

Op-Ed

The New York Times
ON THE WEB

[Home](#)[Site Index](#)[Site Search](#)[Forums](#)[Archives](#)[Marketplace](#)

September 12, 1999

LIBERTIES / By MAUREEN DOWD

Sure I Would

Related Articles

- [Op-Ed Columns Archive](#)

Forum

- [Join a Discussion on Maureen Dowd](#)
-

WASHINGTON -- "She has a sexy mouth, I think. That slight palatial overbite -- it gets to me. She seems expert at marshaling her mouth's resources, at inspiring its ingenuity.

... When she is pouncing on the possibility of an idea, her lips extend their reach into her cheeks and carve out a wolfish, carnal line, as though nothing could please her more than her own hunger.

... Her laugh is the sexiest thing about her, in fact; it packs a lewd wallop. ..."

So writes Tom Junod in the October Esquire. Mr. Junod is not overheating over a pouty starlet with tattoos and a bare midriff. "The woman of incipient bloom" who inspires his leers is our very own First Lady. After following the would-be Senator on her political rounds in New York, he declares her "the most interesting sexual persona of our time."

It was inevitable, I suppose, that Hillary would go from saint to sex object, from brain to bombshell.

We live in a society that obsessively constructs, deconstructs and reconstructs its celebrities. And we have a First Lady who obsessively constructs, deconstructs and reconstructs herself. The fragmentation of Hillary Clinton's image has always been dizzying and confusing.

But, of all the serial mythologizations, this is the most bizarre: The no-nonsense lawyer who was eager to show the country that First Ladies are not paper dolls ends up being celebrated for her "pretty . . . almond shaped, slightly catty" eyes and "mighty cheekbones," and for looking "lovely in the rain."

"The Hillary I saw was not unsexed -- she was *resexed*," Mr. Junod writes about her listening tour. Alluding to both voting and romping, he asks what he considers the ultimate question about Hillary Clinton: "Would I? Sure I would." He probably thought he was doing the First

Lady a favor, setting straight all the guys who think she's icy or bossy or wonky.

The problem with this is that it yanks us back to judging women on their looks and desirability. That is where women have been through history, relying on their appearance to get approval and get ahead, and that can be debilitating.

Female candidates for high office have it tough already. They can't be too soft and they can't be too hard. They have to prove that they're manly enough to handle the job -- no tears or flutters or girlish qualms. At the same time, they have to be womanly enough not to seem threatening.

Now, according to Mr. Junod, they should be seductive, too. He says approvingly of Mrs. Clinton: "One could imagine her talking dirty . . ."

If you want to understand exactly how trivializing it is to sexualize Hillary Clinton in this way, let's apply the Junod approach (and much of his own panting vocabulary) to male candidates:

Al Gore wears expensive pantsuits, drapey around his legs, hiding the ankles that some women mistakenly call thick, and flat shoes. He still looks like the smartest guy at the dance, the guy not smart enough to escape his vulnerability nor ambitious enough to escape his longing. Would I? Sure I would.

Rudolph Giuliani's hair is bright and fixed. But sometimes a tendril of it will come loose and fall into his face and he will seem open to the intrigue of dishevelment. That radical combover, that comb-hither look, makes me shiver. Most women seem to miss his raw appeal. Only a very sexually confident man would slap handcuffs on Wall Street traders right in the middle of the workday. Would I? Sure I would.

I think it would be easy to get Alan Keyes flustered. One little wink would do it.

He's a complete fruitcake, but that's what makes him so irresistibly saucy. Would I? Sure I would.

W.'s eyes, set so close together, squeezed above that long space between the nose and mouth, give him a strange simian magnetism. His rather wide ears sport those macho, mesquite tufts of hair. Cowboys make me weak. Would I? Sure I would.

I don't care that Bill Bradley has a boring voice and a belly and a bald spot and ratty sneakers.

His palatial chin packs a lewd wallop. It is enigmatic in its capacity for adjustment. It seems both the origin and repository of his secrets. Would I? Sure I would.

One could imagine Gary Bauer talking dirty. His lips form a curving line as though nothing could please him more than his own hunger. Would I? Let me get back to you on that . . .

THE WASHINGTON POST

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1999

63

By Lloyd Grove



Just call it her "Vote for Me" hairdo. Possible New York Senate candidate Hillary Rodham Clinton has gone from a longer, less shapely cut to this short and sleek coiffure—a transformation carried out at the White House residence yesterday morning by her longtime stylist Isabelle Goetz of Cristophe. "This is the shortest she's gone," the salon's publicist, Michelle Delino, told us. The first lady's spokeswoman, Marsha Berry, was equally short: "It's just her choice."

PHOTO BY MARK SELIGER. STYLING BY ISABELLE GOETZ OF CRISTOPHE. HAIR BY ISABELLE GOETZ OF CRISTOPHE. MAKEUP BY JANE ROSS.



PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

NATIONAL NEWS

In Search of Starr's Successor

Judges Interview Several Independent Counsel Candidates

By DAVID A. VISE
and LOBBRAINE ADAMS
Washington Post Staff Writers

The three-judge panel that appointed independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr interviewed candidates to replace him yesterday, sources familiar with the matter said. Starr has told the panel he intends to leave his post by the end of October.

The head of the panel, U.S. Circuit Judge David B. Sentelle, appears on track to pick a replacement soon and meet Starr's timetable, sources said.

Although the independent counsel law expired in June, Attorney General Janet Reno determined that the special panel of judges has the authority to appoint a successor to complete Starr's investigation.

Starr's replacement will be responsible for completing inquiries into a few remaining matters, including first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's role in the firing of longtime staff at the White House travel office, and also will be charged with drafting a final report on the office's work.

Starr has forwarded several résumés to Sentelle, including those of his four deputy independent counsels. Among those under consideration for the post are:

- Edward J. Page, a Starr deputy who conducted grand jury examinations of Secret Service agents and who helped write and edit Starr's referral to Congress that led to the House's impeachment of President Clinton. He previously worked with independent counsel David M. Barrett on the investigation of former housing secretary Henry Cisneros. He has been on leave from his post as assistant U.S. attorney in Tampa since 1995.

- W. Hickman Ewing Jr., a Tennessee lawyer who worked as Starr's deputy in Little Rock. Ewing successfully prosecuted then-Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker and the Clintons' partners in the Whitewater land deal. He also drew up a draft indictment of the first lady. Ewing worked for a decade as U.S. attorney in Memphis.

- Michael W. Emmick, a Starr deputy on detail to the office from his post as an assistant U.S. attorney in Los Angeles. Emmick's principal substantive responsi-

bility was the Lewinsky investigation, according to his résumé. Emmick was involved in the office's controversial first encounter with Monica S. Lewinsky at the Ritz-Carlton in Pentagon City.

- Jay Apperson, who was elevated to one of Starr's deputies in March and has overseen personnel and administrative functions for the office. He also participated in the investigation of former associate attorney general Webster L. Hubbell and has advised Starr on relations with the Justice Department and the FBI. Apperson, who lives in Northern Virginia, worked for a decade as an assistant U.S. attorney in Alexandria.

- Paul Rosenzweig, a senior litigation counsel for Starr. Rosen-

weig was the first lawyer in Starr's office to learn that Linda Tripp had information she wanted to share with the independent counsel. He was informed about Tripp by a law school classmate who had worked on Paula Jones's sexual harassment case against the president, sparking allegations of collusion between Jones's attorneys and the independent counsel.

