denial of receiving Jesus." She called for adoption, rather than abortion, and natural family planning instead of contraception.

The remarks drew sustained applause from several hundred people at the breakfast held at the Washington Hilton. Clinton, who spoke briefly immediately afterward, praised the founder of the Missionaries of Charity, but did not directly respond to her statements on abortion. Instead, he thanked her for her "moving words and, more importantly, for the lifetime of commitment" that he said she had "truly lived."

Clinton focused his remarks mainly on a call for the cultivation of "certain personal characteristics that very frankly all of us in this room who have ever been elected to do anything have abandoned from time to time."

He called for humility, honesty and fairness. "Sometimes I think the commandment we most like to overlook in this city is thou shall not bear false witness," Clinton said.

"If Christ said we would all be judged by how we treated the least of these -- the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the strangers, the imprisoned -- how can we meet that test in a town where we all spend so much time obsessed with ourselves and how we stand on the totem pole and how we look in the morning paper?" Clinton said.

Mother Teresa devoted much of her speech to a plea for love within families and in society. She referred to the work of her order with the poor and dying and repeatedly cited the example of Jesus, who "died on the cross to show that great love."

"If we are not willing to give whatever it takes to do good to one another, sin is still in us," she said. ". . . It is not enough for us to say, 'I love

The Washington Post, February 4, 1994

God.' But I also have to love my neighbor."

Mother Teresa's speech was also praised by Cardinal James Hickey, Roman Catholic archbishop of Washington, who said in a statement that her "cry to love and her defense of unborn life are not empty phrases, because she serves the suffering, the hungry and the thirsty, and she welcomes the unwanted child with open arms."

GRAPHIC: PHOTO, DIGNITARIES APPLAUD MOTHER TERESA AT THE ANNUAL NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST HERE. THEY ARE LED BY PRESIDENT CLINTON, LEFT; SEN. HOWELL T. HEFLIN (D-ALA.), AND VICE PRESIDENT GORE AND HIS WIFE, TIPPER, JAMES M. THRESHER

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 4, 1994

DATE: JULY 5, 1995

CLIENT:
LIBRARY: EXEC
FILE: PRESDC

YOUR SEARCH REQUEST IS:
NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST AND DATE IS FEBRUARY 3 1994

NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS FOUND WITH YOUR REQUEST THROUGH:
LEVEL 1... 1

1ST DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

February 3, 1994

CITE: Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 194

LENGTH: 776 words

HEADLINE: Remarks at the National Prayer Breakfast

BODY:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Senator Stevens. Ladies and gentlemen, you have to forgive me; my voice has not quite returned. The Vice President said earlier that being on the same program with Mother Teresa reminded him of the basketball player who scored one point in a game where Michael Jordan scored 68, and then he said for the rest of his life, "Well, we scored 69 points together." I feel like the guy who comes in with 5 seconds left to go with -- the team's gotten a 40-point lead, and all I have to do is hold the ball until the buzzer rings. [Laughter]

First of all, I thank you, Mother Teresa, for your moving words and more importantly for the lifetime of commitment, for you have truly lived by what you say, something we would all do well to emulate, and I thank you for that.

Like all of you, I was so moved by the profession of faith and the experiences of Mother Teresa that almost anything that any of us could say would be anticlimactic. However, I would like to make these points as briefly as I can, for we come here to pray for those in authority, those given, by the people of the United States under our Constitution and laws, responsibility and the opportunity of making decisions every day which affect all of us.

First I say that this prayer breakfast is an important time to reaffirm that in this Nation where we have freedom of religion, we need not seek freedom from religion. The genius of the book which I have promoted almost shamelessly for the last several months, "The Culture of Disbelief," by Professor Stephen Carter, is that very point, that we should all seek to know and to do God's will, even when we differ.

Second, if we really seek to do that, it requires certain personal characteristics that, very frankly, all of us in this room who have ever been elected to anything have abandoned from time to time, including me. It requires first that we be humble, that we know that even as we seek to do God's will, we remember what President Lincoln said, "The Almighty has his own purposes, and we are not capable of fully knowing them." It requires, second, that we be honest and that we be fair. Sometimes I think the commandment we most like to overlook in this city is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." Third, it requires that we give our bitterness and our resentments up.

I was thinking of this when Mother Teresa told the story of the person who died in her arms saying simply, "Thank you," not, "I'm cold, I'm hungry," a simple thank you, someone with more cause to be resentful, more cause to be bitter, more cause to be angry than anyone in this room could ever be bitter or angry or resentful because of what one of us has said or done to the other; and still dying with a simple thank you. Somehow we all have to give up our resentments. We have to find the courage and the faith to forgive ourselves

and to forgive our foes. And if we cannot, we will surely fail.

Finally, that will permit us to do what Mother Teresa has done, to focus every day on other people. If Christ said we would all be judged by how we treated the least of these -- the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the strangers, the imprisoned -- how can we meet that test in a town where we all spend so much time obsessed with ourselves and how we stand on the totem pole and how we look in the morning paper. Five years from now, it will be nothing. Five hundred years from now, the papers will be dust. And all that will endure is the strength and the integrity and the beauty of what we felt and what we did.

Today, this headline is in our papers: "Nineteen Children Found Amid Squalor in Chicago Apartment," not in Calcutta but in Chicago, 19 children living amid human waste and cockroaches, fighting a dog for food.

I say to you, we will always have our differences; we will never know the whole truth. Of course, that is true. But if we have learned today, again, that we must seek to know the will of God and live by it, that to do it we have to give up our bitterness and our resentment, we have to learn to forgive ourselves and one another, and we have to fight, as hard as it is, to be honest and fair, and if we can be focused on others and not ourselves, realizing that we did not get one whit of power from the Constitution and laws from the framers to do anything for ourselves, it all comes for the purpose of helping others. Then perhaps we can do honor to the faith and to the God who has brought us all here today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:47 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 22, 1994

June 18, 1995

DEDICATION AND BLESSING OF THE MOTHER TERESA HOME

DATE: Monday, June 19th
TIME: 10:30 - 11:50 am
LOCATION: Mother Teresa Home
5649 Western Avenue, NW
FROM: Nicole Rabner

I. PURPOSE

To participate in the formal dedication and blessing of the Mother Teresa Home for Infant Children.

II. BACKGROUND

As you know, Mother Teresa and her order, the Missionaries of Charity, have established a home in Washington, D.C. for children aged zero to three to reside temporarily while awaiting placement in foster or adoptive homes. After many consultations and negotiations with the D.C. government and Catholic Charities, the Sisters will be ready to open the home as soon as they complete the renovations required by the D.C. government. The Sisters who will reside in the home will work in conjunction with Catholic Charities and the D.C. Department of Human Services for referrals of infants.

Mother Teresa Home Blessing and Dedication

This event will serve as the formal dedication and blessing of the Mother Teresa Home. When you arrive at the Home, you will proceed to a private meeting with Mother Teresa. Following that meeting, you will proceed with Mother Teresa, Mayor Barry, Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton, Sister Sylvia, Sandy McMurtrie, Cardinal Hickey and Monsignor Duffy throughout the home, as Cardinal Hickey performs the official blessing on the home. After this blessing, you will proceed with the party to a stage outside the front of the home, where many community and religious members will be gathered. Cardinal Hickey will say a blessing and deliver an opening prayer. Sandy McMurtrie and Sister Sylvia will then deliver welcoming remarks and introduce Monsignor Duffy of Blessed Sacrament Church. Monsignor Duffy will then deliver remarks and introduce Mayor Barry, who will make remarks. Following Mayor Barry's remarks, Monsignor Duffy will introduce Mother Teresa, who will make remarks and introduce you. You will make remarks and close the program.

Following the program, Mother Teresa and Monsignor Duffy, as well as many members of the audience, will proceed to the nearby Blessed Sacrament Church to join in a public mass held in honor of Mother Teresa.

Audience

The Sisters have invited the neighbors of the home and the members of the nearby church congregations to the dedication. We have also reached out to the local catholic community through the Office of Public Liaison, Georgetown University, Catholic non-profit organizations, and Linda Lader's prayer group.

See attached Q&A for further background.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Private Meeting with Mother Teresa

- Mrs. Clinton
- Mother Teresa
- Melanne Verveer
- Sister Sylvia, regional Superior and Vice President/Treasurer of the Missionaries of Charity
- Sandy McMurtrie, Mother Teresa's U.S. representative
- Cardinal Hickey

Blessing of the Mother Teresa Home

- Mrs. Clinton
- Mother Teresa
- Cardinal Hickey
- Monsignor Duffy, Pastor of Blessed Sacrament Church
- Mayor Barry
- Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton
- Sister Sylvia, regional Superior and Vice President/Treasurer of the Missionaries of Charity
- Sandy McMurtrie, Mother Teresa's U.S. representative

IV. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- HRC proceeds to private meeting with Mother Teresa
- HRC proceeds to blessing of Mother Teresa's Home for Infant Children
- HRC proceeds to dedication of Mother Teresa's Home for Infant Children
- Cardinal Hickey delivers blessing and opening prayer
- Sandy McMurtrie and Sister Sylvia deliver welcoming remarks and introduce Monsignor Duffy
- Monsignor Duffy delivers remarks and introduces Mayor Marion Barry and acknowledges Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton and Bishop Lori
- Mayor Barry delivers remarks
- Monsignor Duffy introduces Mother Teresa
- Mother Teresa delivers remarks and introduces HRC
- HRC delivers remarks
- HRC exits stage right and works ropeline right to left
- HRC departs through house

V. PRESS PLAN

Open Press.

VI. REMARKS

Provided by Lissa Muscatine.

19TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 Gannett Company, Inc.
GANNETT NEWS SERVICE

February 14, 1995, Tuesday

LENGTH: 609 words

HEADLINE: WENDY'S FOUNDER PROMOTES ADOPTIONS

BYLINE: LISA FAYE KAPLAN; Gannett News Service

BODY:

Dave Thomas, pitchman for Wendy's restaurants and champion of adoptive families, is putting his mouth where his money is.

He established the \$ 2 million Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption in 1992, has lobbied Congress on behalf of adoptive children and families, and is plugging the cause during a promotional tour for his new "Well Done!: The Common Guy's Guide to Everyday Success." (Harper Collins, \$ 18.99)

"I think every child deserves a home and a family of their own," says Thomas.

Most people recognize Thomas, 62, as the cuddly, obviously amateur TV spokesman for Wendy's fast food. His face is always plastered with a well-fed, contented grin. His voice is a soft monotone.

Thomas' easy manner, however, belies a tough life.

He was born out of wedlock in 1932 and placed for adoption with a Michigan couple. His adoptive mother died when he was five. And he tramped around the country with his adoptive father who was always searching for work.

"Although I was lucky that my adoptive father kept me with him, most of my younger years were spent in trailers and modest apartments as he moved around, tracking down work and going through two other marriages," Thomas writes in "Well Done."

"It wasn't an easy life by any means, but I survived."

Thomas credits his adoptive grandmother, Minnie Sinclair, for helping him to cope with hard times.

"She told me I was special," he says.

She also told Thomas he was adopted.

The news shocked the 13-year-old. But it also explained the confusion he always felt.

"I felt I wasn't like everyone else," Thomas says. "Maybe it was because we moved around so much. Maybe because I didn't have a mother."

After an overseas stint in the Army, Thomas searched for his biological parents, but learned they had died young. He eventually met his maternal grandparents.

GANNETT NEWS SERVICE, February 14, 1995

"But it wasn't what I thought," he says. "They were strangers."

In the hands of a sympathy seeker, perhaps someone who had not amounted to much, Thomas's life story would be a three-hanky tale.

But the senior chairman of Wendy's International, a \$ 5 billion global company, shrugs off childhood hardships.

"At least I had a family," he says. "We stayed together. I might not have had the best room. But I had enough to eat and clothes to wear and a place to stay."

A home for every kid. That's what children need, Thomas says.

"Without a family, I would not be where I am today," he told Congress in January.

The Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption raises awareness about the thousands of children awaiting adoption, longing for a home.

The foundation hopes Congress will pass:

- An adoption tax credit to help families defray expenses associated with adoption, which average \$ 9,000 a child;

- An additional \$ 5,000 refundable tax credit to parents who adopt a special needs child - minority children, children with disabilities, siblings who wish to remain together.

Thomas also lobbies corporate heads to include in benefit packages the same assistance to adoptive parents as to birth parents. Wendy's, for example, offers employees adoption expense assistance of up to \$ 4,000 per child and up to \$ 6,000 for the adoption of a special needs child.

Thomas and his wife, Lorraine, have five children, 13 grandchildren. None is adopted.

The restaurant chain is named after his daughter, Melinda, whom they called "Wenda" as a child.

Big mistake, says Thomas, who liked the name Wendy.

"I thought we'd have one restaurant, maybe 2 or 3," he says. "I didn't know we'd have Wendy's all over America. People asked Pam (another daughter), 'Why didn't they name it Pam's.' "

"I love them equally," Thomas says.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 16, 1995

15TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1992 PR Newswire Association, Inc.
PR Newswire

November 23, 1992, Monday

SECTION: Financial News

DISTRIBUTION: TO BUSINESS EDITOR

LENGTH: 562 words

HEADLINE: WENDY'S FOUNDER CHALLENGES CEOS TO SUPPORT ADOPTION WITH EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

DATELINE: National Adoption Week Starts Sunday

BODY:

DUBLIN, Ohio, Nov. 21 -- CEOs at America's Fortune 1000 companies will receive encouragement from Wendy's Founder Dave Thomas to offer their employees adoption assistance benefits during National Adoption Week (Nov. 22-28). The effort is part of Thomas' adoption crusade to secure homes for the tens of thousands of children in America who are waiting to be adopted.

Thomas, spokesman for the President's initiative "Adoption Works...For Everyone," believes there are an equal number of adults willing to consider giving these children a loving home, but don't know what to do or where to start. "I was adopted as a child because someone cared enough to give me a home and love," said Thomas. "Every child today deserves the same."

This week Thomas' personal letters will arrive on the desks of corporate CEOs, encouraging them to implement employee adoption assistance programs.

"It will cost little, and will be of immense value to your company, as well as society," states Thomas in the letter. This is the second letter writing campaign he has conducted since asked by President Bush to serve as spokesperson for the White House initiative in 1990.

"It's an inexpensive way for companies to encourage family values," said Thomas. "We can help these young children find homes if American business plays its part."

Thomas' letter includes a description of the Wendy's adoption benefits program, recognized by adoption agencies as a model for such programs. Wendy's International provides eligible company employees a paid leave of absence and up to \$4,000 in fees and legal costs per adopted child and \$6,000 for special needs children. Since Wendy's began the program in 1990, it has spent \$26,000 on 10 adoptions. Seven more adoptions are pending. By comparison, the company spent about \$2.5 million on employee maternity claims.

The National Council on Adoption estimates 12 percent of large companies nationwide pay some adoption expenses, generally \$2,000 or less.

Wendy's Old Fashioned Hamburgers Restaurants nationwide are displaying posters and trayliners for the "Adoption Works...For Everyone" campaign featuring a photo of Thomas and U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services

PR Newswire, November 23, 1992

Louis Sullivan, along with a group of recently adopted children.

Earlier this year, Thomas established the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption, which is dedicated to the philosophy that every child deserves a permanent home and loving family. Foundation efforts focus on raising public awareness of the thousands of children needing adoption and offering educational programs to help prospective parents better understand the adoption process.

The Foundation has prepared a guide called "Adoption Works...For Everyone: A Beginner's Guide to Adoption," which explains the adoption process to prospective parents. This free guide is available by writing: The Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption, P.O. Box 7164, Dublin, OH 43017. The "Beginner's Guide" is also distributed by adoption agencies throughout the country, and the contents of the guide has been reproduced in the newly released paperback version of Thomas' autobiography "Dave's Way." CONTACT: Denny Lynch of Wendy's International, Inc., 614-764-3413, or Jeff Beckman of Ketchum Public Relations, 312-266-4550, for Wendy's International, Inc.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 24, 1992

11TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The Houston Chronicle Publishing Company
The Houston Chronicle

March 26, 1995, Sunday, 2 STAR Edition

SECTION: LIFESTYLE; Pg. 11

LENGTH: 1058 words

HEADLINE: Wendy's big cheese has more than burgers on his mind

BYLINE: LIZ DOUP; Knight-Ridder Newspapers

BODY:

"Hi, Dave! "

Breezing into a Wendy's restaurant in South Florida, Catherine Phipps greets Dave Thomas - multimillionaire Wendy's founder, adoption crusader and Fort Lauderdale notable - as if they're best buddies, then bends his ear with an unsolicited critique:

She just "hates" it when her neighborhood Wendy's runs out of baked potatoes.

"Never met the man in my life," says Phipps, 38, of Fort Lauderdale. "But I feel like I know him. The commercials, you know. "

His folksy commercials have made Thomas the Sy Sperling of fast food and Wendy's most popular hamburger hawker since Clara Peller squawked, "Where's the beef? " Advertising Age called him "a steer in a half-sleeve shirt. "

Now he's gone public again, plugging his book "Well Done!

The Common Guy's Guide to Everyday" Success (Zondervan Publishing House; \$ 18.99). It's filled with sentimental stories about people who've done good - rescued delinquents, adopted kids, created jobs.

In spite of his homespun commercials and his book's down-home homilies, Thomas, 62, is no one-dimensional, back-slapping, quick-smiling goober. He is a mix of contradictions:

He crusades for adoption, although his experience as an adopted child sounds more disastrous than idyllic.

He touts education and has six honorary degrees, but he's a 10th-grade dropout who earned a GED out of embarrassment at age 60.

He lauds family life, but his wife, five kids and Thomas himself admit he's no candidate for Father of the Year.

The Houston Chronicle, March 26, 1995

And although his face is as public as a billboard, in person he'd rather stick his hand in a kitchen grease fire than talk about himself.

"I'm a doer, not a talker," he says. "I believe if you have a problem, you get out there and make things happen. "

Here's what Thomas, born out of wedlock and adopted as an infant, made happen: At 12, he bused tables at a Knoxville restaurant. At 15, he left his nomadic father and moved into the YMCA in Fort Wayne, Ind., where he worked at a nearby restaurant.

Focused and frugal, Thomas learned every angle of the business. At 30, he took over four failing Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurants in Columbus, Ohio, purchased by Phil Clauss, his boss and mentor. Thomas turned them into moneymakers and got a percentage of ownership.

At 35, he became a millionaire after selling to John Y. Brown, who had bought out KFC.

A year later, Thomas opened a hamburger restaurant, named after his fourth child. It grew into Wendy's International, now at 4,400 restaurants and \$ 4.2 billion in annual sales.

Thomas, stockholder and senior chairman, is reportedly worth \$ 50 million to \$ 80 million.

"Everybody else (we bought out in the mid-'60s) thought about buying boats and Florida condos," says Brown, former Kentucky governor and now Thomas' neighbor in the gated Bay Colony community. "Not Dave. He lived and breathed the business. "

It's no different today. Although Thomas gave up day-to-day management in '82, Wendy's high-profile pitchman is away from his 4,000-square-foot, five-bedroom Fort Lauderdale home about a third of the year. In the last two months, he has chalked up 280 interviews to promote what's nearest his heart: Wendy's, of course, and adoption.

"I guess I'd call adoption a stigma," says Thomas of his early years. "You grow up not feeling equal to others. "

Born in 1932 in Atlantic City, N.J., Thomas never knew his birth parents. At 6 weeks old, he was adopted by Rex Thomas and wife, Auleva, who died of rheumatic fever when Thomas was 5

Rex Thomas was a tall, muscular man who disciplined with a strap. He married three more times and moved around the Midwest looking for construction work.

The Houston Chronicle, March 26, 1995

Having had no loving family growing up, Thomas recognizes how important one is. That's why he promotes adoption. Same with education. Embarrassed by youngsters asking why he, a dropout, tells kids to stay in school, Thomas earned his GED in 1993.

Coconut Creek High School honored him with a special graduation. He was voted "'Most Likely to Succeed. '" Not bad for a guy whose father once said: "'You'll never keep a job. I'll be supporting you for the rest of your life. '"

At 21, Thomas, working as a grill man, met Lorraine Buskirk, an 18-year-old waitress, who didn't buckle under his guff. She hasn't changed.

"'He's a Cancer, a crab,'" says Lorraine, 59, who jokes easily about her husband of nearly 41 years. "'He's been all business for so long the personality has all gone away. Sometimes I'll say, 'David, say something nice,' and he'll say, 'Why should I change now? ' '"

In short order, they had five children: Pam, now 40, Ken, 38, Molly, 37, Melinda, 35 and Lori, 27. Melinda, the restaurant namesake, was "'Wenda'" to siblings who couldn't pronounce her name. Wenda became Wendy.