Starr was in London yesterday and was unavailable for comment. Sentelle and the candidates to replace Starr either did not return phone calls or declined to comment.

Staff writer Roberto Suro contributed to this report.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

THE WASHINGTON POST

A6 THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

Starr deputies interviewed in search for successor

By Jerry Seper
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A three-judge panel of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals looking for a successor to independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr yesterday interviewed five of his deputies — including a top prosecutor who is considered a favorite for the post.

Deputy independent counsel W. Hickman Ewing Jr., a former federal prosecutor in Tennessee, directed the government's investigation of former Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker and Clinton associates James and Susan McDougal.

The others interviewed were Jay Apperson, a deputy in Mr. Starr's Washington office; Michael Emmick, who worked on the

Monica Lewinsky investigation; Edward J. Page, who has investigated Hillary Rodham Clinton's role in the "Travelgate" affair; and Paul Rosenzweig, an expert in legal briefs who also was involved in the Lewinsky probe.

Mr. Ewing was Mr. Starr's initial pick to head the Arkansas phase of the Whitewater investigation. His Southern background was seized upon by Arkansas critics of the Whitewater investigation, who labeled Mr. Ewing — a Memphis native — a "traitor."

He has acknowledged writing a draft indictment of Mrs. Clinton over her involvement in the legal representation of Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan Association, the thrift owned by the McDougals.

Deputy independent counsel W. Hickman Ewing Jr. is considered a favorite for Mr. Starr's post.

In June 1995, when Mr. Tucker pleaded not guilty in a separate fraud indictment, Mr. Ewing faced considerable — albeit hushed — criticism by a standing-room-only crowd of Tucker loyalists. One woman said softly as Mr. Starr entered the courtroom she would like to "bludgeon him to death with my purse" and angrily suggested that Mr. Ewing "apparently had forgotten his Southern roots."

During the arraignment of former Associate Attorney General Webster T. Hubbell on charges of

fraud and income tax evasion, it was Mr. Ewing who meticulously outlined the government's case.

He said Mr. Hubbell "participated in a scheme to defraud and to obtain money and property from the Rose Law Firm... by means of false and fraudulent pretenses and representations." Mr. Hubbell was sent to prison for 21 months as part of a plea agreement he reached in the Whitewater probe — negotiated by Mr. Ewing.

It also was key to an agreement with former Little Rock Municipal

Judge David L. Hale, the government's key Whitewater witness.

Mr. Ewing served as an assistant U.S. attorney for nine years before President Reagan appointed him as U.S. attorney for Tennessee's western district in 1981. He had been in private practice in Memphis since September 1991.

His tenure in Tennessee was marked by several high-profile convictions: a state senator, for fraud and income-tax evasion; a county sheriff, for protecting drug dealers; and a former basketball coach at Memphis State, for tax evasion and obstruction of justice for intimidating a witness.

Last year, White House adviser Sidney Blumenthal publicly apologized for calling Mr. Ewing a "religious fanatic," saying he said he

should not have used the words to describe the Whitewater prosecutor.

The apology came after more than 50 House Republicans wrote to Mr. Clinton, saying remarks made by Mr. Blumenthal during a speech at Harvard University showed disrespect for religious freedom. Although he made similar comments about Mr. Starr, he offered no similar apology.

In his April 23, 1998, Harvard speech, Mr. Blumenthal, who led the White House assault on Mr. Starr's office, personally attacked Mr. Ewing, citing a report in the New Yorker magazine that disclosed Mr. Ewing had left a conservative evangelical church to start his own church.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

NEW YORK POST, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Hillary's dark Starr

FEROCIOUS Clinton pursuer Kenneth Starr has been in the London limelight this week, lecturing law students and enjoying some of the old city's best restaurants. He was dining at Mirabella the other night and my spies say the talk got around to Hillary Rodham Clinton's proposed Senate run. Several people at the table were incredulous that she could be even thinking of getting into a brutal campaign when she knows that Starr's final (and supposedly damning) report into her conduct will be released just a

couple of months before the election. Starr didn't say anything about it himself, but the thin smile on his face seemed to confirm the widespread belief that he detests Hillary more than he does Bill.

4A - THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1999 - USA TODAY

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

SUCCEEDING STARR: A top Whitewater prosecutor who once drafted an indictment of first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was among five people interviewed as a possible replacement for independent counsel Ken Starr. The Associated Press reported, citing courthouse sources. The deputy, Hickman Ewing, oversaw the recently ended Arkansas phase of Starr's five-year investigation. He testified that he thinks the Clintons were not responsive to prosecutors' inquiries and, when asked if he ever called the Clintons "crooks and liars," he said he "certainly expressed internally that I had problems with some of their answers." Ewing is one of five people reportedly interviewed by the panel of appeals court judges that will name a successor to Starr, who is expected to leave before the end of the year.

Bill and Hillary Bickerson

White House martial arts

Lots of married couples and lovers quarrel and make-up, quarrel and make-up. It comes with the territory. But rarely do the rest of us quarrel and reconcile in the headlines.

We've had that with Hillary and Bill for years. It began with that famous "60 Minutes" interview, like Tammy Wynette, she stood by her man by sitting by her man. When he put her in charge of health reform, it was generally assumed that she had struck a deal with him. We've seen them dancing by sea and smuggling by land. We've watched them separate like magnets that repel.

Hillary's gone from treating the president as "nothing but a hound dog," to making him heel like a puppy, raising money for her Senate campaign.

But as bad as the personal confrontations were, nothing's been quite as bad as their public differences on policy issues. The first lady calls Jerusalem the "eternal capital" of Israel. The first man says its status should be decided through talks between Israelis and Palestinians. The president springs Puerto Rican terrorists from the policy. The first lady flips and flops and finally stays flopped.

Obvious questions: Does the first lady pander to the Jewish vote? (She even found a Jewish step-grandfather in the family tree.) To the Puerto Rican vote? To the upstate New York vote? These are all legitimate concerns of a voting public but it's positively

Can anyone imagine the first couple of any other nation acting this way?

Historians of first ladyhood suggest that the role of the wife of the president reflects the status of women in society. That's only partly true. The public scrutiny of a first lady has always magnified her persona, subjecting her to demonization by her husband's enemies, and idealization by his partisans. What's different for this first couple is that their policy disagreements have an impact on her candidacy and on his legacy, such as it may be.

It's very difficult to evaluate their motives. Is he trying to help her? Is she trying to show her independence? These are not your usual dinner table tiffs.

I have always had trouble envisioning the political odd couple Mary Matalin and James Carville in private. But they've carved a public image that "entertains" through disagreement. That's show-biz. It's not dignified, but it's their shtick. They were on opposite sides when they met. Fair enough. Lots of Washington couples have sharp differences on certain subjects, including politics.

But the president and the first lady have always presented themselves to be in political sync. ("Buy one, get one free.") Their recent political differences smack of expediency, or hypocrisy, or both. They give off among other things confusing signals.

Most of us respect presidents who consult with their



Suzanne Fields



eerie to watch the first couple disagree.

There's simply no greater way to exacerbate Clinton fatigue than being an unwilling party to their policy feuds. Her listening tour has become our voyeur tour.

When Paula Zahn interviewed George Bush the elder on Fox, she asked what he thought about the first lady's campaign for the Senate. Mr. Bush said, "I couldn't take it." Simple as that: "I couldn't take it."

This is not about male chauvinism or feminism, but a lot about the image of American leadership in the eyes of the world. It's tacky.

Suzanne Fields, a columnist for The Washington Times, is nationally syndicated. Her column appears here Mondays and

wives. Many first ladies have had to carry their husband's message to specific groups outside the White House. They had to be informed. Eleanor Roosevelt was famous for getting her "friends" to talk to the president or to use her influence to get their message to him.

In that interview in Talk magazine, Hillary says she was thrilled to be liberated to go off on her own after having served as first lady. She should have waited until after she had served as first lady. But that would mean giving up the perks of her husband's power.

Eleanor Roosevelt said that her relationship with FDR ultimately "served his purposes" more than he served hers. Hillary Clinton upstages her favorite first lady by turning that equation around. Like so much about the Clintons,

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Computer supervisor sues first lady, charging reprisal

By George Archibald
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A White House computer supervisor who battled Hillary Rodham Clinton's interference with a major presidential computer database has sued the first lady for job reprisal after being forced to transfer to another agency.

Sheryl L. Hall, who now runs computer support operations for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, filed her lawsuit in U.S. District Court Friday — her last day of work at the White House, where she had managed computer operations since President Clinton took office.

The lawsuit accuses Mrs. Clinton and nine White House political appointees of job harassment and

reprisals against Mrs. Hall over the past five years and seeks \$300,000 in compensatory damages.

In the lawsuit, Mrs. Hall, an Arlington resident, accused Mrs. Clinton of overseeing political misuse of the White House Office Database (WHODB), being built under the direction of senior presidential adviser Marsha Scott.

"Development of the WHODB was overseen by Scott upon the direction and with the approval of [Mrs.] Clinton who, because of her marriage to the president, had usurped far reaching authority and influence over a variety of matters relating to the president's administration, including but not limited to matters relating to personnel," the lawsuit states.

Mrs. Hall, a 15-year veteran computer manager, was assigned to the White House in October 1992 from the Naval Sea Systems Command. She says in her lawsuit that she was harassed and abused by top Clinton political appointees for five years, at Mrs. Clinton's behest, after she first voiced objections to using career White House employees and the WHODB for political activities that violated federal law.

The political activities are not detailed in the lawsuit but Mrs. Hall's complaint quotes from an October 1998 report of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, which said of the \$1.7 million WHODB: "It was not just for official purposes; senior White House staff planned and, in

fact, used it to advance the campaign fund-raising objectives of the Democratic National Committee (DNC). This conversion of government property to the use of the DNC constitutes a theft of government property under 18 U.S.C. 641."

Jim Kennedy, a spokesman for the White House Counsel's Office, said he had not seen the complaint. David Kendall, Mrs. Clinton's attorney, could not be reached for comment.

Mrs. Hall also could not be reached for comment. Sources close to the White House said 70 career employees there attended a going-away luncheon for her last week.

The lawsuit said Miss Scott sent Mrs. Clinton and Deputy White

House Counsel Bruce Lindsey a memorandum on Jan. 26, 1994, stating that the first lady's insistence on creation of the computer database had run into difficulty. "Translating this into action on the part of others is the rub," Miss Scott's memo stated, according to the lawsuit.

The lawsuit said Miss Scott's memo characterized Mrs. Hall, 50, "as old, less informed, unenthusiastic, disloyal to the president's administration, and 'an obstacle' to the development of the WHODB. Such characterizations were untrue, as evidenced by Hall's long and distinguished record as a federal civil servant, and made without prior notification to Hall or the reasonable opportunity for Hall to defend herself."

White House officials then eliminated Mrs. Hall's participation in the WHODB project, removed her supervisory responsibility over 10 computer specialists responsible for developing the database, decreased her other duties, and ordered her against her will "to lower her performance appraisal of a motivated and productive African-American male working under her supervision."

The lawsuit says Mrs. Hall fought the retaliation since 1994, but one of her three discrimination complaints was rejected by the Executive Office of the President in February. She is appealing that decision to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and has other complaints still pending in addition to the lawsuit.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Prez's puttering plops Hill's Senate hopes in the rough

MAYBE President Clinton is devoting so much energy to cheating at golf these days that his political skills have gotten rusty — because he is knocking wife Hillary's Senate bid off-course.

He landed her in the rough by offering to set FALN terrorists free — and by convincing pro-impeachment

Rep. Mike Forbes of Long Island to switch from the GOP to the Democrats, making him a Hillary running-mate.

This double whammy means Hillary gets to run as someone who's soft on terrorists — but also as an ally of the "vast right-wing conspiracy," since Forbes is pro-gun and pro-life, and voted to impeach her husband.

And this makes her look like a true woman of principle, ready to stand up for the Democratic Party's left wing and the GOP's right wing all at the same time. Brilliant, huh?

The Clinton spin is that he was acting purely on principle — and not to boost his wife — when he

offered clemency to terrorist members of the group whose Spanish acronym means Armed Forces of National Liberation.

After all, they say, his FALN deal may well hurt her, so he *must* have acted out of principle. Oh yeah. And he didn't have sex with That Woman.

Of course, Clinton thought about how the clemency deal would affect Hillary — he just

flubbed and thought, wrongly, that it would help. Word is, he didn't even bother to run it by anyone in New York.

This story is just starting to boil as Republicans rev up for hearings and plan a speedy vote on a measure denouncing Clinton's free-the-terrorists deal — thus forcing a lot of House Dems to vote against Clinton.

That vote risks leaving Hillary isolated on the left since she's standing behind her husband's clemency offer — while outgoing Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan has denounced the idea.



DEBORAH ORIN
INSIDE
WASHINGTON

NEW YORK POST, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1999



SPOILER? The president's Mike Forbes and FALN strategies may do in his wife's campaign.

N.Y. Post Tamara Beckwith

So, Rep. Peter King (R-L.I.), a clemency foe, predicts the president will find a way to revoke his offer, perhaps by saying the FALNers didn't act quickly enough to renounce violence.

"I think he'll withdraw the offer because it's really going to hurt [Hillary] with Reagan Democrats who believe in law and order," said King, noting the FALN victims include three bomb-maimed New York City cops.

If that's not bad enough, the FALN opens the dicey issue of how the newly pro-Israel Mrs. Clinton can back clemency for terrorists — but not for Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard, a cause celebre for many Jews.

Then there's the president's push to convert Forbes to the Democratic Party. Clinton got a first-hand taste of how that plays at the grass roots when Forbes was hissed at Dem fund-raisers in

the Hamptons last weekend.

The irony, for many Long Island Dems, is that they thought they had a good chance to whip Forbes in 2000 — perhaps with Moynihan's popular chief-of-staff Tony Bullock as their candidate. Now they fear they'll lose the seat with Forbes.

No wonder Hillary stops well short of endorsing the man her husband convinced to become a Democrat.

By the way, Forbes just yesterday sent Clinton a letter saying his FALN clemency offer is "clearly wrong" and "sends a dangerous message."

"I find the activities of these individuals to be especially egregious, given the impact of their actions on the people of New York," Forbes wrote.

"We simply cannot be tough enough on those who introduce fear and havoc into the fabric of our society."