Although his interview-weary children pass on talking about Dad, they've discussed him before.

"'He was always overtired,'" Pam told People magazine a year and a half ago. "'He really didn't know how to treat kids, didn't know how to go to a baseball game. My mom really held it together. '"

In his '91 autobiography, Dave's Way, Thomas doesn't hedge: "'I have to confess that I cheated my kids by not being involved enough in raising them. '"

In his defense, Lorraine says: "'To know how to be a dad, you needed to have one and he didn't. Not one who acted like he cared, anyway. '"

Lorraine, good-natured and resigned, attends most charity functions without him. For years she's been involved in the Royal Dames for cancer research and the Children's Home Society of Florida

Last fall, the \$ 2.4 million I.Lorraine Thomas Emergency Children's Home opened in Fort Lauderdale, thanks in part to the couple's \$ 500,000 donation.

And they eat at Wendy's, of course. Lorraine arrives at the pickup window in her white Mercedes station wagon. They don't eat inside because he draws a crowd.

Her usual order: A cheeseburger with ketchup, pickle, onion and mustard, and an iced tea with lemon and Sweet 'n Low.

The Houston Chronicle, March 26, 1995

Total: \$ 3.39.

Dave's order: a small chili and a Frosty. Total: \$ 2.10.

(Recently, Thomas went on a diet and dropped 45 pounds. He's since dropped the Frosty from his order.)

They're paying customers.

Thomas pays with a \$ 100 bill.

GRAPHIC: Photo: Wendy's founder Dave Thomas takes a soda break at a Wendy's restaurant in Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Bob Eighmie / Miami Herald

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

TYPE: Biography

LOAD-DATE: April 2, 1995

3RD STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The Baltimore Sun Company
The Baltimore Sun

June 10, 1995, Saturday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: EDITORIAL, Pg. 8A

LENGTH: 758 words

HEADLINE: The Adoption Option

BYLINE: PATRICK ERCOLANO

BODY:

To save one life is to save the whole world. -- Talmud

Like most people, I'm usually happy to encounter a pregnant woman, to be reminded of an expectant mother's luminous beauty and the miraculous way human life begins. But during the past year, whenever I've seen a woman who I know is expecting her second, third or fourth child, I wonder if she and her partner have asked themselves this question:

"What if we added to our family by adopting a child?"

I admit that after our first child was born, and while my wife and I were debating whether to have a second, we never considered adopting any of the countless love-starved kids here and abroad in foster homes and orphanages. It never occurred to us, nor did anyone suggest it.

Until April of last year. That's when we came across a New York Times Magazine column in which Laura Cunningham wrote about her adoption of an orphaned baby girl from the People's Republic of China.

Her heart-rending, in-your-face piece described the "one child" law imposed by Chinese leaders in 1979 to alleviate the country's severe overpopulation. The policy has significantly lowered the birth rate. But it also has resulted in hundreds of thousands of Chinese girls being abandoned or murdered after birth, mainly because most parents want their one child to be a son who will provide for them in their old age.

My wife and I saw the column as virtually a dare by the author. We talked it over for a month. Could we love a child born to people we had never met and probably never would meet? Could we love a child of another race, another culture, another world, and raise her so she would understand and appreciate her heritage? Would the child be accepted and loved not only by her new big sister but also by her adoptive grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins?

After we determined all our questions could be answered in the affirmative, we went into action. We filled out a gazillion forms. We were fingerprinted for background checks by the FBI. We provided records that showed we were financially stable. We told a social worker about our relationships with our parents. More than once it occurred to me that if no child could be born until his or her parents first jumped through all the hoops we were put through, the world might be a happier place.

The Baltimore Sun, June 10, 1995

Certainly the logistical hurdles -- not to mention the soul-searching -- associated with adoption would put off many people. There's also the expense, which, for an international adoption, roughly equals the cost of a new medium-sized car. Infertile couples may have no choice. However, parents who already have biological offspring might easily say, "Who needs this aggravation? We can just have another of our own."

Lawmakers are at least beginning to regard tax credits for adoption costs as an idea whose time has come. In addition, more American companies have begun to pay part of their employees' adoption bills. Dave Thomas, owner of the Wendy's fast-food chain and himself an adoptee, has lobbied for such credits to encourage adoption and create some equity with biological births, which are covered almost entirely by health insurance.

Monetary incentives are nice, but they won't persuade people to adopt. After all, for every reason to bring a child into your family, there are a dozen reasons why you'd be nuts to do so. In the case of adoption, the pitfalls seem even more numerous.

Yet who ever said acts of love are rational? We could have saved ourselves a lot of money and trouble if we had just decided to have a second child ourselves. But last December, when my wife and her dad returned from China with our beautiful, six-month-old baby girl and were greeted at the airport by 15 relatives and friends, the hassle and expense were forgotten. The joy of that moment, and of so many moments since, can't be tagged with a price.

Six months later, we're preparing to celebrate Juliet's first birthday. We don't know her exact date of birth, though we've contacted her orphanage to learn as much about her as possible. There's a lot we, and she, may never know. Still, we'll help her all we can along the way. Meanwhile, she is not our "adopted baby" or our "Chinese baby" but just . . . our baby. She has done what any new child ought to do for a family -- multiply the love within it.

When people meet her, they tell us, "What a lucky baby she is." No, we say. We're the lucky ones to have her, lucky to have chosen the adoption option.

Patrick Ercolano writes editorials for The Baltimore Sun.

TYPE: OP-ED, COMMENTARY

LOAD-DATE: June 12, 1995

Citation
 4/20/95 WSJ A13
 4/20/95 Wall St. J. A13
 1995 WL-WSJ 2128736

Rank(R)
 R 1 OF 4

Database
 WSJ

Mode
 Page

The Wall Street Journal
 Copyright (c) 1995, Dow Jones & Co., Inc.

Thursday, April 20, 1995

Politics & People: Richard Lugar: Can a Good Man Survive in This Climate?
 By Albert R. **Hunt**

A genuine heavyweight entered the Republican presidential chase yesterday: Richard Lugar, with a background as a Rhodes Scholar, businessman and farmer, and acclaimed mayor of Indianapolis, has been elected four times as the moderately conservative senator from Indiana and is the party's most respected politician on foreign policy.

He's ideally suited to the public desire for honest and principled politicians. "He is very smart and as well motivated a public official as you'll ever find," says GOP pollster Bob Teeter, who has known the 63-year-old Mr. Lugar for a quarter century. "I doubt he has ever done anything in public life that he didn't think was right." Even many of us who more often than not disagree with him respect his character and capacity.

But, according to the conventional wisdom, Dick Lugar is a second-tier contender. Sure, he's thoughtful, virtuous and experienced. But what does that count for in this chase? He's lousy at oversimplified soundbites or pandering to zealots -- the stuff that really counts.

If this conventional wisdom is correct, the Lugar candidacy personifies a reality of contemporary presidential politics: The skills required to get to the presidency have little in common with the skills required once there.

"A good president needs the vision thing, and the ability to create skillful compromises," notes John Sears, who ran Ronald Reagan's first presidential campaign. "But the nomination is the province of special interests that have little to do with governing. What often matters is who can prostitute themselves the most."

The primary process requires a slavish discipline: who can spend the most days in Iowa or New Hampshire, who can make the most fund-raising phone calls, who can most quickly seize on a hot-button issue (e.g., Henry Foster's nomination as surgeon general) or coin the slickest gimmick or phrase. This is equally true in both parties; witness the past two successful nominees.

In 1988 George Bush beat Bob Dole by winning in New Hampshire with his no-tax-hike pledge. For the rest of the campaign he carefully

Copr. (C) West 1995 No claim to orig. U.S. govt. works

positioned himself as a kinder and gentler Ronald Reagan who personally knew all the world's leaders.

The tax pledge was a fraud, which the candidate knew, and Mr. Bush never explained how he wanted to lead the country. When the Cold War had the audacity to end on his watch, he was hopelessly lost. After the triumph of Desert Storm, with his approval rating in the polls hovering above 80%, the president addressed a joint session of Congress and asked for a transportation bill and a crime measure, the details of which even he probably couldn't recall today.

In 1992 Bill Clinton, when pressed by Paul Tsongas, promised a middle-class tax cut and told workers he was tougher than his rival on the trade and jobs issues. Both his tax talk and his trade talk were shams, and his sensible policies as president suffered because they were so at variance with what he had said in the campaign.

In foreign policy, candidate Clinton's policies were very clear: He was against anything President Bush did. This made for great soundbites on Bosnia and human rights in China and Central America. But it became painfully obvious that Mr. Clinton had thought little about where he wanted to lead America in the post-Cold War world, or even whom he wanted to orchestrate any policy.

Sen. Lugar knows all of this, but nevertheless thinks he can wage a successful campaign on big issues. The first is to stop the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction. "We have a small window of opportunity before it's virtually impossible," he says; he can be expected to spell out in learned detail how that might be achieved.

Even more central is his domestic centerpiece, replacing the existing tax system with a national sales tax. "The middle income is not making any progress in America any longer," he says. The only way to sustain adequate growth with a savings rate of only 2% is to substitute a sales tax on consumption for existing taxes. This would wipe out taxes on capital gains and dividends and close down the IRS. But, he contends, it "would jump start savings and investments."

In his announcement speech, a more-animated-than-usual Sen. Lugar stressed these issues, as well as the themes of personal responsibility and self-discipline. He called for "reinvigorating moral character" in America and vowed as president to set a "moral example."

No doubt he would. And while he's probably right on proliferation and wrong on a national sales tax, Dick Lugar has a habit of being prescient: He was the most prominent Republican senator to take on South African apartheid, he called for wiping out most agricultural subsidies years ago, and with Democratic Sen. Sam Nunn has fashioned the most coherent post-Cold War policy on Russia.

Copr. (C) West 1995 No claim to orig. U.S. govt. works

Anyone who thinks he's an out-of-touch Council on Foreign Relations elitist type should meet his wife, Charlene. The Lugars have turned down White House invitations because it was Char's bowling night. (Once, my wife's dinner partner was Sen. Lugar and mine was Char Lugar. My wife and the senator talked about Russia, the Middle East and Central America. Ms. Lugar and I discussed Bobby Knight and John Thompson, the basketball coaches at Indiana and Georgetown universities. My wife may have learned more; I had more fun.)

Sen. Lugar, a realist, knows his candidacy is a long shot. But, he says, "I want to be president to make big changes. If not everybody votes for me, I at least hope they have respect for what I'm saying after the campaign." It's a good bet that Dick Lugar will get more respect than votes -- and the public will be the loser.

Postscript: On Monday, President Clinton signed off on guidelines that will make transracial **adoption** much easier. To receive federal funds, **adoption** agencies may not use race as a general consideration in placement, as now is frequently done; the sole criterion must be the best interest of the individual child.

Separately, a conservative legal foundation has filed suit attacking states that impede transracial **adoptions**; the soon-to-be-issued administration guidelines should strengthen the legal case. These guidelines would affect as many as 30 state laws, including those in the president's home state of Arkansas. The heroes in this intense battle were, in addition to the president, former Sen. Howard Metzenbaum, who wrote the legislation last year; the Justice Department's top legal counsel, Walter Dellinger; and White House policy aide Bill Galston. They overrode the objections of black social workers and some bureaucrats at the Department of Health and Human Services who wanted to make it more difficult for whites to **adopt** black children.

----- INDEX REFERENCES -----

NEWS SUBJECT: Biography; Editorial & Columns; Law & Legal Issues; Lifestyle; Politics (BIO EDC LAW LIF PLT)

GOVERNMENT: Congress; Executive (CNG EXE)

REGION: North America; United States (NME US)

Word Count: 1114

4/20/95 WSJ A13

END OF DOCUMENT

Copr. (C) West 1995 No claim to orig. U.S. govt. works

Citation	Rank(R)	Database	Mode
3/9/95 WSJ A19	R 3 OF 4	WSJ	Page
3/9/95 Wall St. J. A19			
1995 WL-WSJ 2124686			

The Wall Street Journal
Copyright (c) 1995, Dow Jones & Co., Inc.

Thursday, March 9, 1995

Politics & People: The Republicans Seize the High Ground On Transracial
Adoption

By Albert R. Hunt

Here's a twist: House Republicans, under the aegis of the Contract With America, are coming to the aid of defenseless little African-American children while the Clinton administration sits on the sidelines.

The issue is transracial **adoption**. A bill sponsored by liberal Democratic Sen. Howard Metzenbaum last year was supposed to prevent discrimination in **adoption** cases because of race. But Mr. Metzenbaum, now retired, laments that his effort -- endorsed by President Clinton -- was hijacked by the Department of Health and Human Services, apparently to placate black social workers who have long opposed transracial **adoption** as "racial genocide."

House Republicans, led by Rep. Jim Bunning of Kentucky, leapt into the breach and, as part of the big welfare bill approved by the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday, would make it illegal for **adoption** agencies that get federal funds to discriminate. Although this would overturn the legislation that bears his name, Sen. Metzenbaum may support it.

The whole issue crystallizes larger problems the Democrats confront with race-based decisions. The efforts by the Clinton administration's Department of Health and Human Services to weaken transracial **adoptions** raise serious constitutional concerns, according to the Clinton administration's Justice Department.

This is precisely what enables critics to depict affirmative action as race-based special treatment rather than as an effort to fight past discrimination and promote diversity. In fact, affirmative action has been more successful than the current debate suggests.

Few areas, for example, have been more controversial than integrating police and fire departments. But it's undeniable that in a lot of cities, it's safer today for the fire department to go into certain areas because the trucks aren't manned only by whites, and that community policing in high crime areas is more successful because of an influx of minorities.

Copr. (C) West 1995 No claim to orig. U.S. govt. works

The impact on the private sector has been real and beneficial. A personal example: When I joined this newspaper almost three decades ago there were precious few women or minorities on the news staff. Today about one out of five Journal news staff employees is a member of a minority group, and about 40% of the staff is female. As recently as 12 years ago there were no minority reporters in the Washington bureau and not that many women; today more than 10% of the Washington reporters are minorities and almost a third are women. Some more-qualified -- on paper -- white males may have been passed over. But The Wall Street Journal is a far better newspaper today because of a more diverse staff.

Yet opponents continue the canard about reverse discrimination, with ludicrous assertions like white males are an "endangered species." For all the racial progress we've made in America, can any sensible person say, with a straight face, that many white males would trade places with many blacks or women?

But it's also true that some affirmative action has outlived its usefulness and too often has been turned into politically destructive quotas. When race-based considerations become the dispositive factor, it offends most Americans.

That's the history of transracial **adoption** for the past 20 years. Because of the black social workers, thousands of black children have been disadvantaged: There are as many as 100,000 children in foster care today waiting to be **adopted**, and 40% are African-American. These black children, on average, wait twice as long as white children to be **adopted**.

Howard Metzenbaum's view was simple: When there are two equally qualified prospective parents, preference can be given to same-race **adoptions**, and where there are special factors -- a child who has been in several foster homes of the same race -- racial factors can be considered. Otherwise, race never should be used to delay finding, or to deny, a baby or a young child caring parents.

But by gutting this legislation in the closing days of the last Congress, HHS threatens not only to create lousy social policy but to cause constitutional problems too. Walter Dellinger, who heads the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, privately has expressed "serious concerns" that the transracial **adoption** measure may permit race to play a broader role than is constitutionally allowed.

The courts have consistently held that race-based governmental decisions are impermissible except in the context of affirmative action, specifically meaning they either must redress prior discrimination or promote integration. Obviously, government sanctioned, race-based decisions on **adoptions** wouldn't qualify.

Mr. Dellinger has argued that guidelines should be **adopted** that very
Copr. (C) West 1995 No claim to orig. U.S. govt. works

narrowly limit the use of race in any child-placement decisions. For instance, race could be considered only in the context of specific needs for a specific child. But privately HHS is considering guidelines that would allow delays of up to a year in order to find a **adoptive** parent of the same race. "That would be a cruel abomination and is totally contrary to what I, and President Clinton, intended," thunders Mr. Metzenbaum.

Jim Bunning, meanwhile, was not only following the GOP Contract but reflecting a personal experience too. His daughter's recent **adoption** of an African-American baby was delayed, apparently because of race-based considerations. He and Mr. Metzenbaum talked on Tuesday for the first time and are in basic agreement.

One legitimate concern of some African-Americans has been that **adoption** can be so expensive -- \$5,000 to \$10,000 is not unusual -- that it amounts to economic discrimination. But another part of the GOP Contract promises a \$5,000 refundable tax credit for **adoption** for anyone making up to \$60,000. Although some tax experts worry that the refundable credit invites fraud -- early indications suggest ominous levels of fraud in the heralded earned-income tax credit -- Rep. Bunning insists "we'll keep the refundable part" of that tax break in subsequent legislation.

The congressional Republican agenda is largely oblivious to the plight of black children. Moreover, as the National Council for **Adoption** complains, the separate GOP plan to turn foster care and **adoption** assistance into block grants to the states inadequately protects the interests of some of these innocent children.

But on the symbolic issue of transracial **adoption**, Jim Bunning has put the GOP on the high ground, as President Clinton is undercut by his own Department of Health and Human Services.

(See related letter: "Letters to the Editor: We Want to Find the Children Homes" -- WSJ March 16, 1995)

(See related letter: "Letters to the editor: Forget Race -- Find The Children Homes" -- WSJ April 5, 1995)

950309-0118

950316-0139

YY95 MM03

YY95 MM04

----- INDEX REFERENCES -----

Copr. (C) West 1995 No claim to orig. U.S. govt. works

NEWS SUBJECT: Editorial & Columns; Labor, Personnel Issues; Lifestyle; Taxes
(EDC LAB LIF TAX)

GOVERNMENT: Congress; Executive; Health and Human Services (CNG EXE HHS)

REGION: North America; United States (NME US)

Word Count: 1068

3/9/95 WSJ A19

END OF DOCUMENT

Copr. (C) West 1995 No claim to orig. U.S. govt. works

EVENT: MOTHER TERESA'S ORPHANAGE

Action Officer: Marcia & Olivier Bernicat

Site Officer:

Date/Time: Tuesday, March 28 at 10:30 am

Location: 12 Commissioner Lane, Civil Lines, New Delhi 54

Time required for event: 45 minutes

Travel time:

From embassy: 35 minutes

From previous Location: 40 minutes

(RON - Sheraton hotel)

Activity: Mrs. Clinton and Chelsea will be met in the front courtyard by Mother Teresa or one of her representatives -- most likely her chief assistant Sister Priscilla or head of the Delhi orphanage, Sister Joyce. Children will present them with garlands and possibly sing a song. As they are conducted on a tour of the facilities (the children are housed in 6 rooms), Mother Teresa or her representative will provide a briefing on the orphanage, its history and services, and the work of the Missionaries of Charity in general. Mrs. Clinton and Chelsea will have an opportunity to meet and/or hold some of the children during the tour and at its conclusion, when children, participants, and press will gather in the rear courtyard for an informal meet and greet and photo op. Mrs. Clinton could use this occasion to make a few remarks, meet American families who have adopted children from Mother Teresa's, and present a gift to the orphanage. The party will then depart.

Background on location/participants: The orphanage in New Delhi is the largest (after Calcutta), run by the Missionaries of Charity in India. Established in 1962 and inaugurated by then-Prime Minister Nehru, the Delhi orphanage placed 103 of the 141 children it welcomed to its facility in 1994. There are currently 166 children at the main orphanage in New Delhi. The Missionaries of Charity also operates in New Delhi an orphanage for severely handicapped children (which contains a shelter for unwed mothers), a hospice for the dying and destitute, and a hospital/rehabilitation center for approximately 400 leprosy victims. The Missionaries of Charity have facilities throughout India and the world including in the U.S.; there are over 4500 sisters in the order. (N.B. - Missionaries of Charity releases children for adoption in India and Europe. Although Americans resident in or who travel to India are able to adopt children from the Missionaries of Charity, the organization does not place children in the U.S. because of Mother Teresa's continued opposition to liberal U.S. abortion laws.)

Participants: (N.B. - The rooms at the orphanage are not contiguous and cannot accommodate a large number of participants in a walk-through.)