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

NEW YORK POST, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1999

GOP subpoenas Clinton's FALN clemency reports

By DEBORAH ORIN
Bureau Chief

WASHINGTON — Republicans yesterday rained down subpoenas and demands that the Clinton administration cough up documents to justify the president's clemency offer to 16 members of the FALN terror group.

The demands came amid a growing storm over Clinton's offer to free the terrorists, which critics charge was aimed at boosting with Hillary's Senate bid with Puerto Ricans — a charge the White House denies.

But there was also growing concern among Democrats normally loyal to the White House over its clem-

ency offer, which is bitterly opposed by every major police group in the country.

A day after Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N.Y.) told The Post that he opposes clemency, Rep. Nita Lowey (D-Westchester) joined the call for Clinton to release the reports that prompted him to offer the deal.

Aides said Clinton acted based on reports prepared by former White House Counsel Charles F.C. Ruff and the Justice Department, which got input from

the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Prisons and U.S. attorneys in Connecticut and Illinois who had prosecuted FALN members.

Lowey joins Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.), who a day earlier called on Clinton to release the clemency report, saying it's impossible for him to know if Clinton's offer was justified without seeing it.

Lowey spokesman Matt Traub said she "wants the administration to release

reports that led the president to offer clemency to these individuals" so she can decide whether she supports it.

Clinton spokesman Jim Kennedy said yesterday the president doesn't intend to release the memos.

Clemency advocates say the FALN members weren't convicted of killing or injuring anyone. Critics say most were convicted of armed robbery and seditious conspiracy and linked

to terror bombings.

House Republicans, spearheaded by Rep. Vito Fossella (R-S.I.), are pushing for a vote condemning the clemency offer, and a Senate terrorism subcommittee plans a Sept. 15 hearing.

That subcommittee's chairman, Paul Coverdell (R-Ga.), wrote to FBI Director Louis Freeh that he wants the documents to see "why this decision has been made against the advice of the Justice Department, the FBI and the U.S. attorneys that originally prosecuted these individuals."

He said he'll be sending other document demands to Attorney General Janet Reno and the Federal Bu-



NITA LOWEY
Wants to see memos.

reau of Prisons seeking all information related to Clinton's clemency deal.

House Government Reform Committee chairman Dan Burton (R-Ind.) sent off a batch of subpoenas to Reno and the prisons bureau demanding the same materials.

Clamor for Formal Candidacy Grows

First Lady's Backers, Pointing to Misssteps, Say Campaign Management Is Needed

By JENNE DUKE
Washington Post Staff Writer

NEW YORK—Hillary Rodham Clinton is under pressure from contributors as well as some New York Democrats to officially declare her Senate candidacy or at least assemble a traditional campaign operation.

Many of these Democrats are frustrated at the loose structure of the "exploratory" campaign, the missteps and the lack of a coherent strategy and message. Rep. Charles B. Rangel (N.Y.), one of the early promoters of Clinton's Senate venture, said last week that he is disengaging from her effort until she officially announces her candidacy.

"There's no campaign manager. There's no issues person. There's no regional person, and if you were to ask me anything at all about what I used to describe as 'my candidate,' I couldn't answer you," Rangel said. "I don't know how to deal with non-candidates involved in campaigns."

When there is a candidate, then I will reengage."

That sentiment was echoed by H. Carl McCall, New York state comptroller and a close Clinton adviser. "They have to build a campaign organization and they have to do that touching all parts of the state." But McCall and others say the time for that kind of organization will come—after Clinton has done more

traveling in the state and raised more money for a race that already has all the elements of a mega-campaign.

Although Clinton's supporters have been clamoring for her official announcement, Clinton insiders say that she will not do so until at least the end of the year. Her most definitive comment on the subject to date came at a news conference here last week. Asked if it was possible she would not run, she said, "I think that's a remote possibility."

While money is pouring in to reach the campaign's target of \$25 million, Sen. Robert G. Torricelli (N.J.), chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, said donors are eager to see the main attraction begin. "They want to see the fight engaged, but that would be a mistake," he said. "This race is going to be so intense and the debate so sharp that the public can only endure it for a matter of months.... So I would simply urge patience."

Torricelli agreed that "the campaign could be more focused on issues and management, but that would come at the cost of spending resources that should not now be spent. I would rather suffer some slight disorganization and make a few mistakes" than spend too much too soon.

Among the mistakes a campaign manager could have avoided, say

those close to Clinton's campaign, was the confusion surrounding her position on her husband's offer of clemency to 16 Puerto Rican nationalists. She announced her opposition to the clemency while unaware that the president already had increased the pressure by setting a deadline for the prisoners to respond. And she also announced her position without consulting with the leaders among her New York constituencies who had been lobbying in favor of clemency for years.

"I think it's raised awareness that there is no campaign manager on site in New York state.... that this campaign's focus needs to shift from Washington to New York, and I think that is happening," said Judith Hope, New York state Democratic Party chairman. "I think of it as a managerial challenge. She has a very lean but capable young staff, and they are doing remarkable work considering how sparse their numbers are."

The Clinton team—including a constellation of advisers as well as a half-dozen paid staff members—has pulled off a series of well-orchestrated "listening events" around the state that have included substantive discussions as well as fluffy photo ops. These events are aimed at making Clinton more familiar in a state where she has never lived or worked.

"In terms of how the internal or-

ganization reaches out, there is no problem whatsoever," said a Democratic source with close ties to the campaign. "In terms of how the outside reaches in, there is this clamoring for a specific contact and structure."

Steve Pigeon, Erie County Democratic chairman, said the campaign needs a "go-to" person—meaning someone who can handle all the questions and needs that increasingly will arise from the party structure. "As she comes here [New York state] more and it becomes more of a campaign mode, you have to have a go-to person."

Harold Ickes, a Clinton loyalist who once was President Clinton's deputy chief of staff, leads the campaign effort, but not exclusively and not full time. He could not be reached for this article, for instance, because he was out of the country for a week with other clients.

Ickes is not slated to become the full-time campaign manager but is consulting with a range of New Yorkers to help Clinton select one. McCall, the Democrat who won the most votes statewide in the last election, is among those advising Ickes. It is time, McCall said, for some clear managerial steps.

"First of all, she hasn't yet been very clear about who's in charge," he said. "I think that's got to be the next step. There's got to be a full-time campaign director."



BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
Hillary Rodham Clinton draws applause at a weekend rally in Albany, N.Y. Insiders say she is unlikely to announce candidacy until year's end or later.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

A Clinton Day With a First Lady Agenda

By KATHARINE Q. SEELYE

SENECA FALLS, N.Y., Sept. 1 — As a likely Senate candidate, Hillary Rodham Clinton set the agenda for today's activities with her husband. They visited sites that honored women's rights, the kind of place any woman running for the Senate would want to log on her campaign itinerary.

But as First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton spent the day trapped in the bubble that inevitably envelops a President and his family as they travel among the people. No matter how close to the voters she wanted to get, there was always the barrier of security and the frenzy that distorted what should have been a routine day of campaigning for office.

The third day of a quasi-vacation, quasi-campaign visit to the Finger Lakes region illustrated the dual nature of the First Lady's unprecedented (and all-but-announced) pursuit of her own political office, especially as she tried to do it with her husband.

With a President in tow, Mrs. Clinton benefited from even bigger crowds and the attention of the national media. Every word and even the most minor action was noted, down to her declining of whipped cream for her French vanilla decaf this morning.

But as the spouse of a President, she found herself inside a 14-car motorcade and Presidential-level security.

This in turn seems to have prompted an extra effort by the Clintons to seem like a normal vacationing family. It has helped that they shed the black limousine that normally ferries them around and are traveling instead in a suburban van, which they usually do on vacation. This has become the standard mode of transportation among New York politicians, including Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, the Republican who is likely to run against Mrs. Clinton for the

Senate.

President Clinton billed today's outing, to four historic sites across the region, somewhat quaintly as an "excursion," a neutral-sounding, stately tour befitting a First Family. But it clearly carried a political energy that Mrs. Clinton needs to harness as she reaches out to voters in this largely Republican territory. (She plans two fund-raising events for Thursday.)

Mrs. Clinton's dual pursuits have led to some confusion over who is in charge of the unwieldy press corps that has sprung up here. It is divided between those who permanently cover the White House and those covering Mrs. Clinton's Senate candidacy. The President is traditionally followed by a small pool of reporters. Now, a pool is developing to keep track of Mrs. Clinton as well.

"It's something we're going to

have to watch unfold," Marsha Berry, the spokeswoman for the First Lady's office, said later, reflecting on Mrs. Clinton's metamorphosis into a candidate. "She'll be making the decisions as she goes along."

In other words, no one really knows how to do this — and that includes the President. Inside the Women's Rights National Historic Park here, Mrs. Clinton chatted with visitors and eagerly explored the site while her husband wandered off by himself, first to the restroom, then to browse in the bookstore.

The crowds here have been overwhelmingly supportive and positive, but curious, too. As they waited outside the historic park here, Eric Aaron and Curtis Quinn, both 17, mulled the Clinton's relationship.

"Ever since the scandal, all the power has shifted to her," Mr. Aaron mused.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

THE NEW YORK TIMES NATIONAL THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1990

Terrorists' victims spoil Clinton's plan

By DEBORAH ORIN

Washington Bureau Chief

The Clinton White House forgot one key thing — the FALN bombers had real victims who still suffer horribly.

When those victims decided to speak out and fight back, it suddenly got very hard to claim that members of the Puerto Rican bombing group were freedom fighters who deserved a get-out-of-jail card.

Very hard when you looked at the fingerless right hand of New York City Detective

Richard Pastorella, maimed and blinded in both eyes as he tried to defuse an FALN bomb on New Year's Eve 1982.

Very hard when Joe Connor, his voice shaking, said his dad was blown up on his ninth birthday — and he hates to think his dad's life counts for nothing because Bill Clinton wants to put his wife in the Senate.

Once the victims spoke out, a storm escalated as mainstream Democrat after Democrat — Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan, former Mayor Ed Koch — blasted the idea.

Sure, the White House denied Clinton was trying to boost his wife politically with Puerto Ricans, but the victims said he was — so did Koch — and there wasn't anything else to explain his surprise move.

Every police group in sight

begged him not to. He'd only given three other clemencies out of 3,042, but now he wanted to give 16 at once — even though the FALNers hadn't even asked for it as the rules require.

For three weeks Hillary Clinton supported her husband's plan to free terrorists, but because the victims chose to fight back, it began turning into a disaster for her Senate bid — and she flip-flopped and blasted it.

The voter math shows why.

Puerto Ricans account for just 5 to 7 percent of the vote in New York State, and she could have expected to get almost all of that vote in any case.

But Jews and ethnic Catholics are a majority of the state's vote, and clemency for terrorists doesn't play well with them.

Jews account for 12 percent of the vote and tend to be very concerned about terrorism — no wonder the Anti-Defamation League came out against Clinton's clemency plan.

Catholics account for 42 to 44 percent of the state vote and Rep. Peter King (R-L.I.) last week pointed out that picking the FALN over the police plays very badly with swing ethnic Catholics or Reagan Democrats.

ANALYSIS

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

NEW YORK POST, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1999

Group Presses First Lady on Spy

FIRST LADY, From A1

squire off with Republican Rudolph W. Giuliani, the New York City mayor.

Some analysts predict other interest groups also will see the first lady's candidacy as a potential conduit to the White House, forcing the president and his aides to cope with an untested brand of political influence.

"It is a pressure point, it is a vulnerability," said Fred Greenstein, a presidential scholar at Princeton University. Lobbying groups have sought to influence other presidents through relatives, he said, citing Libya's courtship of then-President Jimmy Carter's brother Billy. "But none of them are quite the same thing" as wooing one who shares the presidential bedroom, he said.

Sidney Zion, a member of Hinkind's group, wrote in the New York Daily News' Aug. 5 op-ed page that Hillary Clinton may "hold the key to Jonathan Pollard's jail cell." He added: "To win, she needs a big majority of Jews in New York City. . . . Get your husband to pardon Jonathan Pollard and then we'll believe you [support Israel]."

Pollard, a former Navy intelligence analyst, is in the 14th year of a life sentence after pleading guilty to selling U.S. military secrets to Israel. His case has become a prominent cause for numerous Jewish groups that want him released. Leaders of the national security and intelligence communities strongly oppose his release, and Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton have refused to pardon him.

had sent her a query, that she considers Jerusalem "the eternal and indivisible capital of Israel," and favors moving the U.S. Embassy there from Tel Aviv. Both proposals break with the administration's policy. All the various spokesmen said that Hillary Clinton's views would have no effect on U.S. policy.

"The first lady was expressing her personal views and it does not complicate in any way our efforts to promote and accelerate the Middle East peace process," State Department spokesman James Foley said at the time.

Stephen Hess, a presidential scholar at the Brookings Institution, said the Hinkind group's ploy is so brazen that Hillary Clinton has little choice but to ignore it, lest she be accused of opportunism or yielding to political threats. "I can't imagine her lobbying in this regard," he said. "It would be so blatantly inappropriate that the backlash from it would far exceed any votes she would get in the Orthodox Jewish community."

Still, Hess said, interest groups will find Hillary Clinton an unusual by appealing target because she's the first American to run for a major office while married to a president.

"I doubt there will be anything as blatant as [Hinkind's appeal] coming up, but there will be subliminal issues" raised by other groups, Hess said. "And of course she's opened herself to that" by attending a health care forum in Cooperstown on July 8 where she questioned the president's 1997 agreement with Congress that affected federal payments to teaching hospitals, a major issue in New York with its concentration

of the funding issue only in her capacity as a Senate contender.

"The hospital community and its supporters in New York have approached her as a Senate candidate," said Jeannie Cross, spokeswoman for the Healthcare Association of New York. "We have not approached her as an inside lobbyist to her husband's ear. We have very good relations with the White House," she said, noting that representatives of her association have met in Washington with Vice President Gore and others.

More recently, some Republicans have said the first lady's Senate hopes may have played a role in the president's offer to reduce the prison sentences of 16 members of a militant Puerto Rican nationalist group. Their early release is opposed by the FBI and other law enforcement groups, but is supported by many liberals and Hispanic groups, again, an important constituency in a New York election. The White House says the Senate race played no role in the president's decision.