Mission: Ambassador & Mrs. Wisner, Nancy Powell, Marcia & Olivier Bernicat, the Evans, the Files, and the Roecks (adoptive parents and their children), and the press officer

Delegation: Mrs. Clinton, Chelsea, A/S Raphel, Kent Obee, other members as desired

Indians: Representatives of Missionaries of Charity: Mother Teresa, Sister Priscilla, and/or Sister Joyce

Others: pool press (see below)

Press arrangements:

Members of the pool press will cover the event. Anticipate photographers at the entrance and in the inner courtyard. Given the size of the orphanage's facilities, would recommend only the White House photographer follow Mrs. Clinton and Chelsea on the tour itself and that the total number of press (U.S. and foreign) be limited, as indicated by the pool. Press could be staged on the broad step in front of the orphanage's chapel to photograph Mrs. Clinton when she completes the tour and joins children waiting in the courtyard for the remarks, unofficial meet & greet and gift presentation. No formal text of the remarks are required and no q & a session permitted.

TALKING POINTS

-- As a woman who has enjoyed the rewards of motherhood and family life, and a professional career, my attention is drawn to the great social challenges India faces as it endeavors to address the needs of a society of over 900 million people.

-- India's people are its greatest strength. India's challenge is to enable each of them to achieve their full potential so that they, too, may take part in this nation's exciting journey to a prosperous and stable future.

-- The work being done here by the Missionaries of Charity reminds us all that each society is judged by the way it treats its weakest members. The children who are helped to a better life here can grow and learn and achieve success.

-- Mother Teresa and her activities are another link between the U.S. and India. Her charitable work continues every day in both countries, and the example of her service and selflessness inspires us all around the world.

+LDM

L12

MISSIONARIES

'As long as you did it to one of these My least brother. You did it to Me'

54A A.J.C. Bose Rd., Calcutta 700016
21 March 1995

OF CHARITY

Mrs. Hillary Rodham Clinton
The White House
Washington

Dear Mrs. Clinton,

Mother Teresa had written to you in a letter dated February 7 this year that she looked forward to meeting you in India in March.

I am sure, however, that you have received her message conveyed by your Consul-General in Calcutta that she had to leave for Vietnam on March 18. Mother was very sorry that she could not change the dates of her Vietnam visit so that she could be back in India in time to welcome you at our Home in Delhi.

Since Mother will not be here, she has asked me to meet with you in Delhi. It will be a great pleasure for me to see you once again and to be able to welcome you to our Children's Home.

May God be with you on your forthcoming trip. I look forward to seeing you in Delhi.

God bless you.

Sr. M. Priscilla, M.C.

Sr. M. Priscilla, M.C.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Mother Theresa and Visas for Her Sisters of Charity

Currently, we impose a visa fee for Indian religious workers who wish to come to the United States. The fee is based on a statutory requirement of reciprocity and, at last report, was \$100. The Indian Government imposes such a fee on our religious workers; we are required to do the same for Indian religious workers. If India would eliminate its fee, we would eliminate ours.

Mother Theresa has expressed a desire to have the fee waived for her Sisters of Charity. She has made this request of several U.S. Presidents, including President Clinton.

We have concluded that it would be very difficult to waive or even reduce the fee without legislation. We are now reviewing the possibility of seeking a remedy in consular legislation that is being drafted at the Department of State.

Such a remedy might provide exceptions to a narrow class of foreign nationals involved in social service activities who plan to be in the United States for an extended period of time.

Even with this measure, however, visa applicants would still have to pay the \$20 user fee for the machine-readable visas we use in India. In view of the relevant (and recently enacted) legislation, it would be very difficult to get around this particular requirement.

4TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

July 02, 1995, Sunday, Final Edition

SECTION: OP-ED; Pg. C07; DAVID S. BRODER

LENGTH: 756 words

HEADLINE: Meeting on the Common

BYLINE: David S. Broder

BODY:

What good is Independence Day without hot dogs and hot air, barbecues and oratory? I can't supply the eats, but I would offer some holiday thoughts, inspired by an intercontinental exchange between Prague and the American groves of academe.

Vaclav Havel, the president of the Czech Republic, was Harvard's commencement speaker, delivering a passionate and eloquent address on the responsibility of politicians and journalists to embody and inculcate the civic virtues that make democracy possible. Both politics and journalism, he said, must aim at "serving the community," which means "morality in practice."

At the same time, in Havel's home city of Prague, Benjamin Barber, the Walt Whitman professor of political science at Rutgers, was offering a related set of thoughts. Barber's comments are as applicable to our own country as to the representatives of the former Communist lands who were in his audience at a conference sponsored by the Center for Civic Education, the American Federation of Teachers, the Department of Education and the U.S. Information Agency.

In words that Havel would certainly applaud, Barber reminded his listeners that "democracy is a process, not an end; an ongoing experiment, not a set of fixed doctrines. Its ideals, unless we repossess them generation to generation, become little different than any other ideology. The open society means a society without cloture, a society open to challenge and criticism."

And then a sentence that I wish could be written on every classroom blackboard and intoned at the start of each day's session of Congress: "When a nation announces the work of democracy is finished, it's usually democracy that is finished in that nation."

We live in a time when a great many politicians are addicted to rewriting the Constitution. No fewer than four constitutional amendments may be voted on in Congress this year. Most of them don't stand scrutiny. But even if they did, Barber reminds us that constitutional protections are only what James Madison called "parchment parapets," from which threats to freedom and democracy can be repelled only if a strong-willed, principled citizenry stands ready at the gates.

"Constitutions do not create democracy," Barber says. "Democracies create constitutions. . . . America had 150 years of experience with local civic cultures and civil liberty before it codified the experience into the Constitution and Bill of Rights." Those documents will endure only as long as

Lissa- FYI
(see highlighted
passage on p. 2)

The Washington Post, July 02, 1995

their principles are clearly etched on our minds and enshrined in our hearts. That is why this great national holiday really is the occasion for the kind of patriotic oratory that reminds us of our individual responsibility -- Havel's favorite word -- to safeguard democracy through active citizenship.

We also live in a time when, as noted here recently, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, Dick Armey of Texas, and many, many other politicians argue that "the market is rational and the government is dumb." The exaggerated faith in the market is, Barber says, "our most insidious myth, because so many believe it and because the handcuffs of the market feel so comfortable."

He decries the "disastrous confusion between the moderate and mostly well-founded claim that flexibly regulated markets remain the most efficient instruments of economic productivity and wealth accumulation . . . and the zany, overblown claim that naked, wholly unregulated markets are the sole means by which we can produce and distribute everything we care about, from durable goods to spiritual values, from capital development to social justice, from profitability to a sustainable environment, from private wealth to the essential commonweal."

The point is that we are citizens as well as consumers. Individual choice works wonderfully well in guiding our private consumption. But it is only as we join together to sort out the means for meeting our common goals that we can sustain our democracy.

That is why the traditional American Fourth of July involves meeting on the common -- whether it is Golden Gate Park in San Francisco, Grant Park in Chicago or the Mall in Washington, where I will be. It is a time to remind ourselves of the blessings -- and responsibilities -- we share as citizens of this land.

As Havel said at Harvard, "The main task of the coming era is . . . a radical renewal of our sense of responsibility."

There is no better time for pondering that challenge -- and acting on it -- than Independence Day.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 02, 1995

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 992-6600 / (800) 631-1100

**TV
CLIPS**

DATE May 19, 1995
TIME 7:00-9:00 AM
NETWORK CBS
PROGRAM CBS This Morning

ACCOUNT NUMBER N/A
NIELSEN AUDIENCE 3,201,440

PAULA ZAHN, co-host:

From the back of an elephant in India to the arms of a president in Washington, the first lady has seen and done a lot. Now she'll be visiting with us.

Mrs. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON: I'm here as a mother, a wife, a daughter, a sister, a woman.

HARRY SMITH, co-host:

This morning on CBS, Hillary Clinton talks health care, women's rights and other issues near to her heart with us and our audience.

Mrs. CLINTON: I think you have to be true to yourself. You have to find your own voice.

MARK McEWEN (Meteorologist): Live from Broadway, America's theater capital, welcome to a special week of CBS THIS MORNING from the Ed Sullivan Theater, home of "Late Show With David Letterman." It's CBS THIS MORNING. I'm Mark McEwen, and now Harry Smith and Paula Zahn.

ZAHN: Good morning. Thank you.

SMITH: Before we move one more inch, Paula and I just want to say thanks to everybody who's shown up all week this week and to the folks who are here this morning. It has--it has really just been a terrific week. And I think this morning's going to be extra-special. So our thanks to you. And a special thanks to Hillary Rodham Clinton, who will be our special guest in just a couple of moments.

SMITH: Welcome back, of course, to the Ed Sullivan Theater. You would have to go back 50 years, we think, to Eleanor Roosevelt to find a president's wife as politically active and perhaps as controversial as Hillary Rodham Clinton. In her two years and four months on the job, Mrs. Clinton has found her own voice.

It was just a year and a half ago that Hillary Rodham Clinton was challenging the traditional role of first lady with an unprecedented campaign to overhaul the nation's health-care system.

Mrs. CLINTON: I'm here as a mother, a wife, a daughter, a sister, a woman. **CLINTON:** I'm here as a mother, a wife, a daughter, a sister, a woman. I'm here as an American citizen concerned about the health of her family and

Copyright© 1995 CBS, Inc. - All Rights Reserved.

Nielsen Audience Source: Nielsen Media Research, Oct/Dec 1994, Persons 2+, NTI Quarterly Averages
Video cassettes are available for four weeks from our affiliate: VMS (712)736-2010

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 962-6600 / (800) 631-1180

TV
CLIPS

the health of her nation.

SMITH: But after health-care reform died a slow political death, Mrs. Clinton has changed her focus.

Mrs. CLINTON: It is important for women to earn their own income, even when they are married.

SMITH: Traveling on a goodwill tour of Asia this spring with daughter Chelsea, Mrs. Clinton toured schools, health clinics and orphanages, calling for better education for children and better health care and jobs for women.

And at home this month Mrs. Clinton is launching a nationwide mammography campaign, encouraging women to have regular breast exams.

Mrs. CLINTON: (From public service announcement) For many women, mammography is the key to early detection and treatment. For millions of other women, it offers peace of mind.

SMITH: It is an issue close to the hearts of both Mrs. Clinton and the president.

President BILL CLINTON: (From public service announcement) My mother died of breast cancer. That's why I want you to know about the importance of mammography. So make sure to get a mammogram. It's a picture that could save your life.

SMITH: Please welcome Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Mrs. CLINTON: Hi. How are you? Good to see you.

SMITH: Good morning.

Mrs. CLINTON: How are you?

PAULA ZAHN, co-host:

Thank you.

Mrs. CLINTON: Great audience. This is wonderful. Is your mom sitting next to my mom?

ZAHN: Yes, indeed.

SMITH: Have a seat.

Mrs. CLINTON: OK. Great.

SMITH: Climb on up. I want to follow up right where we left off, with the public service announcements. My mother is a breast cancer survivor, over 20 years now.

05 MAY 19 95 01:03PM
BURRELLE'S P.T. CSS P.4 00047014
**TV
CLIPS**

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 992-6600 / (800) 631-1100

Mrs. CLINTON: Good. Good.

SMITH: Virginia Kelley...

Mrs. CLINTON: Right.

SMITH: ...the president's mother, dies of breast cancer. Not even the president's mother, with all the medicine in the world--life can be saved by that. What message do women in America maybe still not understand yet?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, that breast cancer is a disease that affects women of all ages, but it is primarily a disease of aging. And so most breast cancers are found in women over 50 and more than half of all breast cancers are found in women over 65. So please, do your self-exam; please go to your physician and have an annual checkup, which includes a clinical breast exam. And please, especially if you're over 50 or over 65, have a mammogram. And particularly if you're over 65, Medicare--thank goodness--helps pay for mammograms. So there really is no reason not to do this for yourself.

ZAHN: I guess what is so confusing, though, for a lot of American women, you even have different branches of the government giving us different advice on when to have a baseline mammogram. Do you have any advice for women today? Because just a study came out last week that suggested to us that--that maybe we're overestimating our chances of getting breast cancer. We all sort of got used to the statistic that one in nine American women probably will contract breast cancer at some point in their life.

Mrs. CLINTON: The only confusion is for women under 50. And there is a debate about--for those of us in our 40s and for women even younger, how much mammography can really detect, because breast tissue in a woman under 50 is much denser. So with the techniques that we have available, it is not always possible to find what might be there. There is no confusion or debate about the usefulness of mammography once a woman turns 50. So I hope that--there has been this confusion--we can clear it up, because I just see so many women as I travel around the country who have a mistaken idea that breast cancer hits primarily women under 50, because a lot of the survivors who are publicized in the press are women under 50.

And I just want every woman over 50 to know that this is a technique that can save your life. And a lot of women who are older, I think, are concerned that finding breast cancer is like a death sentence. Well, you know, we lost my mother-in-law, but the fact is that most women are able now with early detection and the kind of treatment we have, to be more like Harry's mother and have healthy quality of life after their breast cancer.

ZAHN: And may I add that my mother is a breast cancer survivor, too.

Mrs. CLINTON: Oh, that's wonderful.

ZAHN: And thank God a mammogram caught it.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's wonderful.

BURRELLE'S

73 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 952-6600 / (800) 631-1160

TV
CLIPS

SMITH: Should we take a picture of your mom? Your mom is--is right down there.

ZAHN: Oh, she's going to be so embarrassed. She's going to hate you.

SMITH: Well, we have your mom and Mrs. Clinton's mom...

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right. Our moms are sitting together.

SMITH: ...right next to each other--right next to each other, down there. There's--there's--yes, on the left is Mrs.--Mrs. Rodham. As long as we have these moms here, what kind of a mom are you?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I try to be the best I can. I got really good training from my own mother. She was a great mother, I must say. And that's not just because she's sitting here in the front row. And I try to do as good a job in giving my daughter the sense of possibility and confidence that she gave me. It's the greatest gift, along with love and attention and discipline, that any mother can give her child.

SMITH: People would suggest that you must be doing a remarkable job because you have a teen-age daughter who apparently isn't even embarrassed to be seen with you in public, so...

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, you know, I have to set the record straight, because there was a period, and--but it was--it was earlier. It was like, you know, 12 1/2 to 13 1/2. And if I'd hold her hand or put my arm around her, she would go, 'Oh, Mom.' And then she turned like 13 1/2, she said, 'I'm over that now. You can do that.' So we--we got back to the same old relationship.

ZAHN: Unfortunately, in this country, though, a lot of women, and--and men have to relinquish control of parenting their kids because of their economic situation. What kind of a job overall do you think Americans are doing in--in raising their children?

Mrs. CLINTON: I think that all of us are doing the best we can under difficult circumstances. But I think there are some decisions we could all make that would help our children and help, perhaps, give us more confidence that the job we were doing was working well for us and our children. You know, I really think raising children today, in many ways, poses much more difficult challenges.

You know, I was thinking one day how I used to get on my bicycle in the morning with my friends, and my mother would say, 'Well, be back in time for dinner.' And we'd go to each other's house; we'd go to the park; we would just ride around. And nobody was concerned about us. They had told us the obvious things about, you know, stay away from strangers and the like. But people expected their children to be safe at the end of the day. And that is practically impossible in most parts of our country now. So there are many ways in which the country has changed that I think we, as parents--and I'd say particularly as mothers--have to band together to get those conditions back.

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 982-6600 / (800) 631-1180

TV
CLIPS

It is not fair to children that they are put into this kind of a situation. And, you know, I think there are many, many ways that we organize our life that makes it especially difficult for parents to do the job they want with their children.

ZAHN: We can talk more about that after this short break. And at that point we'll allow our audience to chip in and--and ask the first lady some questions. We'll be continuing live from the Ed Sullivan Theater.

(Commercial break)

ZAHN: And we are back now with the first lady of the United States, Hillary Rodham Clinton. We have the first question for you from our audience now.

Unidentified Woman #1: Good morning, Mrs. Clinton. I'd like to know how you and the president withstand such media scrutiny all the time. Does it affect you and how do you deal with it?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, it has been a learning experience. That's what my mother used to say to me when I'd come home and had some disagreement on the playground. She'd say, 'Consider this a learning experience.' Well, it was more than we ever expected. And it was certainly more mean-spirited than we ever expected. And we had to work through that and get to a point where you can take criticism seriously, but not personally. And try to--if there is something of legitimacy that someone is saying, try to learn from it, but also recognize that people will criticize you in public life for their own reasons, and they will make things up if they think it will promote their particular position. So take that also for what it is.

I can't say that we've gotten to the point where it never bothers us because, contrary to some opinion, you know, you do have your emotions still when you end up in positions like this, and it does hurt. But I think that both of us are very lucky that we have a supportive family and lots of friends, and that we try to remember what's really important in our lives and not let this bother us.

SMITH: OK. We have a question right over here. Can you stand up, please?

Unidentified Woman #2: Good morning, Mrs. Clinton. I would like to ask you, as a mother of three children and as an educator, what would you say to the American public to convince Congress to spare the education budget cuts?

SMITH: And there's about a minute left.

Mrs. CLINTON: I would say that if we cannot invest in better education with our children, and instead want to cut education to give the richest people in America tax cuts, we have our values upside-down and backwards.

SMITH: We've got about 30 seconds left. Do you have a quick question for--yeah, real quick.

Unidentified Woman #3: Good morning.

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 862-8800 / (800) 631-1160

TV
CLIPS

Mrs. CLINTON: Good morning.

Woman #3: I'm thrilled to be here and I'd like to know how you keep all the balls in the air, juggling your life, your--everything that you do and do it so magnificently.

SMITH: In 25 seconds or less.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I think like most women today in America: I do the best I can every single day. And I try to let go of what I haven't gotten done that day and try to get up the next morning and do the best I can that day. And I think that's what we're all trying to do.

SMITH: We'll be back live from the Ed Sullivan Theater with Mrs. Hillary Rodham Clinton in just a couple of minutes.

(Commercial break)

SMITH: Every once in a while you have those kind of out-of-body experiences. You say, I'm in the Ed Sullivan Theater, I'm a grown-up, got an audience full of people; we've got cameras outside on Times Square; we have the first lady of the United States sitting in a chair up there, we're talking to her. What am I doing here?

Please stand up. Please stand up. Go ahead. What's your question?

Unidentified Woman #4: I work at Victims Services in New York. We hear a lot of talk these days about family values as being the cure for society's problems. Every year, we see about 50,000 women and their children who are being beaten by the men in their families--their husbands, their boyfriends, their fathers. What we're experiencing is the children are learning at home to be violent. We're very encouraged that this administration has signed into law the Violence Against Women Act, because we don't think we can rely exclusively on family values. I'm wondering what you think this--what else the federal government can do to stop family violence?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I think one thing is to make it clear that violence against women and children is not just a domestic matter, it is a criminal offense and should be treated as a criminal offense, and that we have to do a better job of enforcing the laws in our society so that people know there are consequences to such actions.

In addition, I think what you're doing is very important, providing services in the neighborhoods of our country so that women and children have a place to go, and also some kind of counseling so that families, if there is a chance that they can overcome whatever the problems were that led to violence, they at least will have that chance to try.

But I think this goes back to what kind of people we are. You know, a government can pass laws, but it doesn't make any difference if people don't change their attitudes. And I have to say that there is so much violence in

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 992-8800 / (800) 631-1100

TV
CLIPS

the culture around us that many people, both men and women, believe the way to solve problems is through violence. They see it on television; they read about it; they are told that all the time. So we have to start not just with family values by giving lip service to such matters, but by valuing families and starting with understanding that if we're going to show our children violence, violence, violence, they will become more violent. And we have got to put a stop to that so that they learn different ways of solving their problems, so that when they grow up, the cycle of violence can be broken.

ZAHN: We have another question. Please stand. Go ahead.

Unidentified Woman #5: Mrs. Clinton, I was very surprised by the negative reaction of women, in particular, during the early stages of the administration. You fought so hard and worked so hard, especially for health care. And I was wondering if you were as surprised by the reactions of women as I was?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, no, because I think that there was a lot of misinformation and a lot of stuff in the air. I don't know how else to say it. And people—I think it's very understandable. I felt like my husband and I had moved into a new neighborhood, and before we got unpacked there were people standing on the street, saying, 'You're not going to like these people.' You know? So that—that is just a part of what you go through when you're in public life. But I think that there is finally a chance in our country now for people to break through all the rhetoric and to break through the criticism. If people disagree with one another, let's do it in a civil, polite way. Let's not call each other names. Let's try to agree that our most important effort should be coming together to help each other. And so then I think the criticism, whether it's directed at me or anybody else, it's not going to count for very much.

ZAHN: All right. We're going to take a short break here, and we will be back with more questions for Hillary Rodham Clinton.

(Commercial break)

ZAHN: Welcome back to the Ed Sullivan Theater and our live hour with Hillary Rodham Clinton. Welcome back.

SMITH: Good morning. Good morning, everybody.

ZAHN: Before we go back to our audience, I have a question for you. Because all this morning, you've been touching on health issues, family issues, women's issues. And as you know, because you read newspapers, there are some Americans who are wondering where the lawyer Clinton is, where—where the legislating Hillary is. And I'm wondering if you feel, given the kind of response you were given during the first couple years of your husband's presidency, whether you can do everything you really do want to do?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, you know, I've worked on these issues, including health care, for more than 25 years. And it's what I care most about. And I'm just going to continue to work on them. Because I feel such a personal

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 962-6600 / (800) 631-1160

TV CLIPS

responsibility given the opportunities that I've been blessed with to do what I can to help people. And that's another thing my mother taught me, and that is you have to listen to yourself. And I really cannot be bothered by what other people say about what I'm doing as long as I feel I'm doing the best I can.

ZAHN: So what do you with those articles that say she's softening her image, she's—she's changing her style?

Mrs. CLINTON: Oh, well, you know, sis—since I think no matter what I do, especially—do you like my new hair? You know...

(Applause)

Mrs. CLINTON: I—thee—the one thing I have learned in two years—and my friends and I laugh about this—is it doesn't matter what I do. There's always going to be somebody who is going to criticize it. So my feeling is I'm just going to have as much fun as I can, you know.

(Applause)

SMITH: I think—I think just about every woman out here has a question for you this morning. Good morning.

Unidentified Woman #6: Hi. I'm a physician and mother of two. Do you have any advice for young women today who wish to combine a career with a family?

Mrs. CLINTON: Yes. Do what you think is right for you. And that may mean making some compromises at certain points in your career in order to care for your children, but it's worth it. We're going to live so much longer now as women. We've gained 30 years of life in this century alone, and there's plenty of time to have a family and work that you care about.

SMITH: How do you get men, though—because you saw the survey just—the recent survey that says—What?—half of the women in the country are the primary breadwinners and these men still expect these women to do all of the stuff around the house and be the primary care-givers...

(Applause)

SMITH: How is it—how is it in your house?

Woman #6: My husband really helps out a lot. He had a mother who also worked and was an educator, and he's very comfortable helping with the children.

SMITH: Well, how do you drag all these other guys up into the 20th century then?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I think one thing is mothers can start with their sons, by helping their sons understand that. You know, I'm—I'm so proud of my brothers who are, you know, real macho guys, but boy, they really help their wives. And one of my brothers is expecting his first baby, and he just is

BURRELLE'S

76 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 992-8500 / (800) 631-1180

TV
CLIPS

helping out so much. So I think a lot of it has to do with the message we-messages we send very early to boys.

ZAHN: We have another question for you over here.

Dr. BLAKELY: Yes. I'm Dr. Blakely, the deputy mayor of Harlem and also the chair of the Harlem Women's Committee. We're very proud that you went around the world to look at the Harlems of the world, but we also extend an invitation for you to come to Harlem here and feel what we feel as women and see what the real issues are in a war zone situation around our children, which you care a great deal for.

ZAHN: What would you say is the major issue that--that you would like for Mrs. Clinton to address today?

Dr. BLAKELY: Is to come and to see and feel what we feel and make sure that we are part of the official delegation representing the Harlems of the world, and the prototype is 125th Street. We extend that invitation to you. Come and join us and see what we see.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I'd be glad to. You know, I was there last year at the hospital, and I really appreciated the opportunity I had to visit and meet with a lot of people, but I will be back.

Dr. BLAKELY: Yes, thank you. We extend that.

(Applause)

SMITH: Another question.

Unidentified Woman #7: Good morning, Hillary.

Mrs. CLINTON: Good morning.

Woman #7: It's really wonderful to be here and be able to speak with you. We all know that women are the guardians of health for ourselves and for our families. What can you recommend to all of us here today as women as--and as moms to a--strategies for us to really be able to effect quality health care for all Americans? What can we do?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, obviously, there's different things we all can do. One, take care of our own families, which is the first thing. And that means immunize your children, give them well baby checkups. Don't quit taking them to see a doctor when they become teen-agers and don't want to go. The worst health in our country is among adolescents because everybody just kind of things they're OK, and they're eating a lot of junk food and they're not taking care of themselves. So starting with our own families I think is important.

But beyond that, I think we have got to be banded together in order to say it is not acceptable in our country that we have more than 40 million people now without health insurance, 10 million of whom are children, all of whom are in

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 962-6600 / (800) 631-1160

TV
CLIPS

working families, and some day, we're going to have to figure out how to provide decent health care to everybody. And I think women, as the primary caretakers of the health of their families, can lead the way on that. So both on the personal level and the public level, we should be better organized in order to get health care to everybody who need it is.

ZAHN: Are you in favor of overhauling Medicare without doing it within a huge, huge, large framework?

Mrs. CLINTON: I'm very scared about overhauling Medicare without health-care reform, and just quickly, for two reasons. First of all, if you look at what the income of Americans over 65 is, the average man makes less than \$15,000 a year to live on, and the average woman over 65 in America lives on less than \$9,000 a year. I really don't want to do anything with Medicare that makes it more difficult for average Americans to get their health-care needs met.

And secondly, if you slash Medicare and Medicaid to cut the government funding, what is going to keep the hospitals in the inner cities open? What is going to prevent the costs that were carried by those government programs from being shifted onto our private insurance bills, which is what will happen? So it's not just looking at Medicare alone that we need to do, there's a right way to reduce the costs and a wrong way. And I want us to do it the right way.

ZAHN: All right. We're going to take a short break now and continue with more questions for the first lady. We'll be right back, live from the Ed Sullivan Theater.

(Commercial break)

SMITH: We are live in the Ed Sullivan Theater with Hillary Rodham Clinton and lots of questions from our audience. Good morning.

LISA (Audience Member): Hi. Hi, Hillary. My name is Lisa. I see you as a very outgoing person and you really like to go out and help people. I'd just like to know what do you do for your support when you feel like you need somebody to talk to? Do you have that same support that you give to others?

Mrs. CLINTON: Yes, I'm very, very blessed. I have a wonderful husband and daughter and mother and family and friends. And we spend a lot of time together, just doing nothing, just kind of playing games and being with each other, and that gives me a lot of support. Thanks for asking.

ZAHN: We have another question from back here, if I live walking through this aisle here.

Unidentified Woman #8: Hi. Good morning, Mrs. Clinton. I was wondering your views on children and violence on television and if you could specifically address your newly formed commission.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I am concerned about violence on television because I now think the evidence is absolutely proved that children who watch a lot of

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07038
(201) 962-6600 / (800) 631-1160

TV
CLIPS

violence both become more violent themselves and become less sensitive to violence. We've done some experiments where two different groups of children watch television, and some saw very violent kind of programs unfortunately that are too common. Then both sets of children were taken out and were shown a situation in which some children--other children were in trouble. The children who were watching all the violence were much slower to respond. It was as though it wasn't real to them. And so I think we've done a lot of damage to ourselves, not that anybody set out to do it. I don't think there's any big conspiracy where we're going to make ourselves more violent. Just over time, it has worn down the sensitivities and released the impulse controls of too many people. So I think if we don't start demanding different kinds of television and parents exercising more responsibility--turn it off, don't subscribe to the channels that are--the most violent programs. That's not censorship. That's parental responsibility. So we can do a lot in our homes as well.

ZAHN: Do you--do you think there should be any government regulations controlling the--what the content of programs should--should be specifically for children?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I think two things. I think we made a mistake when we loosened a lot of the regulations about what could be shown during certain times of day. I think there should be children viewing hours and family viewing hours. And I also believe it would be a terrible mistake to do away with programs like "Sesame Street" and "Barney" and other things that are not violent and try to teach our children something. So I do think there's a role for government, not in censorship but in trying to set boundaries.

SMITH: All right, we had a question right over here. But I want to reiterate, because I'm a mom for a day and a dad all the time. Parents absolutely have that ultimate control of the TV set.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right. That's right.

SMITH: Just turn it off. It's an amazing thing.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right. Turn it off. Do something else.

(Applause)

SMITH: All right.

Unidentified Woman #9: I'd like to change the subject for a minute. I'm a pro-choice Republican, and as you know, that issue is key to the upcoming--our upcoming convention in choice of nominees. From the White House point of view, who do you think would be the toughest opponent and the easiest?

Mrs. CLINTON: We have enough trouble. I mean, I am--I'm--I'm going to leave that to your party. It just looks like you're going to have a real interesting time sorting it all out.

SMITH: All right. Thanks very much.

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07020
(201) 892-6900 / (800) 631-1100

TV
CLIPS

(Applause)

ZAHN: Speaking of the upcoming elections, to what extent will you be involved in your husband's re-election campaign? Because there was a story that broke earlier this week that you were heading it up. You dismissed that story.

Mrs. CLINTON: Right.

ZAHN: How actively involved will you be? And is it true that you've told your husband he cannot wear loafers anymore and he can't wear shorts when he runs in public?

Mrs. CLINTON: I never said anything about loafers. I will be as actively involved as I've always been, which is to support him first and foremost. I mean, it is really hard work. I—I know that this is the wife speaking, but you know, it's an enormous strain. And so part of what I've always tried to do and my family tries to do is support my husband personally and then I will do whatever I can to get the message of the campaign out. Because I really believe in him and in what he's trying to do. And I'll work as long and hard as it takes to get that out to people.

SMITH: I'm going to squeeze one quick question in here.

Unidentified Woman #10: How can we ensure that scarce federal dollars are used for research into the causes of breast cancer?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, we have started doing that. You know, the president's increased funding for breast cancer research by 65 percent just in the last year and a half. And all of the medical research is under attack. So you can do it by telling your members of Congress and calling talk shows and telling your friends, let's not turn back our medical research efforts. Let's try to find cures for these disease.

SMITH: All right. Much more live from the Ed Sullivan Theater with Hillary Rodham Clinton when we come back after this short break.

(Announcements)

SMITH: From "Four Weddings and A Funeral" to "The Englishman"—oh, oh—"That Went Up A Mountain and Came Down A"—whatever it is, meet heartthrob Hugh Grant Monday on CBS THIS MORNING.

ZAHN: And we are back now with the first lady of the United States. I have a quick question for you about the Baby Richard case. You've made some pointed comments about that over the last week or so. You do not think this little baby should have been given back to his biological parents. Why is that?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, not at that point in his life. If a decision could have been made very early—and it should have been made very early, once it became clear there was going to be a contest, then everybody involved—all the adults on all sides—should have moved quickly to make some kind of an assessment and

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 892-6600 / (800) 631-1160

TV
CLIPS

to make a decision. But once it dragged on for four years, I do not think that child should have been removed, and I have done cases like that, I have represented adoptive parents. And that child really was a part of an extended family and a neighborhood. So he didn't just lose his parents, he lost his sibling, he lost everyone. And, you know, I keep remembering the Bible, remember when King Solomon said, 'I'll cut the baby in half,' and the people who really cared about the baby—the mother who really wanted the baby, said, 'No, no, let her have it.' I mean, there's a point at which adults' rights have to end and children have to be given their best interests.

(Applause)

SMITH: ...minutes left. Here's a question.

Unidentified Woman #11: This is building on what you did when Harry, Do My Job—when you were a minister and you gave that great sermon. I think one of the things that Harry touched upon was in Oklahoma City. As tragic as it was, we saw such great images of America and who we are. And unfortunately, the best comes out at the worst. How can we build on that feeling without a tragedy, all the good in us that can come out?

Mrs. CLINTON: That's a wonderful question. You know, because today is the month anniversary of what happened in Oklahoma City. And I think if we will keep those images in our minds of all those people helping, showing up to help, the kind of outpouring of caring and bring it back home, think about our own families, our own neighborhoods, be willing to start treating each other with more respect and decency, being involved in our communities through our churches and through our schools and being willing to stand up against people who are just negative. I'm tired of Americans being negative. We have so much to be grateful for in our country.

(Applause)

ZAHN: We have another quick question for you from here.

Unidentified Woman #12: I work at an agency called Inwood House in New York City serving pregnant and parenting teen-agers. And I wanted to hear some of your ideas about what to do about this situation.

ZAHN: In—in less than a minute or so.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, first of all..

ZAHN: Good luck.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...persuade your children not to have sexual activity when they're too young to know what they're doing, try to make them postpone it in their own minds as something to look forward to. Keep your children active in school because we know that children who stay up with their schoolwork are more likely to make good decisions and not engage in sexual activity. If they do become pregnant, support them and help them, try to get them back in school and help make them the best parents they can possibly be and try to convince

BURRELLE'S

75 EAST NORTHFIELD ROAD / LIVINGSTON / NEW JERSEY 07039
(201) 962-6800 / (800) 631-1100

TV
CLIPS

them not to have any more children until they are married and stable and able to give that child a home.

(Applause)

SMITH: Last--the last question. Real quick.

Unidentified Woman #13: I have a question. Everyone talking about violence around. What can we do to help mothers who have babies are born--are born addicted to drugs to help the mother become a better parent?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, first of all, drugs are destroying so many families in our country. And we have got to do everything we can to persuade our people, particularly our young people, not to go down this path. If somebody does, though, get addicted, we have to provide treatment for them. We know treatment can work, but we don't have enough treatment opportunities in America. And so instead, we pay the price in crime instead of treatment. And then I guess, finally--oh, Harry's got my mother. I've got to stop.

SMITH: Thanks to Mrs. Rodham and Mrs. Clinton. Thank you all very, very much.

Mrs. CLINTON: Oh, thank you.

ZAHN: Thank you.

Mrs. CLINTON: Oh, thank you, Paula.

DATE May 16, 1995
TIME 4:00-5:00 PM
NETWORK BNO
PROGRAM The Oprah Winfrey Show

ACCOUNT NUMBER N/A
NIELSEN AUDIENCE 10,150,140

HOST: Oprah Winfrey

EXECUTIVE PRODUCER: Dianne Atkinson Hudson

HILLARY CLINTON AND T. BERRY BRAZELTON

OPRAH WINFREY: She's the first first lady to juggle motherhood and a career.

Ms. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON (First Lady): Nothing is more important to our shared future than the well-being of children.

WINFREY: Today, we're honored to talk with Hillary Rodham Clinton about her passionate commitment to children, and she'll tell of the rewards and risks of raising Chelsea in the White House. Also, renowned child expert T. Berry Brazelton shows us how we can help our own kids cope with the fears and the stress of tragic events. Putting Children First--coming up.

Everybody says they want to do it. Today we're talking about how to put children first and create a national movement in this country. You-all can sit down. She'll be out in a minute. Nice to have you here in Chicago.

My first very special guest today is one of the most admired women in the country and was once described as arguably the most important woman in the world. She is, of course, a successful attorney, she's a champion of children's causes, she is a loving wife and mother. She is the first lady of the United States of America and we are honored to have her here today. Please welcome Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Mrs. CLINTON: How are you?

WINFREY: Yes. Yes, yes, yes. Great. This will be fun. This will be fun. This will be fun. Yes. Yes. Yes. There you are--right there. Thank you. Oh, yes.

I have to tell you, we are--we are thrilled to have you here. Your secret service has been here for days. I would not want to be you for one minute.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, some days it's better than other days. But I am so glad to be here with you. Thank you. Thank you.

WINFREY: Thank you very much. I wanted to have a really serious conversation that would get the country moving in another direction, because, you know, we have this whole health campaign going. But I wanted us not to just pay lip service to the idea of putting children first...

Mrs. CLINTON: Right.

WINFREY: ...because for so many years, and throughout the years on this show--I have done 3,000 shows that in one way or another illustrate the crisis in families and with children. And I, like a lot of people, am fed up with the idea that child molesters are allowed to go free after molesting children...

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm.

WINFREY: ...that people are allowed to abuse their own children and neglect their own children. And I wondered how we could, together, start a movement with the nation--a movement, not just a public service announcement or spend this hour on this talk show talking about it. But how do we get people to understand that, unless we start today to change the lives for our children, that this country is headed to hell with a speeding ticket.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I think we start by doing what you've been doing, number one, which is to absolutely focus on these problems. And I want to commend you, before we get into that, for turning the show in such a positive direction. I am so...

Mrs. CLINTON: You know, I am--I am so convinced that what people see on television absolutely affects how they treat children and how they feel about themselves. And I am tired of folks saying that we can't change television because that's censorship. All of us who grew up and are as old as I am, know that television can be a good role model...

WINFREY: Mm-hmm.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...it can help us solve our problems. And we ought to start by saying we're going to change what we see and how we treat each other.

And as far as a movement, I think there are several things we can do. First of all, each adult has to become more responsible for the children in that adult's life--not just parents, but all of us. You know, there's that wonderful old African proverb, "It takes a whole village to raise a child."

WINFREY: "It takes a village"--yeah.

Mrs. CLINTON: There are too many of us who are not doing our part for our children. And I think it's also true there's been a false debate in our country. There are those who have taken the position that families have to be responsible and nobody should help them. They're out there on their own. Single mothers...

WINFREY: Right--that it's not our job to interfere.

Mrs. CLINTON: Not our job--you get out there, do whatever you want behind closed doors, but you have to sink or swim on your own.

WINFREY: Uh-huh.

Mrs. CLINTON: There are other people who say, 'Oh, no, it's the government's responsibility' and 'People don't have to take responsibility.' Both those are dead wrong. I mean, each of us is a product of our families and our society, so we have to start figuring out, how do we strengthen families? How do we keep families together? How do we prevent a lot of the problems that we see on the headlines? And we have to do a lot of hard work to decide, what is society's and government's responsibility to help families be strong and productive?

WINFREY: What is that?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I think it's several things. I think a strong economy, so that there really are jobs out there...

WINFREY: Mm.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...that can provide a decent living; a safety net, because, you know, there but for the grace of God go a lot of us. I mean, I am so appalled when I see people ranting and raving against folks who are less fortunate than themselves, because I always think I am so lucky. I was blessed with good parents. I was blessed with people who gave me a good upbringing. But I was also blessed with good health. I was blessed with a father who never lost his job. You know, I was blessed with things that a lot of families are not blessed with. So there needs to be a safety net if we really care about our children.

And, finally, I think we have to do more than lip service, and that means organizing. And I think there's a wonderful opportunity, particularly for women and mothers, to organize around a lot of these issues and let our voices be heard, because I have worked for 25 years on children's issues. And, like you, I am just tired of people...

WINFREY: Yeah.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...saying one thing and doing something else.

WINFREY: It's so frustrating. Well, let's just take, for example--every day in the news we hear about yet another child--and many times in the news we don't hear it--about another child being molested and abused. Just here in Chicago yesterday, they even caught it on camera. The police happened to be driving by in Inglewood and found this--this student being assaulted

For those of us who hear about Polly Glass and the children who...

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: ...are molested by repeat offenders...

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: ...and we feel frustrated--we feel like the laws need to change--I'm wondering--I was talking to my friend Andrew Vox about this recently--why can't there be a civil rights law for children? Why can't we put under the federal government--and I know people don't want government in their lives--but why can't we as a nation--we all say it to ourselves: 'The children are our future.' Every time I hear somebody say that, it makes me want to spit, because I say, 'What have you really done to...'

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: ...to make a difference? Why can't there be a national--why can't we as a country say, 'We will not tolerate the abuse and molestation of our children?' And if you do, the law doesn't change from Virginia to Oklahoma...

Mrs. CLINTON: Right. Right. Right.

WINFREY: ...to Wisconsin to--I--is that impossible?

Mrs. CLINTON: No. It's not impossible.

WINFREY: Because if it's not imposable--everybody tells me it's impossible. And I was saying to friends the other day, 'I would give my life for that.' I would work my entire life to create a civil--I would give up this show; I would do whatever was necessary to create a civil rights law for children so that--so that we--we honored the right of being a child.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's a wonderful way of putting it, because that's what I think we don't do. I don't think we honor children in our country. And I think there could be laws, but we could do a better job of enforcing the laws we've got. I am a big supporter of what you've tried to do in order to make it less easy for people who are repeat offenders against children to be out in the work force. You know, after a certain point, adults should lose their rights...

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...if they have abused children.

WINFREY: You should just go to jail and stay.

Mrs. CLINTON: They should not be continually given their rights.

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: You know, one of the--one of the hardest--one of the hardest issues is, where does somebody's rights start and where does somebody else's stop? But when it comes to children--you know, their lives are forming every minute. And a young child who is 2 years old--something that is horrific that happens to that child is a huge part of their life.

WINFREY: Yes, but may I interrupt you? Where the rights begin--the guy in prison gets three meals a day. He has medical care and free legal advice.