Since launching her exploratory Senate bid, Hillary Clinton also has differed with Clinton administration policies on dairy supports. On July 9, she said she supported extending the life of the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact, which promotes price supports for dairy farmers, a big constituency in upstate New York. The White House has proposed replacing the compact with a national price support system that would be less generous to

POLITICS

Ben White

Cutting Remarks About Clinton and Taxes

From the beaches of Martha's Vineyard to the lakes of Skaneateles, a vacationing President Clinton can't seem to catch a break from taunting political ads.

The Republican National Committee, which advertised against the president on Martha's Vineyard last week, yesterday launched a cable television spot in Skaneateles criticizing Clinton for staying in a "multimillion-dollar vacation estate" for free and "traveling on taxpayer dollars."

The ad goes on to urge Clinton to sign the \$792 billion GOP tax cut bill. "If Bill and Hillary Clinton get to watch a little TV during their so-called 'vacation' to the Finger Lakes, I want them to see that New Yorkers deserve to keep more of the money they earn," says RNC Chairman Jim Nicholson, posing with a briefcase filled with \$10,000—the amount the RNC says New Yorkers could save under the tax cut.

Republican presidential hopeful Steve Forbes is running a similar radio spot urging Clinton to sign the tax bill. Does this irk the president? Quite the contrary, according to deputy press secretary Jake Siewert, who said it was unlikely Clinton would be off the golf course long enough to even see the RNC ad.

And if he does see it? "We believe that the longer the Republicans talk about their tax cut, the less popular it seems to be," Siewert said. Any chance Clinton might change his mind about the bill? "Not a snowball's chance. . . ."

In other news from the First Vacation, Siewert told reporters that the first lady's Senate exploratory committee would pay "some of the costs" associated with the Clintons' travel in New York as well as for any obviously political events, such as their trip to the state fair in Syracuse on Monday.

Nothing new going on here, Siewert assured

lady vacationing with her presidential spouse in a state where she might run for office.

In explaining why the exploratory committee will not pick up the entire tab for the Clintons' New York trip, deputy White House press secretary Barry Tolin in Washington said: "To the extent that this is vacation, the costs of travel are official costs. . . . Because the president is the president no matter where he is."

Or to whom he is married.

Ventura "Just Kidding"

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

she had no comment about the Pollard case or the more general topic of groups trying to pressure the president via his wife's campaign.

The first lady's office, the State Department and the president's spokesman did comment earlier this summer when Hillary Clinton told another Jewish organization, which

Clintons Near Deal on House In Westchester

By JOHN F. HARRIS
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Clinton and first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton are in final negotiations to buy a house in New York's Westchester County, according to sources who said the Clintons may announce their selection of a post-White House residence within days.

The Clintons, after a summer-long search for houses in the state, Hillary Clinton hopes will elect her to the U.S. Senate next year, have set their sights on a five-bedroom, four-story Georgian colonial in Chappaqua. The house, whose owners were asking \$1,695,000 for the property, has a pool and sits on 1.1 acres.

"They want it, and they're in negotiations," said one person familiar with their house hunt. "They're trying to lock it down."

Some accounts from people in Westchester professing second-hand knowledge yesterday portrayed the purchase as a done deal, with the sellers already celebrating. But sources close to the Clintons, neither of whom has lived in New York, said hurdles in the negotiations remained to be cleared. They did not specify those hurdles, or how much the Clintons had offered for the house.

White House officials and a campaign spokesman for Hillary Clinton did not provide details. "There's been no announcement yet," said Howard Wolfson, spokesman for Hillary Clinton's campaign exploratory committee.

The Clintons' selection of a house that, if their hopes are realized, can be called their home a little more than 16 months from now is the culmination of an extensive search led mainly by Hillary Clinton. It was a more complicated, and more public, choice than confronts the typical home buyer. Beyond personal tastes, there also was a greater-than-average need for security. There also was the inevitable political dimension of the choice between New York City and its suburbs, and between metropolitan New York and the vast region upstate. She looked at or inquired about places in Manhattan, and outside Buffalo, before focusing on Westchester.

The Clintons toured the Chappaqua property on Saturday. If their offer is accepted, Hillary Clinton will get something she has sought for years: a pool. She once proposed building one, with private money, in the executive mansion in Arkansas, but dropped the idea after being told voters might be offended.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

12 FALN inmates a clemenc

At least 12 of the 16 FALN convicts offered clemency by President Clinton have said yes — and 11 of them could get out of jail within days, the White House said last night.

The convicts accepted Clinton's deal three days after he came under pressure from wife Hillary to yank the offer, which touched off a political firestorm that threatens her New York Senate bid.

The prisoners' families hailed their impending release while victims of the 130-bomb terror spree said they felt sick.

"I feel sick and furious."

By Deborah Orrin in Washington and Robert Hardt Jr. in New York

Clinton is letting terrorists out on the street. They're evil people who did evil things," said Diana Berger, whose husband, Alejandro, was killed by a 1975 FALN bomb at Fraunces Tavern.

"Some of people who are now going to be let out were arrested in the process of making bombs," she added, her voice shaking.

Deadina Ortiz, mother of New York City art teacher Eliazar Escobar, jailed for 19 years, said that "Clinton's crazy" and "the conditions are terrible" but "it's already a lot" that her son can come home.

Among those eligible for immediate release is Dylcia Pagan, wife of the FALN's master bomber, William Morales, who escaped from Bellevue Hospital in 1977 and now lives in Cuba.

Those who did not take the deal are Oscar Lopez-Rivera, who the FBI charged was tied to the top FALN bombers, and



FLIP FLAP: Hillary Rodham Clinton, here at a White House appearance yesterday, threw a wrench into the FALN clemency offer by turning against the deal last week.

Antonio Camacho-Negron. The radical Puerto Rican group's initials stand for Armed Forces for National Liberation in Spanish.

News of the deal comes at a dicey time for Mrs. Clinton, who's in New York for the next three days and will finally hold a real news conference — without using a partisan crowd as a buffer to boot tough questions.

Critics charge that the president offered clemency to boost his wife with

Puerto Rican voters and then, when it backfired with other key swing groups, she belatedly flip-flopped against it.

Some Puerto Rican leaders blasted Mrs. Clinton's flip-flop and Rep. Jose Serrano (D-Bronx), has threatened to yank his support, saying, "I would be a hypocrite if I did not."

Mrs. Clinton's spokesman, Howard Wolfson, said: "Hillary Clinton understands that her friends feel very strongly about

this issue, but she stays by her statement" that the deal should be withdrawn.

Fourteen Puerto Rican Democratic leaders met yesterday to discuss the flap, and afterward, assemblywoman Carm Arroyo (D-Bronx) said: "Who cares about Hills Clinton now? We want get the prisoners free."

Even as the prisoners accepted the deal, FALN lawyer Jan Susler vowed to fight some of the terms set by Clinton, who

Rudy jury rules against plaintiff

By DAREH GREGORIAN and MAGGIE HABERMAN

Mayor Giuliani and his fellow jurors took less than an hour yesterday to shoot down a Manhattan man's claim that a too-hot shower scalded his genitals.

"Now I go back to work," a smiling Giuliani said shortly after he and five other jurors tossed out the \$7 million personal-injury suit Oliver Johnson brought against his landlord.

"The only thing we ever wanted was safe, sanitary housing," Johnson, 45, said afterward, refusing further comment because "there's been enough embarrassment already."

testimony.

Johnson claimed the scalding left him unable to have intercourse and ruined his relationship with his wife.