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

WINFREY: What about the right of the person--the child he molested?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, that's what I want to try to prevent, is to get those children out of situations in which they are subjected to molestation. I absolutely approve of the laws that are now being passed in jurisdictions to give people in neighborhoods information about...

05/18/95 15:21

BURRELLE'S P.I. --- HARPO

005/018

Mrs. CLINTON: ...convicted sex offenders who may move into their neighborhoods. I think it's absurd to say that a family should not know that somebody down the block is living in a house, who is there...

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...and has raped girls or has molested young boys. I think that's absurd, you know. So I think there--there are a lot of things that we--we can do better, but it really starts in the home. I mean, parents have to pay more attention to where their children are and what is happening to their children, and that's harder these days because so many families are working so hard to make ends meet, so many single mothers are doing the best job they can.

WINFREY: Do you think it's education? Do you think that people--I mean, it makes me crazy because I think--over the years, I've said it so many times; you'd think people should get it--but is it that people don't know what their neglect does? Do we need to start there, by saying, 'OK. If you neglect the child today, then that child internalizes that and that child becomes this kind of adult?' Is it educa--is it that pe--people don't know?

Mrs. CLINTON: I've concluded that that's a big part of it. And--and I don't know why, because we're deluged with information.

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: But I think, actually, having so much information delivered so impersonally with the disruption of the extended family, which used to deliver information in a more personal way...

WINFREY: Mm-hmm.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...has meant people have more information and know less to do with it than they did 10, 20, 50 years ago. So I do think we almost have to start from ground zero. I remember a few years ago I was walking by a group of people who were, I thought, kind of being very harsh to a little baby. You know how sometimes you're in a supermarket...

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...and you see things you wish you didn't see, and, you know...

WINFREY: Were you into a supermarket?

Mrs. CLINTON: Yeah, I was in a supermarket--the days I used to be able to go to the supermarket...

WINFREY: Oh, OK.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...which I really would like to be able to do again.

WINFREY: Because I'd hate to see you go to the supermarket with 10 secret service ahead of you. It'd be really hard now.

Mrs. CLINTON: Yeah, well--they're--you know--they're pretty good. They kind of clear the aisles out. So--and--and I--you know, I had one of those moments that we all do, like, 'Do I say something? Don't I say something?' And I just figured, 'You know, if I don't say something'--I remember when I was living in my neighborhood, growing up here outside of Chicago, the entire neighborhood looked out for us. One day my grandfather had a new car and pulled up in front of the house, and the woman across the street didn't recognize the car. She was out of her house in 10 seconds, across the street, running up to make sure I was OK. Now most of us, you know, we'd look out; we'd say, 'We don't recognize the car but we don't want to get involved.'

WINFREY: Yeah.

Mrs. CLINTON: So I went up and I said, 'You know, you really shouldn't shake a baby. That is not a good thing to do.' And this woman just turned on me. And I could tell that she was upset

05/18/95 15:21

BURRELLE'S P.I. --- HARPO

006/018

said, 'You know, if you shake a baby, their little brain sometimes can knock around in their head.' And she stopped, startled. And I thought, you know, 'How can we not do everything possible to get better information out?'

WINFREY: Now what would have happened if she'd have said, 'Mind our own business, you so and so?'

Mrs. CLINTON: I would have said, 'I'll be happy to mind my own business, but I want you to know that what you're doing to that baby--and I assume you love your baby, because I can tell that you're trying to discipline your baby...'

WINFREY: Uh-huh.

Mrs. CLINTON: '...you could damage your baby in ways that would make it impossible for your baby to learn, make it impossible for your baby to really love you. So I'll mind my own business, but you need to know more about the business of raising your baby, because I know you love that baby.' You know, part of it is reaffirming parents, because a lot of parents are doing the best job they can under difficult circumstances.

WINFREY: Well, I--I--I appreciate the fact that you understand that. And I'm--I'm wondering if it's not overwhelming, because part of the--the--what I feel every day is, where do you even begin? Where do you even begin?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, there are so many things we could do that we don't do in our country. We could spend more time with new mothers in hospitals. I personally am appalled that we are now discharging mothers with babies as soon as we possibly can get them out the door. I think that is wrong.

You know, when--I know how I felt when I had my daughter. I mean, here I was, this person who had been to school longer than I needed to be, and all of a sudden I had this baby and I didn't know the first thing about what I was doing. And it took a lot of nurses and my mother-in-law and my own mother and other people to kind of make sure that I had a good idea of what I was doing.

I was sitting there learning how to breastfeed Chelsea one day in the hospital, and so I had her in a funny a--angle. And all of a sudden I see stuff--foam--coming out of her nose. I thought my baby was dying. And I punch all the buttons and the nurses run in, and the nurse says, 'Well, it would help if you sort of lifted her head up a little bit.' You know--and--but I could imagine how terrified I would be if I'd been alone in that situation, without a support of wonderful husband, without a family.

So let's start at the very beginning. Let's take the time we need with new mothers to help them bond with their babies. I was--I was in Manila, in the Philippines. I went to a hospital in a very poor section of Manila that had a very high abuse rate of children. And the doctors there had decided they were going to keep their mothers in the hospital with new babies till they learned to breastfeed and bonded with those babies. They kept them in three, four, five, six days. Not only did the mothers really bond with the babies; child abuse went down, the numbers of babies went down, because each mother was more invested in each baby, so they didn't feel the need to keep having more babies. Well, we can do the same thing here at home--so starting at the very beginning. I also believe we ought to have home visits from nurses and from citizens...

WINFREY: Really?

Mrs. CLINTON: ...from mentors, from role models. Absolutely. Because what we're doing now is we're not spending the time in the hospital. In fact, with the way that health care is developing, we are not even having a lot of registered nurses available who can really help train mothers. We're just moving the mothers in, moving them out with their babies and sending them home into a situation where they often have no help, no support system.

And I have been in other countries, and I have seen model programs here in the United States where, if you get that mother and baby off on the right footing, it makes all the difference in the world. Then, if the mother has to go back to work, she has bonded with the baby. And she will demand better day care than is available...

WINFREY: Because there's a connection there. Right

Mrs. CLINTON: ...to most mothers in this country right now.

WINFREY: Yeah. When we come back, we're going to meet a very good friend of Hillary's. I've known T. Berry Brazelton for--since I started in television. How long have you known him and how did he become such a good friend?

Mrs. CLINTON: I've known him--I can't remember--10, 15 years. I have followed his work. He and I have tried to advocate together on behalf of changes for children. I think he's just a great man and a wonderful doctor.

WINFREY: We're going to hear from T. Berry Brazelton--Dr. Brazelton--when we come back. We'll also talk about motherhood in the White House and how Hillary's raising Chelsea. I heard you talked to Jackie Kennedy Onassis, before you moved in, about raising kids in the White House.

Mrs. CLINTON: I did.

WINFREY: Really? We'll talk about that when we come back.

Mrs. CLINTON: Yeah. Good.

WINFREY: Yeah. Thank you. Back in a moment.

(Announcements)

WINFREY: Today we're pleased to have a very special guest with us, the first lady of this country, Hillary Rodham Clinton, talking about motherhood in the White House, raising Chelsea and making our children, your children, a priority in this country.

And joining us now is a man I think every parent in this country knows and respects. He's considered one of the leading authorities on children and parenting and is celebrating his 10-year anniversary as contributing editor for Family Circle magazine. Please welcome Dr. T. Berry Brazelton.

He's been quoted as saying, 'Never before has one generation--you're quoted as saying, 'Never before has one generation been less healthy, less cared for, less prepared for life than their parents were at the same age.' What happened?

Dr. T. BERRY BRAZELTON (Pediatrician): I don't know. You know, how can we let it happen in a country like this? We're the least child- and family-oriented society in the civilized world--probably in the world.

WINFREY: How did--OK. So how it happened isn't as important as we need to turn it around.

Dr. BRAZELTON: That's right. And this is what I think is--that we've got to pay attention to. I love what you're doing, Oprah, incidentally.

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm.

Dr. BRAZELTON: And if we can give people hope, we can turn it around. We've just got to quit beating ourselves on the breast and saying, 'Oh, we don't know what to do. We can't do it.' And if we just decide we're going to do it--for instance, you-all were talking about the 24-hour discharge. Well, Proctor and Gamble has made my dream come true. We now have a center in which we're studying what we can do in that 24 hours, because mothers are so exhausted, they can't think. So what we do is show them their baby. And if I show a baby to a mother and put the baby's head here--I talk, 'Hi. How you doing?' The baby will turn to me. But if I put the mother over there, they'll always turn to her. And so, when she starts talking, the baby turns to her. She always grabs her baby and says, 'You know me already.'

And now--now I do it with fathers, if I can get their macho types over here. We--we play this game, and 80 percent of them turn to their father's voice. And the other 20 percent, I tip their head. And at that point--at that point fathers grab them and they say, 'You know me!--like it was a miracle. But you know, we can do that. If we pay attention to what people care about, we can do that.'

05/18/95 15:23

BURRELLE'S P.I. --- HARPO

008/018

WINFREY: Well, I think it's important to stress, because I think so many parents--and I see this--a lot of you who are working moms and, of course, working fathers out there feel--and we just did this show recently on Am I Spoiling My Child, where they--parents are--they live their lives to get their children these \$90 sneakers and \$70 jeans and stuff and stuff and stuff, and we went to a 6-year-old's house who has enough toys to fill a--you know, a charity full of--of children. And parents seem to be focused on--on--on material things--this generation. I think that's what's happened; I'm not sure.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: So that the--the actual attention and time with their children is not stressed as much as 'I've got to get my child this.' The--their children--they're preparing their children to compete in the world of 'Who has what.'

Dr. BRAZELTON: Mm-hmm.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right. And what every child wants, more than anything, I think, is the time and attention, love and discipline--that combination--from their parents. And they want it so that they feel validated...

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...and it is--it is so--you know, it is so hard for so many parents today who are working very hard to understand that...

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...that, you know, really slowing down enough to spend that time is more important than anything you can physically, materially give.

WINFREY: Right. And this is something that I read that Dr. Brazelton had suggested. This is a great idea, America. This is a great idea. He says make a date with your children. You make a date and you start early in the week talking about it. You say, 'I'm going--I--we're going to have a date on Saturday or Wednesday or Thursday,' or whatever, and during the week you talk about the date and what you're going to do and how much fun you're going to have. And that is, whether it's 20 minutes or 30 minutes or an hour, that--throughout the week you get the bonus of the child looking forward to it and understanding that that...

Dr. BRAZELTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: ...time is important. Isn't that a great idea you had?

Dr. BRAZELTON: Well, I think it works. I'd rather hear it from you.

WINFREY: I love that idea.

Dr. BRAZELTON: The other thing I'm--I'm recommending to working parents--because 70 percent of mothers are working now...

WINFREY: Yeah.

Dr. BRAZELTON: ...in the work force--is learn to cheat on the work force.

WINFREY: Mm-hmm.

Dr. BRAZELTON: And when your boss calls, you don't go the first time; just sort of cool it as you walk down the hall. When you get there, take--you know, take dictation very slowly and save up energy. So when you walk in the door at night, everybody--you know they're all going to be at you and screaming at you, so just walk in the door and pick them all up and sit in the big rocking chair and just rock. And then, as soon as they calm down, take them in the kitchen and let them help you. You know, kids need to be involved.

WINFREY: So what we're trying to get across is--is that there needs to be a shift. If we could just do that, that would be a big deal--a shift in priorities, because I think what has happened with a lot of working moms and dads out there is that the priority is, 'I've got to get it; I've

Mrs. CLINTON: And I think it goes back to something you said earlier: A lot of people find it hard to believe that these very simple things are really that important. You know, it's the difference between breastfeeding and bottle feeding. 'Well, if it's bottle feeding, a formula, that must be better, because that's an advance.' Well, it isn't an advance. And if you spend time with your children, that may be very simple, but it is more important than the lot of other things you could do with them.

WINFREY: I guarantee you, America, if you made a date with your children on a regular basis, you would see a difference in their behavior.

Mrs. CLINTON: We used to do that with Chelsea a lot.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Yeah. I forgot about that.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's one thing th--yeah. We made a date, and we--we alternated; every week one of us got to choose what we would do. So sometimes it would be my husband's choice; we'd go play miniature golf, you know--and even when she was, like, three years old.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Her choice.

Mrs. CLINTON: Sometimes it was my choice, you know; we'd go play--we'd go do something else. And Chelsea would pick out odd things, like 'I want to go to the store and buy a coconut.' Well, we didn't know where that came from, you know? But it's what was--she wanted to do it. And I remember one day, we go to the store, we buy a coconut, and neither Bill nor I could get the darn thing to break open. We took that--but we had so much fun. We finally took it outside, just were throwing it on the sidewalk. Well, she remembers those things, because those were her times and she was kind of in charge. She got to make the decision. So she felt very much a part of the family. And it wasn't just 'You go do this and you go do that.'

Dr. BRAZELTON: And see, it's...

WINFREY: We said before the commercial break that you had asked Jackie Kennedy Onassis, before you moved into the White House, about raising a child in the White House.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right.

WINFREY: And what did she tell you?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I think everybody knows what an incredible job she did and how much she...

WINFREY: I think that's the greatest tribute to her.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...it's--well--and she herself said that, you know, 'If you don't spend your time with your children and if your children don't turn out all right, then everything else you've done is not going to mean as much.' And I said to her...

WINFREY: Did you hear that, America? Did you hear that?

Mrs. CLINTON: And...

WINFREY: It doesn't matter what positions you have, how much clout you have in the office, if you don't spend the time with the children. And what was it all for?

Mrs. CLINTON: And I was concerned because, you know, I felt that we'd been able to protect our daughter and basically have the life we wanted with our values being...

WINFREY: Mm-hmm.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...transmitted to her, but I didn't know what would happen when we got to the White House. So I went to talk with her, and she was so great. You know, she said things that just were common sense, but--your child has to continue to have chores, to be involved in doing things, has to have responsibilities around the home; so, you know, every time I tell my daughter to go clean up her own room she gives me a cross-eyed look, but that's part of--you know--her maturing.

Dr. BRAZELTON: She does.

Mrs. CLINTON: And she told me that...

WINFREY: I'm so happy Chelsea has chores.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well--well, yeah. I mean...

Dr. BRAZELTON: Me too. I love it.

Mrs. CLINTON: You know--it--I mean, we have to make them up some...

WINFREY: Yeah.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...I mean, you know, it's not easy. But we sort of--you know...

WINFREY: What trash is there to take out?

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right. Exactly. But--but we also learned, from talking with Jackie, that it's very important that children--as they mature, you follow these--what Dr. Brazelton calls touch points. And at certain points along their development you give them new responsibilities. And--she told me how, for example, everybody always wanted to help her children and everybody wanted to intervene, to solve their problems for them.

WINFREY: Yeah.

Mrs. CLINTON: And there were always adults around. And I...

WINFREY: I can imagine; you can't drop a ball without somebody wanting to pick it up. You can't do anything.

Mrs. CLINTON: Yeah. You can't drop a ball. And so she told me one time that--you know--John had run into some bullies in the--in the park across from where they lived, and they had grabbed his bicycle and were going off with it. And immediately, you know, all the adults who were around and the security were going to move in. And, you know, she said to them later--she said, 'If that ever happens again, he has to solve it himself.' And, you know, sure enough--when it happened again, he had to go solve it himself. And when he was late for school, she made him, you know, get there on his own and not be taken care of. So that, as a child matures, you have to be willing to let them--to have consequences of their actions that are not going to be harmful and damaging. And that's very important, too. So I was very, very grateful to her.

Dr. BRAZELTON: You know...

WINFREY: When we come back...

Dr. BRAZELTON: ...Jackie--Jackie consulted me, when she was in the White House, when John came along, because Caroline was so mean to him.

WINFREY: Really?

Dr. BRAZELTON: And so we had a talk about sibling rivalry way back there. Didn't work, but--there's...

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right, but she was--didn't work. But it's those touch points. She was aware of what was happening in her children's life.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: And I think you can be the busiest mother in the world, but you can still be aware. Because we all think about our children 24 hours a day anyway, so we ought to think about them in line with their developmental needs.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Absolutely.

WINFREY: When we come back, Hillary's the first lady to be a nontraditional working mother,

05/18/95 15:28

BURRELLE'S P.I. --- HARPO

011/018

woman do both well? We'll talk about that, next.

(Announcements)

Mrs. CLINTON: (From speech) Women need to have the right and the opportunity to make incomes to help themselves and their families.

WINFREY: Yes. Because--Hillary was saying to me during one of the commercial breaks--we talk about putting children first. You can't put the children first unless you're willing to put the moms first.

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: And that was Hillary addressing the labor union of poor women in India during her trip with her daughter, Chelsea, to south Asia last month. How did they accept that speech?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, this was a group of women who had been organized to help themselves. And they were the poorest of the poor. They were women who were vegetable vendors, who were poor farmers, and, through their coming together, they were lending each other money, they were able to go out and help raise the standard of living of their own families. They'd pool their money together to get a well for clean water in their community. And I were th--I was there with about 500 women, who--some of whom had walked 12 to 15 hours to be there. And each one who talked...

WINFREY: Whoa.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...stood up and said something like, 'I am so proud now, because my children can go to school. I don't have to take them out to work. I am so proud now, because my husband and I, working together, are able to help my family.' And they would say things like, 'I am not afraid anymore. I used to be afraid all the time. And now that I am not afraid, my children are not afraid.' I mean, everything was oriented toward the next generation. It was so wonderful to see that.

WINFREY: It--it must make you a lit--very frustrated and feel, sometimes, like--I don't--not--not giving up, but when you see a--the poorest woman in India, who has walked 15 miles and is a vegetable vendor, take charge of her life...

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: ...and her existence, and then you see what we have in this country...

Mrs. CLINTON: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: ...and people sit around and whine about 'What can I do?'

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I--I did feel that when I was there.

WINFREY: Makes you want to spit, but you can't say it. Yeah.

Mrs. CLINTON: I want--no, I--I--no. I wanted to take every American with me, and particularly every American teen-ager, and let them see what other people are sacrificing to get an education, to be able to fulfill their own God-given potential. And we really do, in our country, have so many blessings we take for granted. And, as the doctor said, I mean, if we can't figure out how to help our children have better lives in this country, then shame on us. There's something very wrong with how we're making decisions and what our values are. And that's what I hope we can turn around.

WINFREY: Now you've been criticized for trying to create this superwoman mo--role model that a lot of women say they can't live up to. Do you think--of course, that's not fair, because you're doing the best that you know how.

Mrs. CLINTON: Right. Well, I feel strongly that every woman should make the right choices for her.

WINFREY: For her.

Mrs. CLINTON: For her.

WINFREY: That's what I feel.

Mrs. CLINTON: And what I'm hoping is that we will recognize that all of us, thankfully, are living longer and we're going to have many opportunities in our lives. And we ought to support each other as women, so that if a woman makes the decision, as some of my dearest friends have, to be full-time mothers during their 20s and 30s and early 40s, we ought to say, 'Hallelujah.'

WINFREY: Hallelujah.

Mrs. CLINTON: And if other women make the decision that the right choice for them is to pursue a profession or a career, that also ought to be respected. But what happens is most of us are trying to compose a life consisting of all these different notes, to use Mary Catherine Bates' phrase. I mean, here we are; we're trying to work, we're trying to be true to our families, we're trying to do what we can to make a contribution. And we sure make it hard in this country. We make it very difficult for women, and I think we're going to have to change the way we think, because we are seeing less productivity, we are seeing a lot of anger, a lot of distress.

WINFREY: Yeah. I would like to see that change, too. I would like to see--wouldn't you, Dr. Brazelton?--women especially being supportive of each other, rather than trying to be divisive...

Dr. BRAZELTON: ...(Unintelligible).

Mrs. CLINTON: Right.

WINFREY: ...and criticizing and judgmental of what one woman chooses to do with her life vs. another.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Well, it would take so little to support women, too. In Europe, you walk around--women feel good about themselves that they're working. And Lois Hoffman at the University of Michigan has a study in which she shows that, if women feel good about their work, they bring that self-image home to their kids, so their kids profit, too. You can do both.

Mrs. CLINTON: I mean, we--we always end up with these stereotypes which are so unfair to women.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Mm-hmm.

Mrs. CLINTON: I mean, women have problems with the families, if they're at home, if they're in the workplace, and women can be very successful with their families if they're at home and if they're in the workplace. What matters is the kind of attitude that the mothers bring and the support they get from the outside society and from their families.

WINFREY: Absolutely. That's right.

Mrs. CLINTON: And that's what we ought to be trying to promote.

WINFREY: How violent and tragic events, like the Oklahoma bombing, are affecting our kids--it's more than you know. We asked a group of fourth-graders to share their private fears, and take a look at what we heard.

(Excerpt from video)

Unidentified Student #1: Well, I'm worried about the bombing and that it could happen anywhere. that they could just plant a bomb anywhere where you are and you wouldn't know it till it exploded.

Unidentified Student #2: You know, the little babies from the Oklahoma bombing, you know, with--you know, with all the blood, and they've got these really deep cuts. And--and it's--it really is sad. And I think the people who did it should get the death penalty twice, to tell

(Announcements)

Mrs. CLINTON: (From speech) I know that many children around the country have been very frightened by what they have seen and heard, particularly on television, in the last few days. And I'm sure that you, like many of the children I've already talked to, are really concerned, because they don't know how something so terrible could have happened here in our country.

WINFREY: That was the president and first lady addressing some children in the Oval Office after the tragedy in Oklahoma. What did the kids tell you?

Mrs. CLINTON: Told me what we've already heard from the children here, that it was a very mean thing to do; these were very bad people. And they were scared that it could happen to them and their families. And it was so awful, I think, for many of us, because it was difficult to explain to our children. And that's one of the reasons the president...

WINFREY: To explain to ourselves.

Mrs. CLINTON: To explain to ourselves...

WINFREY: Yeah.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...yeah--or even to absorb it.

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: And that's one of the reasons the president and I did that, was to try to, in some way, help other parents deal with it, because we certainly, even though our daughter is now older, we certainly went through the same kinds of questions with her and the children of our friends.

WINFREY: And so this affects children in ways we don't recognize, isn't that true, Dr. Brazelton?

Dr. BRAZELTON: Yeah.

WINFREY: Because I remember growing up with the Cuban Missile Crisis, and I remember thinking at any moment we were going to be bombed. Every time I heard a plane I was, like, terrified for months as a--as a--as a kid.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Well, this time I had a 4-year-old who asked his mother to call me so he could talk to me. And he said, 'Dr. Brazelton, why did those mommies put those babies in a burning building? Were they bad kids?' And I thought, 'Oh, Lord, this is what every child feels, that if they--if that--it's their fault if something like this happens.'

WINFREY: Wow.

Dr. BRAZELTON: And I just think it's critical for parents to, no matter what their own fears are, to sit down with their kids at night and say, 'Look, you must be as worried as I am. Let's share what we're thinking.'

WINFREY: Well, a parent was telling me that they were telling their child, 'This could never happen to you. This was a--and then I said, 'But is that the truth? Are you telling your child the truth when you say this will never happen again, this w...'

Dr. BRAZELTON: And they know better than that, so...

WINFREY: Yes, and they know better than that.

Mrs. CLINTON: But they do need the reassurances that you will take care of them...

Dr. BRAZELTON: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...and you'll be there for them, and that there are more good people in the world than bad people.

05/18/95 15:28

BURRELLE'S P.I. --- HARPO

015/018

KIM said that she wishes there would be an end to violence and destruction. That's why you're concerned about the bombs being--bomb information on computer?

KIM: Yeah, I am, because, I mean, there are lots of little kids, like in the Oklahoma City bombing, and they had no idea that there was a bomb in their building.

WINFREY: Mm-hmm.

KIM: And when it exploded...

WINFREY: Do you think that you would--Kim, let's just think for a moment. In your lifetime--I mean, because you see a lot of violence on television. Are you allowed to watch it?

KIM: Yeah, but I don't like to.

WINFREY: You don't like to.

KIM: No.

WINFREY: Because it scares you...

KIM: Yeah.

WINFREY: ...sometimes. But do you think in your lifetime that it is possible--that it would be possible to eliminate a lot of the violence that we see on television and--and destruction caused in the world by violence?

KIM: Well, I think it would be really good if we could eliminate the TV shows that show, like, all the gory stuff and the killing and the guns and the bombs.

WINFREY: Are you hopeful that that will happen, though? Do you think, like, in your lifetime...

KIM: Yes.

WINFREY: ...you think that's going to happen?

KIM: Yes.

WINFREY: OK. That's good. Adriana said she wishes she could end the hatred.

Dr. BRAZELTON: You know, Oprah, Mrs. Clinton has set up a n--a new commission for children's television, and there are about 10 of us now trying to decide how to control the appropriate timing of television.

WINFREY: Why did you say you wish you could end the hatred? Because...

ADRIANA: Because, if we--if we don't worry about other people and what they hate most, then we're going to get hurt. And we need to teach those people--somebody needs to tell them--that they're doing something wrong and they just need to control themselves. Otherwise, we're not going to love each other; we're going to hate each other.

Mrs. CLINTON: I agree.

WINFREY: Thank you, Adriana. When we come back, we want to know what Hillary feels she sacrificed as a woman, wife and mother to be our first lady. We'll talk about that when we come back, and I know you-all have some questions. We'll talk to you, too.

(Announcements)

WINFREY: We've been talking today about how to put your children first. I don't want to leave the hour without some specifics on how to begin doing that. Hillary?

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, there's a lot that we can do. And Dr. Brazelton and I were just talking about--what we need is a whole movement, as you said, in this country, that really does respect and support parenting and honors children. And I think there are some specific things starting

14

05/18/95 15:29

BURRELLE'S P.I. --- HARPO

017/018

needs that extra time, she does it. And I think there are little things like that that can always make it clear to your child that you're out there doing the best you can to provide the material support, but your heart is there with that child.

WINFREY: When we come back, Dr. Brazelton's specific advice for putting children first. That was really good.

(Announcements)

WINFREY: We were just talking in the commercial break about this; I know you don't have a long time to address it, but what do you think about the Baby Richard situation?

Mrs. CLINTON: I think it's an outrage that that child was not considered with respect to his best interests. And it is something that I have fought for for a long time. That child should not have been moved. Those were his parents. It was a psychological bonding that happened.

WINFREY: Talk about not putting children first.

Dr. BRAZELTON: You know...

WINFREY: Yeah.

Dr. BRAZELTON: ...Oprah, more than that, it--it would have been so easy to have evaluated that situation four years ago, and found out that--that the real parents were not equipped to handle that child. So instead of putting him in a foster situation and yanking him out and wrecking his life for the future--there's no question in my mind about that--because he shoves it under. What's going to happen? It'll bubble up someday and he'll--he'll go bomb Oklahoma City or something.

Mrs. CLINTON: You know, Oprah, I used to, as a lawyer, do cases like that, where I represented adoptive parents who all of a sudden had been told that they had to give the child back after two, three, four years. And, yes, it's a difficult matter. And I used to stay awake at night worrying that was making the right decision. But if you put the child first, you can only make the decision about what you know right now. And that child had bonded. That child was not just the child of the adoptive parents; that child was the child of an entire extended family and neighborhood. And it was as though a bomb had gone off and he was the only survivor. Now think about it like that, because that's what has been done to that child, in terms of the depth of the trauma.

Dr. BRAZELTON: I have one idea.

WINFREY: You wanted to say something to this working mother.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Yeah.

WINFREY: Yes. What?

Dr. BRAZELTON: Well, all right. I-- I was going to say to the working mother, make some tapes and leave different tapes for each day you're gone. And when you call her, say, 'Go watch that tape, because I'm thinking about you all the time.' And she'll know you care about her and she'll feel like this is par--her contribution.

But I have one more idea for--for America--for children first. We need somebody like Hillary in the White House, who's right at the president's side, saying, 'Children come first.' And we ought to have a cabinet-level person. We fought in--in--when we went around the country in the National Commission for Children, we fought for a cabinet-level person who thought of children first. And everything that was going to happen was related.

(Announcements)

WINFREY: I thank you so much, Mrs. Clinton, for being here.

Mrs. CLINTON: Thank you for what you're doing.

WINFREY: Thank you so much. And, Dr. Brazelton, I never had a baby you could be the

05/18/95 15:27

BURRELLE'S P.I. →→ HARPO

014/018

Dr. BRAZELTON: That's right.

Mrs. CLINTON: They do need all that, because one of the problems is the violence on television breeds violence and children get desensitized to violence. They get a sense that...

WINFREY: Can we talk about what's going on on some of the other talk shows? I know that that's a sort of a taboo subject, supposedly, with me, but I have recently--you know, for years I never watched other people's work and never understood the criticism from the critics. But it's not the violence; it's the day in and day out--if you see shows--for instance, you come home from school, parents, and you only see shows that depict one-night-stand reunions and who slept with whose boyfriend.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right.

WINFREY: To me, it's such a breakdown of morali--it's saying we no longer even question whether it's OK to have a one-night stand, because we say we should have a reunion with the one-night stands. Yes.

Mrs. CLINTON: Right. And everybody's doing it.

WINFREY: Everybody's doing it. Yes.

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right. You know, my fa...

WINFREY: We don't question whether you should sleep together on the first date; we question, whose boyfriend should you steal?

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right. Well, you know, my father used to say all the time, you know, 'Do as I say, not as I do.' And I used to think, 'Oh, please.' But you know, adults need to be careful about what they say around children and what they portray to children. And I'm all for bringing back some old-fashioned hypocrisy, because I think the kind of dysfunctional behavior that we are subjecting our children to gives them no role models, gives them the feeling anything goes, that they can do anything with no consequences and get on television--which, you know, my goodness--that validates everything. So I'm--I am absolutely with you, Oprah. I think that the talk shows, combined with the violence, is, in effect, changing the way children feel about themselves in very damaging ways to themselves and our country.

WINFREY: When we come back, we'll talk to some students who are here today with questions. Back in a moment.

(Announcements)

WINFREY: And you had a question for Mrs. Clinton.

Unidentified Student #3: Yes. What are we going to do about--well, it's really easy to boot up information about how to build bombs and where to put them off your computer. Like, the other day, Kim wrote that in one of her essays on how easy it was. And so she asked me if I could get proof about it. And so I went home and booted up Incarda 95 and I went under military technology, and it said, "Bomb." And so I went there and it's, like, so...

WINFREY: You're computer literate, of course. We can tell. Yes.

Student #3: And it said, like, all-purpose bombs and where to put bombs. And I was just wondering, is--are we going to someday be able to get that eliminated from computers and not make it so easy?

Mrs. CLINTON: I sure hope so.

WINFREY: And how old are you? How old are you?

Student #3: Ten.

WINFREY: You're 10. You could get that information and you're 10. Yeah. What did you want to say? Oh, I--I have this to say about these girls. Joining us are some fourth-graders from Francis Parker School and sixth-graders from the Ogden Public School here in Chicago. We asked them to tell us what they worry most about and what they would want to change in the world. And

05/16/95 15:29

BURRELLE'S P.I. --- HARPO

016/018

with birth, which we've already covered; changing policies in the workplace that just make it so difficult for most working parents--particularly working mothers--and I think practically impossible for single parents--to do their jobs both at home and out in the workplace.

WINFREY: OK. This wom--you--you're are a single working mom?

Unidentified Woman #1: Yes. I'm a single working mother, and I'm wondering: How do you deal with the guilt? Because I travel; I work every day, about 50 hours a week. And was just wondering...

Dr. BRAZELTON: I--I can't imagine a harder job than being a single parent, for one thing, but also having to work like that. I think you've--you've got to have some support. So I hope you know other single parents that get together and can all support each other and...

WINFREY: You just looked like you didn't, though. You don't? You don't?

Woman #1: No. I--I--I find it hard to balance time and find time for myself.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Mm.

Woman #1: And you just get into this routine. When does it--you know, when do you ever stop?

WINFREY: That's why Hillary is writing a book. Aren't you writing a book--"It Takes a Village to Raise a Child"?

Mrs. CLINTON: I am writing a book about that, because...

WINFREY: Yeah. Because you can't--I think you can't emphasize enough: You really can't do it alone.

Mrs. CLINTON: You can't do it alone.

WINFREY: And everybody's been raised to believe that you should be out here doing it alone.

Woman #1: Mm-hmm.

WINFREY: You can't do it alone. You c--y--you can't.

Mrs. CLINTON: And so many mothers are made to feel even guiltier, because they think, 'I'm the only one who can't manage this.'

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: And that is ridiculous. You know...

WINFREY: Because everybody else is feeling like you.

Dr. BRAZELTON: Mm-hmm.

Woman #1: Mm-hmm.

Mrs. CLINTON: Everybody is. And, you know, all I--just from my own experience, having support made a big difference. I--I--like Dr. Brazelton, I can't imagine the difficulties you face every day. But setting some priorities--and I know that sounds simplistic again, but I really think we need to get back to basics...

WINFREY: Right.

Mrs. CLINTON: ...about spending that time with your child, no matter what. I have a good friend who's always been a working mother. She calls her child every single day at the same time, no matter where she is. And, you know, she's traveled all over the world with her job.

Woman #1: Mm-hmm.

Mrs. CLINTON: But that child knows that, no matter what happens--and the mother's just made it clear--if she has to walk out of a meeting, if she has to slowly walk down the hall because she

Dr. BRAZELTON: I'm s--I'm still waiting.

WINFREY: I--I--you know what I think? I think if we g--if--if we did nothing else today to get the country thinking about what you can, in your own life, do...

Mrs. CLINTON: Right.

WINFREY: ...to prioritize and put your child first...

Mrs. CLINTON: That's right.

WINFREY: ...we would have made a difference.

Mrs. CLINTON: Well, I hope so, because each of us can do something more than we're doing, and do it better, and then we can spread out from there.

WINFREY: Thank you. Thank you, everybody. Thanks for watching.

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

April 13, 1995, Thursday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A06

LENGTH: 969 words

HEADLINE: GOP Plan Revives Adoption Battle; Welfare Proposal Would Cut State Aid Over Delay in Minority Matches

BYLINE: Barbara Vobejda, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

A Republican welfare reform plan is resurrecting an old and contentious debate over whether social workers should attempt to match children and adoptive families by race.

Under legislation adopted in the House last month a state could lose every penny of its federal child protection money if it delays the adoption of minority children to place them with minority families.

No other misdeed by a state would invite such harsh punishment under the Republican plan, not serving Twinkies for school lunch, not cutting off cash aid to the poor, not even ignoring child abuse.

Critics say that with this multimillion-dollar threat, Republicans have taken a sledgehammer to an exceedingly complex and sensitive social issue. But authors of the language say they wanted to correct misdirected policies that keep minority children trapped in foster care.

"The problem is that you've got so many minority kids that are bottled up, that could be adopted and would be adopted but for that problem," said Rep. E. Clay Shaw Jr. (R-Fla.), who heads the House subcommittee that drafted the bill.

For many in the welfare debate, the subject of transracial adoption was considered important but tangential to the central mission, to get welfare recipients to work and revamp a seriously flawed national system.

But the House included much less severe penalties for violating the bill's mandate to put welfare parents to work. A state that fails to move a single welfare recipient into a job would lose just 5 percent of its federal payment for cash assistance, compared with losing its entire child protection grant for violating the interracial adoption provision.

House Republicans left little room for interpretation, approving language that prohibits a state or agency receiving federal funds from "delaying or denying the placement of a child for adoption or into foster care, or otherwise discriminating in making a placement decision" on the basis of race, color or national origin.

Now, even some of the measure's sponsors are arguing that the sanction ought to be revisited when the Senate takes up welfare reform after the Easter recess.

The Washington Post, April 13, 1995

"I think the penalty probably is a little too harsh," said Rep. Jim Talent (R-Mo.), and Shaw said he did not think a state should lose its entire child protection block grant "for a single incident. . . . That's not going to happen."

Opponents of the House measure say there is a wide consensus among social workers that adoption agencies should make every effort to place minority children with minority families, unless it causes a child to languish in foster care.

"We would agree, if you can't find a black family, go ahead and place the child with a white family," said Leora Neal, who co-chairs the National Association of Black Social Workers' task force on foster care and adoption. But, she added, "Adoption itself is traumatic to the kids because they're cut off from their biological family. . . . Transracial adoption just adds another layer."

She argued that these children are often not fully accepted by the white community and, at the same time, it is difficult for them to feel part of the African American culture.

The House welfare bill replaced dozens of federal programs with five lump sum payments that would go directly from Washington to the states, eliminating hundreds of regulations and giving states much more discretion in running their own welfare programs. One of those payments, a child protection block grant, would provide \$ 3.9 billion to states next year to place abused and neglected children in foster care and adoptive families.

The House Republicans acted out of dissatisfaction with legislation approved in October last year, which would allow agencies to consider the ethnic background of a child and "the capacity of the prospective" parents "to meet the needs of a child of this background" in placement decisions.

That language "sent a signal, go ahead and race match as long as you play by these rules," said Carol Statuto Bevan, director of public policy for the National Council for Adoption. "If you don't send a clear message that discrimination is not going to be tolerated . . . you're going to continue to have delays."

The subject of interracial adoption has prompted controversy since the early 1970s, when the National Association of Black Social Workers condemned the practice, saying minority children fare better with minority families.

Over the years, it has become common for adoption agencies to attempt to match children with prospective families by their ethnic or racial background. Now, 43 states lean toward race matching and three states require race to be considered in placements, according to the National Council for Adoption.

Both sides in the debate say it is acceptable to match children and families by race if it does not create a delay in placement, but they disagree over whether the practice is causing serious delays.

About 445,000 American children are in foster care, and for those in line to be adopted, the median wait is 2 years and 8 months. According to the National Adoption Information Clearinghouse, nearly half of the children in foster care

The Washington Post, April 13, 1995

are minorities, and black children stay in foster care a third longer than the national median.

Opponents of the House language say racial matching alone does not cause the delay in placing black children. They note that these children are often older, handicapped or difficult to place for other reasons. David Liederman, executive director of the Child Welfare League of America, said if the House bill is enacted, state agencies and social workers will "do whatever is expedient because they don't want to be penalized. They might do interracial placements when they might not have had to."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 13, 1995

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The New York Times Company
The New York Times

April 13, 1995, Thursday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 16; Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 1040 words

HEADLINE: Bitter Racial Dispute Rages Over Adoption

BYLINE: By STEVEN A. HOLMES

BODY:

Addicted to the crack passed to him in the womb, Matthew left the hospital nine days after his birth in 1992 in the arms of Lou Ann Mullen, his foster mother. Ms. Mullen, looking at his unruly shock of dark hair and wizened face, gave him the nickname of Little Man.

But a month after lovingly nursing the infant back to health, Ms. Mullen and her husband, Scott, broached the subject of adoption, only to be rebuffed by their social worker. Little Man was black. The Mullens were not.

"I was told, Don't even think about it," Ms. Mullens said on Tuesday in a telephone interview at her home in Lexington, Tex. "He's a baby; he's black; he's going into a black home."

Matthew and his older brother, Joseph, 6, whom the Mullens also want to adopt, have become symbols of the latest permutation of the emotion-laden battle over public policies based on race. Convinced that thousands of black children are languishing in foster care while social workers prevent them from being adopted by eligible white families, an unlikely coalition of liberals and conservatives is pressing for what they call color-blind adoption policies.

A little-noticed provision of the bill to overhaul the welfare system that passed the House last month says any agency receiving Federal money cannot deny or delay the placement of any child in foster care or adoption on the basis of the race, color or nationality of the child or of the prospective parents.

A group of liberals and conservatives will file a suit today on behalf of the Mullens in state court in Austin, Tex., to have race matching in adoption declared unconstitutional.

The debate over interracial adoptions has united some old enemies. For example, the group filing the suit includes Laurence H. Tribe and Randall Kennedy, two law professors at Harvard University who are ardent supporters of affirmative action, as well as Clint Bolick, who successfully led the fight against the appointment of Lani Guinier to head the Justice Department's civil rights division. Mr. Bolick is head of the Institute for Justice, a Washington public interest law firm that frequently challenges racial-preference policies.

"It doesn't make me in the least uncomfortable," Mr. Tribe said when asked about his association with Mr. Bolick, whom he has been critical of in the past. "I pick issues based on their substance and not on the personalities of the people involved."

The New York Times, April 13, 1995

Forty-three states have laws that encourage public adoption agencies to match a child with prospective parents of the same race. Critics say social workers who want to preserve the children's cultural identities often use these laws to keep black children in foster care while they conduct what sometimes turn out to be fruitless searches for black families willing or able to adopt.

"These policies are seriously harmful to black children, requiring that black kids who could get good homes be left in foster care," said Elizabeth Bartholet, a professor of law at Harvard University. "There is not an iota of evidence in all the empirical studies that transracial adoption does any harm at all, compared to same-race adoption. There is plenty of evidence that delay in adoption does do harm."