Juror Caleb Silver, a producer for Bloomberg TV, said "I feel bad for what happened to him ... When something happens to you, you always feel someone is to blame. We just didn't think it was the landlord."

Giuliani — who invited his fellow jurors to have dinner with him at Gracie Mansion — said he was the last person to vote.

"Since I was foreperson, it seemed to me the best thing to do was to let them express themselves first, and

"I would suspect if he's able to masturbate that sexual intercourse would be no more abusive to his penis," Miller said.

Silver said hearing testimony like that while sitting with the mayor was bizarre.

"We're talking about a very personal case on a very personal part of the body, and some of the testimony was awkward and uncomfortable," he said. "And the fact that New York most famous face is one of the people working on it was slightly surreal."

Johnson's lawyer, Joe Kellner, said the mayor's presence on the jury turned a private embarrassment into

PHOTOCOPY PRESERVATION

POSTOPINION



I SHUDDER TO THINK WHAT OUR NEW NEIGHBORS WILL SAY ABOUT YOUR FLIP-FLOPPING!

Caught in the FALN Trap

Hillary must still explain her flip-flop on Bill's pardon of ter

By now, Hillary Clinton probably wishes she'd never even heard of the FALN. From the start, her handling of the furor over her husband's profoundly misguided clemency offer to 16 unrepentant Puerto Rican nationalists has been so inept that it's difficult to understand how she acquired the reputation as the Clinton family's political genius.

Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.) says that America "will have to get used to the idea" that Mrs. Clinton will occasionally disagree with her husband's policies. But if she's disagreed with the president before, she's kept it quiet — because backing her husband to the hilt has always been in her personal political interest.

She may still be the first lady, but Mrs. Clinton now has different political interests. She must simultaneously embrace her husband's policies and distance herself from them. Even a master politician would find that a tall order — and, as she's shown over the past few weeks, Mrs. Clinton is no Houdini, able to escape the tightest political handcuffs.

By first cautiously embracing the clemency offer and then abruptly switching sides, she managed to infuriate those she most hoped to please: a political constituency that forms a key part of the Democratic base and one she's going to need if she hopes to wend her way to a seat in the Senate.

Mrs. Clinton's explanation (actually, her spokesman's — the would-be candidate herself has not been heard from) of why she reversed course sounds far too much like someone desperately trying to bail out of a position that has caused her nothing but political grief. Rudy Giuliani must have been chortling inside when he pointedly observed, "She originally strongly supported [clemency], but now she strongly opposes it. She'll have to answer questions on why she changed her position."



ERIC FETTMANN
ON
WEDNESDAY

after three weeks, the prisoners had not accepted her husband's condition for clemency: that they renounce the use of violence. But as one of the prisoners, Elizam Escobar, claims, "Since 1997, we've been saying that we would not use violence anymore."

Which, of course, begs the question: If they've allegedly already renounced violence, why not say so again as part of the clemency offer? Because, says Escobar, "Our decision will be based on what we believe most benefits the movement for independence for Puerto Rico." (A movement, incidentally, that the voters of Puerto Rico have overwhelmingly rejected. Which is why the FALN was founded not in San Juan, but in East Harlem.)

Like Hillary Clinton, the FALN prisoners will say whatever serves their narrow political interests.

In other words, any new renunciation of violence, as agreed to yesterday by 12 of the 16, is lip service at best. Like Hillary Clinton, the prisoners will say whatever serves their narrow political interests. (This gets downright outrageous: They also suggest that, like those killed and maimed, they also are "innocent victims" of the FALN's bloody terror campaign.)

The prisoners reportedly were concerned about some of the strings attached to clemency. For example, the Clinton offer forbids them from meeting with each other if freed. But not associating with a fellow ex-con, even for legal reasons, is a standard condition of parole everywhere.

outrage that any conditions we tached. These are "political prisoners," said people like Reps. Jose rano and Nydia Velazquez, "be their offenses were complicate political ramifications." Added other Puerto Rican leader, "I were crimes of conscience."

That's a dangerous door to op "personal conscience" and "pol ramifications" are valid excuse murderous political behavior, it's time to set free everyone, bombed an abortion clinic. For matter, Timothy McVeigh would serve executive clemency, too.

Clinton's conditions were atta in hopes of avoiding the contro over President Jimmy Carter's l brained pardon of four Puerto I nationalists. That group had she Congress in 1954, injuring five n sentatives, and killed a preside guard in a bloody shootout duri 1950 attempt to assassinate P dent Harry Truman. But Carter (the objections of Puerto Rico's g

nor) granted clemency no conditions and angrily jected criticism of his n On being freed, two of terrorists immediately claimed themselves unrep tant "revolutionaries" "cannot disavow people use bombs."

Both Clinton and Carter said acted because the prisoners "I suffered enough." But that open yet another dangerous Pandora's — for that standard, as Jonat Pollard's supporters argue, leave logical reason to keep the convi spy behind bars.

Though most of the 16 have b tedly accepted Clinton's condi- the cynical way in which the cl eney offer has been received arg for its withdrawal. That's unlikely course. Which means that Hil now faces yet another dilemma: I she stand with the FALN's terror or with its victims?

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

12 Puerto Ricans Accept Clemency

Criticism of Hillary Clinton Continues for Her Opposition to Freeing Militants

By LYNN DUKE
and WILLIAM CLAIBORNE
Washington Post Staff Writers

Twelve Puerto Rican militants imprisoned as members of a violent independence movement yesterday accepted President Clinton's offer of conditional clemency, an initiative that sparked heated opposition, even from Hillary Rodham Clinton.

By accepting clemency, the prisoners have agreed to obey several conditions: that they renounce the use of violence for any purpose and accept restrictions on their travel and their right of free association. They will also be subject to the same

restrictions placed on any paroled felon.

The 12 were part of the Armed Forces of National Liberation (the FALN, in Spanish), which set off more than 100 bombs in New York and Chicago in the 1970s and early 1980s to press for Puerto Rican independence from the United States. Though at least six people were killed and scores more wounded in those attacks, none of those offered clemency was convicted of a specific deadly or injurious act. They were convicted of weapons possession and seditious conspiracy.

Clinton's Aug. 11 clemency offer, which is set to expire Friday, has mushroomed into a contentious political issue, in part because of his wife's prospective Senate campaign in New York next year.

Opponents of the clemency, especially law enforcement personnel injured in FALN attacks, criticized Clinton for sending a signal of leniency toward terrorism and of trying to gain support for his wife among members of New York's Puerto Rican community.

But supporters of the clemencies, including former president Jimmy Carter and South African Nobel laureate Desmond Tutu, have framed the issue in human rights terms and argued that the FALN members' sentences were disproportionate to their crimes. The prisoners received sentences of between 35 and 90 years; more than drug dealers, for instance, or even convicted murderers. Most have already served 19 years.

"This is not about who will be the next senator in New York," Jan Susler, attorney for the detainees, said at a Chicago news conference. "These people went to prison for the same thing that Nelson Mandela went to prison for," she said, referring to the decades of imprisonment that preceded

democratically elected president.

Clinton's offer applied to 16 FALN members, most of whom are still in prison. From separate federal prisons all over the country, 12 have accepted clemency. Virtually all of them say they will return to Puerto Rico upon their release, for which a date has not been announced, according to Susler. Two have declined clemency because of objections to its conditions. The remaining two have until Friday to decide.