But members of the National Association of Black Social Workers and some black conservatives contend that adopting children of the same race is necessary to help them maintain a sense of racial identity and that the efforts to expunge race from adoption decisions is merely a way of allowing whites to raid the black community for babies.

"White babies are in extremely short supply," said Zena Oglesby, executive director of the Institute for Black Parenting, a Los Angeles company that places black children with black families. "The going price is \$20,000. Asian countries and other countries are passing laws to stop Americans from adopting their babies. The only healthy babies around are black and brown. These laws are about making those babies more available."

While precise figures are hard to come by, experts say that about 40 percent of the 100,000 children awaiting adoption are black. And while blacks adopt children at a higher rate than whites do, they cannot keep up with the demand caused by more and more black children being placed in foster care.

While Mr. Bolick insists that his involvement in the case is part of a general philosophy of attacking what he terms the regulatory welfare state, he also says his criticism of race-matching fits in with his fight against racial-preference programs.

"There is no question in my mind that this is a vestige of the Jim Crow era as far as using race as a criterion for social policy," he said. "It is also very consistent of our view -- and a very strong example of our view -- that allowing government the power to discriminate in any instances is a very troublesome concession."

Mr. Bolick, Mr. Tribe and Ms. Bartholet say they are also against giving adoption agencies a time limit to match children racially before allowing a transracial adoption. "Once one starts down the road of let's wait a little while to find a racially suitable family, that's a very slippery slope," Mr. Tribe said. "Once you allow the principle that it's O.K. to wait for a short time, there is no principled way to say waiting twice as long is not also O.K."

Linda Edwards, spokeswoman of the Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Services, said, "We have been following the law which says that race cannot be the determining factor in adoption."

But lawyers for the Mullens say that although Texas law does not allow race to be the determining factor, social workers in the Mullens case have made it

so.

The Mullens already are a multiethnic family. Mr. Mullens is white, and his wife is an American Indian. They have two foster children, a girl, 11, and a boy, 9, who are black, and an 8-year-old daughter they adopted through a private agency, who is half-black and half-white. They also have an 11-year-old biological daughter.

The court papers say the couple provided foster care for 22 children, 14 of whom are black, since 1987. So far, they say state authorities have given them high marks for the quality of the care they have provided.

GRAPHIC: Photo: Lou Ann and Scott Mullen of Lexington, Tex., with two of their foster children, Joseph, 6, left, and Matthew, 2. They are trying to adopt the boys, but they have been refused because they are not black. (Bill Albrecht for The New York Times)

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: April 13, 1995

MEMORANDUM

To: Lissa
Fr: Sabrina
Re: Adoption info
Da: June 29, 1995

The Clinton Administration supported and signed the Multiethnic Placement Act (MEPA) in October 1994. The Act, originally sponsored by Sen. Metzenbaum, is designed to:

- Prevent discrimination in the placement of children on the basis of race, color or national origin.
- Facilitate the diligent recruitment of foster and adoptive parents.
- Increase the number of children who are adopted.

States have one full year to implement the Act's guidelines.

There were some areas of contention between the White House, the Department of Justice and HHS. My understanding is that Justice's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC), for constitutional reasons, wanted a very narrow consideration of race in MEPA, as did the President. HHS advocated a somewhat broader consideration of race, but eventually agreed to go along with the President and the OLC. Although resolved, the debate was reported in the media; HHS was criticized for undermining the White House.

HHS Numbers on Adoption

In 1990, there were approximately 69,000 foster children in the country for whom state agencies had determined that adoption was the appropriate goal. Approximately 20,000 of these children were legally free to be adopted (their parents rights to ever regain custody had been terminated) and were waiting to be adopted.

Forty-four percent of the children awaiting adoption were white, 43% African American, 7% Hispanic. Only 4% were under the age of 1; 36% were between ages 1 and 5; 43% were 6-12 years of age; and 17% were over the age of 12. Two out of three waiting children have special needs: medical, developmental, behavioral or psychological.

According to an opinion piece in the Ft. Lauderdale *Sun-Sentinel*, fewer than 53,000 non-relative adoptions occur annually in the United States. And according to Holt International, between 6000 and 9000 foreign children are adopted each year by

↑ numbers vouched for
by Nat'l Council for Adoption
(see attached)

American families. I am waiting to confirm these numbers, because HHS only has statistics for the children adopted through public agencies.

What We are Doing

* The National Council for Adoption says the 53,000 number is the closest guesstimate for annual adoptions. That * has been relatively constant for the past 15 years. (see attached)

In addition to supporting the implementation of MEPA, the Clinton Administration is working to increase adoption by:

- Ensuring that states make effective use of the Adoption Assistance Program, which provides economic support for families who adopt special needs children.
- Providing grants to public and private agencies to develop successful models for recruiting families.
- Conducting national and regional conferences to build the capacity of public and private agencies to facilitate the adoption of minority and special needs children.
- Providing support for the National Adoption Exchange, the Adoption Clearinghouse, the National Resource Center for Special Needs Adoption, and the Interstate Compact on Adoption and Medical Assistance.
- The Clinton Administration has expressed strong concerns about "welfare reform" proposals that would jeopardize these programs and eliminate the guarantee of federal funds to help support adoptions.

Inter-country Adoptions (1984 - 1994)

Region/Country of Birth	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
All Countries	8327	9286	9945	10097	9120	7948	7093	9008	6536	7348	8195
Europe	79	91	103	122	99	120	262	2761	874	1521	2406
Romania	-	-	-	-	-	-	121	2552	145	88	199
Russian Federation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1530
Other Former USSR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*12	*432	*1107	268
Other Europe	79	91	103	122	99	120	141	197	297	326	409
Asia	6251	6991	7679	7614	6484	5112	3779	3194	3032	3163	3641
China, total	92	139	140	137	157	142	95	157	263	388	856
China - Mainland	6	16	10	15	52	81	29	62	201	330	787
China - Taiwan	56	72	90	66	56	14	66	55	35	31	35
Hong Kong	30	51	40	56	49	47	-	40	27	27	34
India	468	496	588	807	698	677	348	448	348	342	406
Japan	45	57	46	64	69	74	57	83	71	59	49
Korea	5157	5694	6188	5910	4942	3552	2620	1817	1787	1765	1795
Lebanon	15	20	19	21	23	21	16	17	16	24	16
Pakistan	14	8	12	9	10	14	14	9	15	12	17
Philippines	408	515	634	593	476	481	421	417	353	358	314
Thailand	19	28	27	31	75	99	100	127	90	65	47
Vietnam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	105	88
Other Asia	33	34	25	42	34	52	108	119	66	45	53
Africa	8	11	22	22	28	36	52	41	63	59	91
Oceania	9	9	21	3	15	13	10	16	13	1	7
North America	1026	1012	885	973	844	910	959	1047	1136	1133	846
Canada	9	11	13	17	12	5	8	12	6	7	1
Mexico	168	137	143	178	123	107	112	106	104	97	85
Caribbean	93	118	102	124	140	202	156	159	134	150	132
Dominican Rep.	44	47	31	52	54	69	58	50	41	39	17
Haiti	13	12	19	25	41	80	64	52	49	49	61
Jamaica	16	47	38	37	38	43	28	39	29	48	35
Other Caribbean	20	12	14	10	7	10	6	18	15	14	19
Central America	756	746	626	654	568	595	683	770	892	878	628
Belize	5	4	5	12	6	7	10	4	8	5	3
Costa Rica	99	59	72	72	73	78	105	55	65	48	29
El Salvador	364	310	147	135	88	92	103	122	115	97	38
Guatemala	110	175	228	291	209	208	257	324	428	512	436
Honduras	148	181	135	114	161	191	197	244	253	183	77
Nicaragua	10	0	14	5	8	9	7	11	8	9	18
Panama	20	17	25	25	23	10	4	10	15	24	27
Other N. America	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
South America	954	1172	1235	1363	1650	1757	1995	1949	1418	1471	1204
Bolivia	24	14	25	25	21	28	30	51	74	123	37
Brazil	117	242	193	148	164	180	228	178	139	178	149
Chile	153	206	317	238	252	254	302	263	176	61	79
Columbia	595	622	550	724	699	735	631	527	403	416	351
Ecuador	12	25	25	31	41	19	59	11	36	48	48
Paraguay	8	15	32	90	300	254	282	177	244	405	483
Peru	31	34	71	84	142	269	440	722	324	230	37
Other S. America	14	14	22	23	31	18	23	20	22	10	20

Table 1. Related and unrelated domestic adoptions and foreign adoptions: United States, 1986 National Committee For Adoption Survey

Geographic division and State	(a) Related and unrelated domestic adoptions	(b) Related domestic adoptions	(c) Unrelated domestic adoptions (subtotal d+e+f)	(d) Unrelated domestic adoptions by public agencies	(e) Unrelated domestic adoptions by private agencies	(f) Unrelated domestic adoptions by private indi- viduals	(g) Unrelated domestic adoptions of infants (included in c)	(h) Unrelated domestic adoptions of children with special needs (included in c)	(i) Foreign adoptions (not included in a-h)
United States.....	104,088	52,931	51,157	20,064	15,063	16,040	24,589	13,568	10,019
New England.....	5,520	3,139	2,381	938	1,182	261	1,184	573	784
Maine.....	873	601	272	109	70	93	56	25	53
New Hampshire.....	512	346	166	62	43	61	49	50	54
Vermont.....	333	203	130	51	34	45	97	35	56
Massachusetts.....	2,334	1,176	1,158	411	747	0	560	307	383
Rhode Island.....	493	313	180	65	53	62	115	48	20
Connecticut.....	975	500	475	240	235	0	307	108	218
Middle Atlantic.....	12,949	5,882	7,067	3,084	1,802	2,181	2,851	1,707	2,085
New York.....	7,213	3,635	3,578	1,606	848	1,124	1,732	920	1,027
New Jersey.....	1,631	178	1,453	666	429	358	134	247	537
Pennsylvania.....	4,105	2,069	2,036	812	525	699	985	540	521
East North Central.....	17,218	6,873	10,345	3,598	3,770	2,987	5,079	2,891	1,705
Ohio.....	1,898	329	1,569	785	322	462	759	416	227
Indiana.....	3,791	2,296	1,495	1,058	235	202	275	489	94
Illinois.....	5,430	1,051	4,379	714	1,576	2,089	2,564	1,160	411
Michigan.....	4,115	2,074	2,041	725	1,316	0	988	541	618
Wisconsin.....	1,984	1,123	861	316	311	234	493	285	355
West North Central.....	9,229	5,896	3,333	1,240	1,384	709	1,411	873	1,441
Minnesota.....	2,100	1,500	600	290	285	25	260	215	771
Iowa.....	1,504	783	721	142	411	168	148	100	304
Missouri.....	2,660	1,755	905	501	174	230	438	262	164
North Dakota.....	484	311	173	1	172	0	49	64	34
South Dakota.....	482	247	235	75	113	47	114	49	39
Nebraska.....	1,009	801	208	35	102	71	164	53	83
Kansas.....	990	499	491	196	127	168	238	130	46
South Atlantic.....	21,033	12,515	8,518	3,546	2,216	2,756	4,235	2,292	978
Delaware.....	186	88	98	48	50	0	25	0	44
Maryland.....	1,400	647	753	231	277	245	364	200	331
District of Columbia.....	326	164	162	65	42	55	78	43	24
Virginia.....	2,348	1,541	807	448	241	118	120	223	224
West Virginia.....	1,254	982	272	100	40	132	135	120	46
North Carolina.....	3,535	2,515	1,020	568	322	130	494	270	67
South Carolina.....	1,569	930	639	255	165	219	532	169	27
Georgia.....	2,732	1,776	956	310	96	550	642	257	87
Florida.....	7,683	3,872	3,811	1,521	983	1,307	1,845	1,010	128
East South Central.....	7,046	4,532	2,514	909	612	993	1,307	676	276
Kentucky.....	1,040	646	394	182	67	145	279	169	85
Tennessee.....	2,058	1,249	809	221	262	326	392	214	90
Alabama.....	2,480	1,897	583	216	95	272	284	100	58
Mississippi.....	1,468	740	728	290	188	250	352	193	43

See notes at end of table.

Table 1. Related and unrelated domestic adoptions and foreign adoptions: United States, 1986 National Committee For Adoption Survey--Continued

Geographic division and State	(a) Related and unrelated domestic adoptions	(b) Related domestic adoptions	(c) Unrelated domestic adoptions (subtotal d+e+f)	(d) Unrelated domestic adoptions by public agencies	(e) Unrelated domestic adoptions by private agencies	(f) Unrelated domestic adoptions by private indi- viduals	(g) Unrelated domestic adoptions of infants (included in c)	(h) Unrelated domestic adoptions of children with special needs (included in c)	(i) Foreign adoptions (not included in a or c)
West South Central.....	14,572	7,639	6,933	2,734	1,796	2,403	3,291	1,291	406
Arkansas.....	1,541	777	764	305	197	262	370	202	31
Louisiana.....	1,683	1,188	495	165	135	195	174	278	57
Oklahoma.....	2,350	1,175	1,175	469	303	403	569	311	92
Texas.....	8,998	4,499	4,499	1,795	1,161	1,543	2,178	500	226
Mountain.....	7,220	3,554	3,666	1,555	893	1,218	1,607	795	680
Montana.....	652	329	323	129	83	111	156	86	75
Idaho.....	330	53	277	63	114	100	163	73	60
Wyoming.....	232	117	115	46	30	39	56	30	14
Colorado.....	2,036	1,267	769	275	300	194	326	250	273
New Mexico.....	979	177	802	595	119	88	97	7	55
Arizona.....	1,303	657	646	258	167	221	313	171	75
Utah.....	1,261	782	479	58	38	383	416	127	113
Nevada.....	427	172	255	131	42	82	80	51	15
Pacific.....	9,301	2,901	6,400	2,460	1,408	2,532	3,624	2,470	1,664
Washington.....	2,133	1,169	964	246	429	289	620	250	445
Oregon.....	1,161	125	1,036	295	446	295	697	300	290
California.....	5,069	1,093	3,976	1,751	423	1,802	2,070	1,808	714
Alaska.....	662	322	340	135	88	117	162	90	67
Hawaii.....	276	192	84	33	22	29	75	22	148

NOTES: (a) Categories a-h exclude 10,019 foreign-born children adopted from other countries in calendar 1986. (b) Categories a-h obtained by NCFA survey of State adoption experts listed in Appendix A, "Sources of Data Shown in Table 1". Category i obtained by NCFA from Immigration and Naturalization Service, and excludes 7 adoptees to Guam, 24 to Puerto Rico, and 2 to the Virgin Islands. (c) For methods of using data categories from reporting states to derive unreported data categories, see Appendix A.6., "Sources of data in table 1".

Ann Rosenzweig

letter

going to indicate to states whether i compliance or not

what have to do to get into

compliance by 10/95

30 states have been let out of compliance

can't say

→ race will never be a factor

3RD STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 Newsweek
Newsweek

February 6, 1995 , UNITED STATES EDITION

SECTION: LIFE/STYLE; Pg. 44

LENGTH: 1260 words

HEADLINE: 'Ordered to Surrender'

Family: After years, Baby Richard's adoptive parents must give up their child. Why him?

BYLINE: MICHEAL INGRASSIA with JOHN MCCORMICK in Chicago

BODY:

THE MANDATE WAS SURPRISINGLY terse, one sentence devoid of either passion or comment. But the Illinois Supreme Court wasn't looking to win hearts last week when it ordered the nearly 4-year-old boy known as Baby Richard removed from the adoptive family he has lived with since he was 4 days old and turned over to his biological father. On Saturday a U.S. Supreme Court justice refused to delay the order, all but ending any hope that Richard can remain with the only mother and father he has ever known. The one-two punch angered the Illinois politicians, newspaper columnists and adoption advocates who have lobbied furiously to uphold Richard's adoption. The news also resonated among adoptive parents and would-be adopters, who worried that their child could be next. For everyone who recalls Baby Jessica, time has not dulled the August 1993 image of the 2 1/2-year-old, wailing as she was strapped into a van and whisked away from the only family she'd ever known.

Yet for all the passion these cases evoke, adoption in America is not turning into a custodial free-for-all. Headline-grabbing sagas like Baby Jessica and Baby Richard may be dramatic, but they're also aberrations. Of the estimated 50,000 domestic adoptions that take place in the United States each year, the National Council For Adoption says, not even 1 percent are contested by fathers or mothers trying to wrest back a child.

Most matches that go horribly awry are doomed from the start -- in ways that both birthparents and adoptive parents could have predicted. In Baby Jessica's case, the mother lied about who the father was. Baby Richard's case is riddled with even more deception. When Daniela Kirchner gave up her newborn son in March 1991, she was angry that her then boyfriend (and now husband), Otakar, had left her two weeks before the baby was born and returned to Czechoslovakia. She believed rumors that he had run off with an old girlfriend. He believed her story that the baby was dead -- even though Oto and Daniela had lived together for the first eight and a half months of her pregnancy. She refused to disclose that he was the father. He failed to search for his son as thoroughly as some thought he should have. Then, in May 1991, the couple reconciled in Chicago. And 80 days after Baby Richard's birth, Oto challenged the adoption. Although Illinois requires a father to demonstrate an "interest" within 80 days of the birth, Oto argued he couldn't stake a claim to a son he didn't know he had.

Two lower courts didn't buy it, ruling that Oto had abandoned his rights to his son, summer, though, the Illinois Supreme Court not only overturned the adoption but also excoriated the adoptive parents -- he's a firefighter, she's

Newsweek, February 6, 1995

a paralegal -- for not trying hard enough to find the father. The ruling stunned almost everyone because, unlike Baby Jessica's, Richard's case raised the chilling prospect that even a completed, legal adoption could be upended. Days of brinkmanship followed last week's Illinois Supreme Court ruling, which again ordered Richard returned to the Kirchners. On Saturday attorneys for the Does and Richard told NEWSWEEK they would ask yet another U.S. Supreme Court justice to delay the order. They also have 90 days to appeal the merits of the Illinois decision to the full court.

Adoptions don't have to fall apart. Top on the list of pitfalls is an inexperienced attorney. No matter how much Cousin Bill the real-estate lawyer wants to help, don't let him: adoption laws are intricate and vary widely from state to state. And no matter how much money it saves, using one lawyer to represent both the adoptive parents and birthparents is courting trouble. Ensuring that the birthmother gets professional counseling is just as important. A birthmother needs to grieve. But since coming to terms with that can take years, it's also essential to build in a safety valve -- a neutral party to whom she can turn. If Daniela Kirchner had had counseling, says Chicago adoption specialist Toni Carter, "there might have been an opportunity to build some trust" -- enough to persuade her to notify the father or disclose his name.

Why do adoptive parents ignore obvious precautions? In a word: desperation. According to the National Council For Adoption, more than 1 million American families are looking to adopt. That's 20 for every child available for placement, nearly 35 for every healthy infant. And especially for couples who've waited until their 30s to try to get pregnant and then find themselves infertile as they push 40, the prospect of waiting a year or two for another baby to come along is as daunting as waiting another decade. Though laws nationwide favor birthparents, Roberta DeBoer, after trying 10 years to conceive, not surprisingly fought to keep the child.

In the days before open adoption, when neither set of parents knew the other, both sides viewed each other with suspicion. Now they're more likely to work together. What's often overlooked is that adoption starts out as the birthmother's plan, making her the least likely person to want to disrupt it. "Most birthmoms worry, 'Who's going to want my child knowing I'm the kind of person who would give up a baby'," says Chris, a 25-year-old Illinois woman who placed a son for adoption five years ago. At the agency where Chris surrendered him -- Sunny Ridge Family Center in Wheaton, Ill. -- officials say that of the 1,160 domestic adoptions they've handled since 1979, only one birthmother has ever contacted the agency to say she irrevocably regretted her decision.

How tough is it for the children who do get handed off from one set of parents to another? Dr. Robert Gatson, director of child development at Chicago's Cook County Hospital, says that because small children see the world in a self-centered way, they can view the loss of a parent as their fault. "This child will know that his parents didn't die. In his eyes, they will have given him away. He must have done something wrong." Baby Jessica has reportedly come through the turmoil attached and adjusted to her new family. The Kirchners insist they don't want to wrest Richard from the Does overnight. "We lose everything by going out there with the sheriff and having a Jessica," says Loren Heinemann, Oto's attorney, who has offered a gradual transition. "If we can't learn from Jessica, damn us all."

*Kids
Gloss
Silver*

Newsweek, February 6, 1995

Fairy tale: Whether or not we're learning, the sagas of children like Jessie and Richard rivet us, to a degree that far outstrips their actual numbers. Our fascination goes beyond rubbernecking at the car wreck. We have a visceral sympathy for a child in pain-and most of us can't imagine having to give up our own kids. For some, however, the fantasy of adoption may also offer a secret release: kids can imagine jettisoning annoying parents for an adoptive family that will really appreciate them; temporarily fed-up parents can dream of leaving the kids on the doorstep. "Little disownings" is how University of North Carolina psychologist Paul Brinich describes them. "One of the things we as parents never like to admit is that sometimes we don't like our kids. It's the same idea behind a lot of fairy tales that include adoption. That's where we deal with a lot of our ambivalence." Yet no matter how strong the emotions they stir, most of us can never really know what kind of scars adoption battles leave. Baby Richard isn't so lucky. Oto Kirchner says he wants to meet his son this week.

GRAPHIC: Picture, no caption; Picture 1-2, BABY RICHARD, Adoptive parents, After last week's decision, the U.S. Supreme Court is the couple's last hope. - Biological parents, For 80 days, father Otakar Kirchner says, he didn't know he had a son, SETH PERLMAN - AP (LEFT), ANDRE P CHUNG - SUN TIMES - AP; Picture 3-4, BABY JESSIE - The DeBoers had to give up the 2 1/2 year-old they raised since birth. - Biological parents Cara Schmidt put her baby up for adoption, but the father didn't, MELCHIOR DIGIACOMO (FAR LEFT), REBECCA COOK -- GAMMA -LIASION (LEFT), ANN ARBOR NEWS -- SYGMA

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 7, 1995

6TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1994 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

November 8, 1994, Tuesday, Final Edition

SECTION: FIRST SECTION; PAGE A6

LENGTH: 897 words

HEADLINE: Controversial Illinois Adoption Ruling Upheld;
Without Comment, Supreme Court Affirms Biological Father's Right to 'Baby
Richard'

SERIES: Occasional

BYLINE: Edward Walsh, Washington Post Staff Writer

DATELINE: CHICAGO, Nov. 7

BODY:

The U.S. Supreme Court let stand today an emotion-charged Illinois decision to remove a 3 1/2-year-old boy from the home of his adoptive parents and award custody to his biological father. The decision immediately set off a new round of legal battles over a state law that was enacted specifically to keep the child with the adoptive parents.

The high court ruling, made without comment, effectively affirmed a unanimous decision by the Illinois Supreme Court in June in what has become known as the "Baby Richard" case.

The Illinois justices, overturning lower court findings, ruled that the biological father, Otakar Kirchner, had not surrendered his parental rights and nullified the 1991 adoption of the boy.

The case, one of several recent high-profile disputes between biological and adoptive parents, caused an uproar here and attracted national attention. It also led the Illinois General Assembly to hurriedly enact a law requiring a court hearing on the child's "best interest" to determine if the child should be returned to the biological parents, which was the case under previous law, or remain in the custody of the couple who sought adoption.

The law appeared today to represent the adoptive parents' last hope of retaining custody of the boy, who was turned over to them by the biological mother when he was four days old.

But even if the adoptive parents, who have been identified only as "John and Jane Doe," are eventually awarded custody, today's Supreme Court decision means they could never legally adopt the child without the biological father's consent.

Cook County Public Guardian Patrick Murphy, whose office is charged with protecting the interests of children, filed a motion today in Cook County Circuit Court demanding a custody hearing on the basis of the new law.

The Washington Post, November 8, 1994

Calling the protracted legal dispute "a strange case from beginning to end," Murphy said:

"We have a little boy who has lived his entire life with a phenomenal couple. He's got an older brother he's bonded with. This is a family. To take this kid out of the family will just tear this kid apart emotionally. It would just be a horrible thing to do."

Meanwhile, Kirchner's lawyer, Loren Heinemann, asked the Illinois Supreme Court today to rule that the new custody law could not be applied retroactively to the "Baby Richard" case.

Although the adoption issue has been settled, Heinemann said, if the issue of custody is now fought out in an entirely new case under terms of the new law "it could be years" before custody of the boy is finally settled.

The lawyer argued that the adoptive parents knew from the moment Kirchner surfaced a few months after the birth that the adoption was in jeopardy, and that now "the only thing they have going for them is the passage of 3 1/2 years that they largely brought about themselves."

He said removal of the boy from their home would be "disruptive" and "confusing," but need not be the "emotionally devastating" experience that critics of the ruling have portrayed.

From the moment it was handed down, the state Supreme Court's June decision provoked emotional arguments on both sides and eventually led to an extraordinary exchange of insults between one of the court's justices and Gov. Jim Edgar (R) and other critics of the ruling.

Lower courts in Illinois terminated Kirchner's parental rights, ruling that he was "unfit" because he showed no interest in the boy during the first 30 days of life as required by state law.

But Kirchner argued that the biological mother told him the baby had died shortly after birth while Kirchner was visiting his native Eastern Europe in 1991.

When he learned that "Baby Richard" was alive and had been placed for adoption, Kirchner immediately began legal action to stop the proceedings. He and the biological mother, Daniella, have since married.

When the state Supreme Court ruled that Kirchner's parental rights had not been legally terminated, there was a storm of protest led by Chicago Tribune columnist Bob Greene. Edgar attempted to intervene in the case on the side of the adoptive parents and backed enactment of the new custody law.

In July, by a 5 to 2 ruling, the state Supreme Court refused to reconsider its June decision.

The court's one-sentence order was accompanied by a six-page opinion by Justice James D. Heiple (R), chief author of the original opinion, in which he accused Greene of "acts of journalistic terrorism" and Edgar of a "crass political move" in attempting to intervene in the case.

The Washington Post, November 8, 1994

Edgar replied that Heiple was "smug" and "arrogant" and that the court had "committed a travesty."

In both the June ruling and his scathing opinion a month later, Heiple raised arguments about the rights of biological parents that also prevailed in the celebrated 1993 case of "Baby Jessica," the girl who was ordered returned to her biological parents in Iowa from the custody of a Michigan couple who had reared her almost from birth. Heiple said existing state laws are meant to protect the "preemptive rights to their own children" of biological parents who have not been found to be abusive.

"If best interests of the child were a sufficient qualification to determine child custody, anyone with superior income, intelligence, education, etc., might challenge and deprive the parents of their right to their own children," Heiple wrote in June.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 8, 1994

15TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 Chicago Tribune Company
Chicago Tribune

May 2, 1995 Tuesday, NORTH SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 1; ZONE: N

LENGTH: 1512 words

HEADLINE: 'BABY RICHARD' CASE MIRED IN MISTRUST;
HIS BEST INTERESTS FORGOTTEN AS ADULTS ARE TO BLAME FOR HIS DAY OF UPHEAVAL

BYLINE: By Janan Hanna and Louise Kiernan, Tribune Staff Writers.

BODY:

It could have been the disagreement over the hug.

Otakar Kirchner wanted to embrace his 4-year-old son when he met him for the first time. The boy's adoptive parents, known as John and Jane Doe, thought "Richard" should make the initial move.

That's one of the reasons the negotiations between the two families imploded in a 72-hour period, resulting in the ugly spectacle the country witnessed Sunday.

There are dozens more. At various times, the two families couldn't agree on where Kirchner should meet his son, who should guide the transition or what Richard should be told and when.

None of those reasons, however, can completely explain what happened.

The abrupt transfer of the child known as Richard from one family to another violated the one rule everyone said they were working toward: doing what was in the best interests of the child.

But any hope of settling the "Baby Richard" case peacefully and privately was hampered from the beginning by a court system that, for four years, forced both families to see each other as adversaries.

It was hampered by mistrust and paranoia fueled by the intense public scrutiny of the case and the propensity of both sides to try to use that exposure to their advantage.

Ultimately, it was doomed by the inability of adults to see beyond their own interests and emotions.

"The nature of the legal process suggests that everything is black and white, that there's a winner and a loser," said psychiatrist Lauren Wakschlag, who has been working with the Does, as the adoptive parents were known.

"Parenting can't be an adversarial process. It meant that everything got drawn along battle lines. It made it very difficult to work together."

That may be the only opinion everyone involved in the case could share. The day after the transfer, the lawyers and others traded as much blame as they

Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1995

had paperwork in the months that led up to the conclusion of the custody battle.

"It comes down to this," said Loren Heinemann, the attorney for Otakar Kirchner. "There was such a great lack of trust between both of the parties."

Others blame Heinemann and the opposing attorneys for that mistrust, saying they made it too difficult for the parents to talk to one another.

Even the lawyer who mediated between Heinemann and the opposing attorneys at Jenner & Block when communications broke down thought there was too much lawyering involved.

"The very nature of the involvement of the attorneys, and the fact that they were acting as filters . . . deprived the parties of an opportunity to open up channels of communication," said Bruce Boyer, a professor at Northwestern University Law School.

On Jan. 25, the Illinois Supreme Court ordered Richard to be turned over to Kirchner. But the legal maneuvering continued for months.

Kirchner had the authority to immediately take the child, but said at that time he would wait to be introduced to the child and get to know him first.

The Does had no legal power, but they had public sentiment on their side, and they knew it.

"We don't want to just go grab the child," Heinemann had said during the discussions. "We would look like monsters."

The Illinois Supreme Court's ruling offered no guidelines for the transfer. So the families were left to figure it out for themselves.

But even as the Does said they would cooperate fully, they also continued to pursue every possible legal avenue to prevent Richard from being removed from their care.

That contributed to the atmosphere of doubt.

Laura Kaster, an attorney for the adoptive parents, insisted that she and her clients agreed to every one of Kirchner's demands. But Heinemann always felt the Does were jockeying for power and time.

The Does appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, although they knew it was unlikely the court would hear the case. And the court didn't. Another appeal is still pending.

For a time, though, there seemed to be progress.

The two families agreed a Cook County Circuit judge would oversee the process for transfer. Kirchner had received a dozen pictures of the child.

The transfer process initially bogged down in a series of disagreements about who should be on it, but by mid-March the two sides had agreed to a three-member team of mental health experts.

Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1995

On March 28, the two couples had their first and last lengthy meeting, talking with each other and the transition team for 2 1/2 hours. It would prove a turning point.

They discussed the story they would tell Richard. Mrs. Doe told the Kirchners about Richard's schedule, what he liked and disliked.

Kirchner talked about his childhood, how he had been abandoned by his own parents and why it was so important for him to raise his son.

At the end of the sometimes tense meeting, Mrs. Doe and Daniela Kirchner, the boy's biological mother, tentatively embraced each other.

Still, according to Karen Moriarty, a psychologist working with the Kirchners, the couple left unhappy. They thought the families would decide that day what Richard should be told, and they were frustrated by the slow pace of negotiations.

Because of conflicting schedules, the next meeting couldn't be held until April 14. The mental health experts couldn't agree how and what the Does should tell Richard about his situation.

In particular, tension was growing between Moriarty and Bennett Leventhal, chairman of the psychiatry department at the University of Chicago Hospitals.

Leventhal and the third team member, licensed clinical social worker Kenneth Watson, have national reputations for their work with children.

But Moriarty, who Heinemann chose to lead the team, is a former assistant school district superintendent in Orland Park who has run a private practice specializing in custody and divorce cases for less than three years.

She met Heinemann last fall when she was marketing her services to a number of attorneys in the area.

"She didn't have any experience, and she viewed that she had to be in charge," Leventhal said Monday. "It's hard to be in charge of something you don't understand."

The two also had fundamental philosophical differences. She thought the transition could occur quickly. Leventhal did not.

"I felt we needed to listen to both sets of parents," Moriarty said Monday. "I believed he wasn't doing that."

The next week, Heinemann fired Leventhal from the team, saying he wasn't available and charged too much. Later, though, he would complain Leventhal had met secretly with the Does, a claim Leventhal denies.

But to Kaster, the real problem was Leventhal's advocacy of a slow transfer. "(Heinemann) didn't like what he heard," Kaster said.

As the transition team stalled, the lawyers took over. In a terse letter to Kaster, Heinemann demanded full control of the transfer process and threatened to remove the child.

Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1995

He began issuing daily demands for custody.

Meanwhile, the adoptive parents asked the Illinois Supreme Court to appoint an independent psychiatrist to help the parties break their stalemate. The court refused.

The April 14 meeting took place without the Kirchners or Moriarty. Moriarty says she wasn't told about it until the night before, and Leventhal claims she knew but chose not to attend. The Does brought Richard, which seemed a slap in the face to the absent Kirchners.

The Kirchners were convinced the Does didn't want them to meet Richard, Moriarty said. The Does, according to their psychiatrist, just wanted to make sure the transition would be as painless as possible.

By last week, Kirchner agreed to meet his son once before taking custody, and a meeting was scheduled for Thursday.

Less than four hours before the meeting, the Kirchners canceled, saying they didn't like the guidelines the Does and their psychiatrist had laid out: that the meeting would be fairly short, that Richard wouldn't be told that he was going to live with the Kirchners and that the boy initiate any physical contact.

By Friday afternoon, the attorneys had exchanged a series of increasingly hostile letters. Through Heinemann, the Kirchners demanded custody by the end of the weekend. The Does' attorneys asked them to reconsider but finally told the couple to arrive at their home at 3 p.m. Sunday.

That morning, the Does decided the public should see what was going to happen to Richard, and they invited the media.

"The situation already couldn't have been more catastrophic for him," said Wakschlag, who was at the couple's Schaumburg home throughout the day. "I don't think having the media there worsened it for him."

Even that decision was a last-ditch effort to prevent the inevitable.

Kaster said before the transfer that the Does hoped the cameras might dissuade Kirchner from carrying the boy out of the home and draw public attention to the legal system that allowed it to happen.

The Kirchners and their supporters deplored the scene. But it was not unexpected.

"It had such an ugly history-four years of bitter battles-it's not surprising it came to that point," Moriarty said.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO GRAPHICPHOTO (color): Richard's toys were set by the curb Sunday. Tribune photo by Val Mazzenga.; GRAPHIC (color): Letters between the families lawyers; After a letter from Loren Heineman on Thursday, April 27, stating the Kirchners would be taking Richard "within the next 72 hours," the following excerpted correspondence between the lawyers for the Does and the Kirchners took place on Friday, April 28:; Chicago Tribune.; See microfilm for complete graphic.

Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1995

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 2, 1995

33RD STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 Chicago Tribune Company
Chicago Tribune

March 7, 1995 Tuesday, NORTH SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 3; ZONE: N

LENGTH: 687 words

HEADLINE: EASY TO BECOME DAD, HARDER TO BE FATHER

BYLINE: Mike Royko.

BODY:

If you think about it, one of the easiest things a male can do is become a biological father.

By the time we're 12 years old, most of us are not only physically capable of this deed, but eager to give it a try. Actually, the end result-fatherhood-is not foremost in our minds, but the process is.

It can take as little as a few seconds in bed, on a sofa, in the back seat of a car, on a beach, in a hallway, a bush, a tent or an igloo. Just about any place on the face of the Earth will do, as today's movie scripts demonstrate. When a guy puts his mind to becoming a biological father, he's not fussy about where. The big question is always when?

You can have the IQ of a frog and become a biological father. And why not? Frogs do.

To show how easy it can be, one of the most productive biological fathers on record was Emperor Moulay (The Bloody) Ismael of Morocco, who had 525 sons and 342 daughters by numerous wives by the time he was 30.

Actually, that's a meaningless record. Any able-glanded man could become a biological father thousands of times if he knew enough cooperative females. Fortunately, most women aren't eager to share in such records. For them, a roll in the hay is the beginning of a long, arduous process. The male, on the other hand, is merely along for the ride.

And as the deadbeat rates for child support indicate, the ride is often over almost before it begins.

It's so easy to become a biological father that you really don't need a willing partner. Even a rapist can do it, and some have, which shows that old Mother Nature isn't much of a feminist.

Which leads me to Otakar (Otto) Kirchner, who has had more than his 15 minutes of fame by being the biological father of Baby Richard, the child caught in the nightmarish legal tug of war.

It appears that Kirchner has the law on his side and, unless something unexpected happens, will get possession of his biological son, who doesn't know that Kirchner exists.

Chicago Tribune, March 7, 1995

That's the law, but it doesn't mean that the law is right. Common sense tells us that it isn't; that Baby Richard should remain with the adoptive parents who brought him home from the hospital and have raised him as their own child.

The higher courts are impressed by Kirchner's claims as the biological father. But what is it that he did, besides hop in the sack with a very good-looking woman?

Did the prospect of becoming a father impress him so much that he rushed her to the altar as soon as it was known that his seed was effective?

Nah, he couldn't make up his mind. He was still in love with his longtime sweetie, Maria. Then he was in love with the pregnant Daniela. Then with Maria. Then with Daniela. Maybe both at the same time. Some guys aren't sure where they're going to have breakfast.

As most mothers will agree, the place for a father to be nine months after he does his thing is right there in the maternity ward. If he can't share the pain, the least a man can do is show up to express curiosity and throw in a few reassuring hand squeezes.

But where was Otto when his biological child came into the world? Pacing in the hospital's waiting room? Asking a nurse how it's going?

No, while Daniela spent nine hours grunting and groaning to make Otto a biological father, the biological daddy was visiting relatives in Europe, reportedly with the always-reliable Maria.

Most women would take that as kind of a snub. But most judges are not women.

So the evidence indicates that about all Otto did to establish himself as a biological father was what most young men would do if a good-looking blond said: "You want to come up for a drink?"

Does that make him a father? The law says, yes. So do blood tests, DNA tests, and the rest of it.

But common sense says that after four years, the true father is the man who has been raising Baby Richard since birth. And, according to all reports, doing a fine job of it. All Otto did was enjoy getting lucky, as the saying goes.

And if Daniela had just said, "No, I have a splitting headache," maybe Otto would still be running around Europe with Maria.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 7, 1995

COLUMN #2 NOTES

@ 445,000 kids in foster care

median wait for adoption is more than 2 1/2 yrs (32 mos)

Honor children

where do adult rights stop & child's begin.

Betsy Richard

HRC

Mona Luisa - Delhi -

multi racial

at home in Delhi - met ppl from Cuba
who had adopted kids from US

Have so many friends who have
adopted from Thailand / Asia
I'm thrilled all these children

get homes & glad no obstacles
My delight is tempered by sadness
that so many kids in U.S.

See probs

@ Baby Richard - publicity has returned
his parents from taking a
chance -

That is a v. remote poss - can't say
it will never happen

@ Other prob is trans racial -

v. strong prohibition explicit & implicit
for v. long time

One of v. cases as Law student 1970
involved a child mixed bl/wh
placed in foster care w/ older bl.

woman - loved boy - had her

3 yrs -

State wanted to put in adoptive home - woman volunteered
to adopt -

State said no - she can pass as white / presumed / was way I kid have been darker -

oprah.
p. 4

p. 17

COLUMN #2 / NOTES

Adoption / Mother Jones

National Council for Adoption says 50,000/yr in U.S.
1 m. families lkg to adopt

Problems w/adoptions:

Birth mother needs to grieve (∴ counseling helpful)
Kids invariably blame themselves - feels like
he has been given a way

✓ Biblical passage abt parents / children

"Little disowning" UNC psychologist Paul Brinich
ambivalences come up for all parents + children

→ Baby Richard's father wanted to embrace the boy
Adoptive parents thought Baby shld initiate

Chicago Trib story: "It was doomed by the inability of
adults to see beyond their own interests
and emotions"

Mental health experts couldn't agree on what
to tell ~~parents~~ Richard

✓ Royko
when

What is a parent? or father

HMC/2

Adoption

For yrs we have been struggling w/ these rules that

contin. protests I've been hearing
of Metzgerbaum bill
we thought we had freed —
still fighting w/ 61 soc. workers +
11 judges

✓ Melame

- deep. fact that Pres has met
pres. w/ votes to expedite regulation
"based on best interests" —

I'll go after HHS —

—> how impl. adopt
often what stands in bureaucratic
— men made imped.
to what children — which is
come to all

When I visited r...

Also struck by — such else —
my Amer. —

Wly.

Pull aside > spk —
dais emptied —

— HHS + DOJ wly to implement
interpreted statute so you can't take it
act > for a child where law is
not an issue

plus
clear

MARIE/MRC 6/29/95

- Part of solving any problem is to find a common ground (Jenasa)

Debut Baby Richard / Focus on needs of child

- Stopping during a walk -

couple stopped and asked me to take their picture

Shifts between public roles

quote about doing this in public

Remember who this Hillary Clinton is who I read about in the paper.

Like my women, try to integrate these

roles -

issues

Complications of women's lives

- put children to bed before second shift

-

/men/