Meanwhile, Hillary Clinton came under continuing criticism from Latino leaders in New York over her announcement Saturday that she opposed her husband's clemency offer. Her position put her on the same side as New York City Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani (R), her likely rival in the Senate race, and sparked an uproar in the politically potent Hispanic community.

Mrs. Clinton called the offer a "mistake" and said the absence of a response from the prisoners, especially on the renunciation of violence, "speaks volumes." (A press release dated Sept. 2 and issued by the detainees' lawyer said they had indeed agreed to renounce violence.)

Mrs. Clinton's move came a day after White House lawyers had set the Sept. 10 deadline for the FALN to respond.

Latino leaders here expressed outrage at Mrs. Clinton's stand, calling it premature and suggesting she took it to counter claims that the administration was pandering to their community. On Labor Day, she tried to assuage their concerns through strategic telephone calls, but that did not appear to lessen the outrage.

Both Fernando Ferrer, the Bronx borough president, and Rep. Nydia M. Velázquez (D-N.Y.), confirmed today that they spoke to Mrs. Clinton Monday. Neither,



Jose Torres, left, aided by attorney Jan Susler, is father of prisoner who agreed to U.S. terms.

she made a huge mistake."

Rep. Jose E. Serrano (D-N.Y.), who threatened over the weekend to withhold his campaign support from Clinton and reaffirmed that statement today, said he received no phone call Monday. "They are not calling me," he said.

At a Manhattan news conference, Serrano, Velázquez, Ferrer and 11 other Latino elected officials criticized Mrs. Clinton for playing politics with an issue that is near and dear to Latino politicians and should have been beyond political point-scoring. All of these leaders are Democrats and would be hard-pressed to support Giuliani's Senate campaign. But they made their displeasure at Mrs. Clinton well known nonetheless.

State Assembly member, said as emotion rose in her voice. "We are commending the president. Who cares about Hillary Clinton now?"

"Or for that matter, Rudolph Giuliani," said Ferrer.

"We want to see the prisoners free," Arroyo said.

Despite this political dust-up, Howard Wolfson, a spokesman for Mrs. Clinton's exploratory Senate committee, characterized the angered Latino leaders as "friends" of Mrs. Clinton's.

"Hillary Clinton understands that her friends feel very strongly about this issue," Wolfson said. "But she stands by her [Saturday] statement."

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

CORRECTIONS

A chart on Labor Day closings that appeared Sunday and Monday incorrectly described plans for Prince George's County trash collection. Trash will be collected on its normal schedule for the rest of the week for people who receive twice-a-week service. People receiving once-a-week service will have their trash collected on the day after the usual day.

An item in Sunday's Travel section gave incorrect information on a special air fare offered by Spanair from Washington to Madrid. The round-trip fare of \$329 is good for Monday, Wednesday or Thursday returns, not Fridays.



In San Juan, Puerto Rico: Human-rights group spokesman Luis Nieves Falcon, center, announces Tuesday that 12 Puerto Rican nationalists in prison have accepted a clemency offer.

Clintons enrage opposing sides in clemency matter

By Mimi Hall
and Tom Squitieri
USA TODAY

The fate of most of the 16 Puerto Rican nationalists offered clemency by President Clinton may have been settled Tuesday, but the controversy created by first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's decision to speak out against her husband's offer is sure to linger.

And the Clintons will face criticism from all sides: Republicans who say the president never should have offered clemency, Democrats angered by the first lady's sudden decision to oppose the offer and members of the news media questioning whether the White House got involved in a political effort to help the president's wife with her Senate campaign.

In Washington, GOP lawmakers plan to hold congressional hearings next week into Clinton's decision to offer clemency to the pro-independence nationalists convicted in connection with about 100 bombings in the USA in the 1970s and 1980s.

Rep. Vito Fossella, R-N.Y., said on Tuesday that he'll introduce a resolution on the House floor condemning Clinton's action.

"If anything, the president of the United States should be sending a clear signal around the world that terrorism is not tolerated on our soil," he said. For Hillary Clinton, most of

the heat will come from New York. In Manhattan, the heart of the first lady's expected campaign for a U.S. Senate seat, some Latino officials gathered Tuesday to rail against her opposition to the release of the prisoners.

"Hillary Clinton's statement was wrong; it was inappropriate," said state Assemblyman Roberto Ramirez, referring to her Saturday statement opposing the clemency offer on the grounds that the nationalists hadn't agreed quickly enough to comply with a White House condition that they renounce violence.

Rep. Jose Serrano, D-N.Y., said he is rethinking his support for the first lady's candidacy. "I am disappointed," he said. "I am angry."

At the White House, officials insisted the initial offer was not made to help the first lady curry favor with Puerto Rican voters. "This was not a partisan maneuver," spokesman Joe Lockhart said.

The administration says it was responding to appeals that those offered clemency had served enough time.

Despite the backlash, Hillary Clinton said Tuesday that she stands by her opposition to the clemency deal.

But Bronx Borough President Fernando Ferrer warned that she could pay politically. "I told her she made a huge mistake."

► Clemency accepted, 1A

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Puerto Rican Inmates Accept Clemency Offer

By HECTOR TOBAR
and JOSH GETLIN
TIMES STAFF WRITERS

NEW YORK—Facing a fast-approaching deadline and a political firestorm, a group of Puerto Rican nationalists imprisoned for 19 years as terrorists accepted the conditions of clemency spelled out last month by the Clinton administration, their attorneys and the White House said Tuesday.

The announcement came as the controversy over the clemency offer reached new heights when First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton said she disagreed with her husband and said he should withdraw the offer.

"It just seemed it was becoming an issue for all the politicians to weigh in on," said attorney Michael Deutsch of Chicago, ex-

plaining why the 12 prisoners ac-
cepted the offer after indicating
they might reject it. "We're not
dealing with reality, we're dealing
with people's political agendas."

Administration officials continue to maintain that politicians and women, members of a played no role in the presidential independence group that decision. "The president expects responsibility for more than 100 all those who accept the code in the United States in the international democracy grant to abide convicted of seditious conduct by its terms, including ~~and~~ weapons charges. Prosecuting from the use or advocacy linked those offered clemency of the use of violence for any purports or injuries. Still, authorities pose and obeying all the statutory group, known by its Spanish conditions of parole." White House, was responsible for six House press secretary Joe Lockhart said in a statement.

In New York, the case—with its complex mesh of nationalism and terrorism—has proved to be a minefield for Hillary Clinton's exploratory campaign for the U.S. presidency. Clinton, who is on a holiday weekend, the Clinton administration had given the prisoners a deadline to accept the conditions, which include a renunciation of violence and a promise to obey unspecified conditions.

... if the 16 prisoners offered clemency—Carlos Torres and Oscar Lopez declined. Two others not in prison but whose fines would be reduced have more time to respond. Some of the prisoners signed the clemency offer Tuesday morning, family members said. Among those accepting the offer was Elizardo Escobar, who called the terms "humiliating" in a prison interview with *The Times* last week.

A Justice Department spokeswoman said the administration had not yet received the prisoners' formal acceptance of the offer and that it was too early to say when they might be released.

"It is a tragic day that these terrorists may soon be walking America's streets," said Rep. Vito Fossella (R-N.Y.), a lead-

ing crime or the clemency offer. "I call on the president to unconditionally reject this offer of clemency. I don't want to see one more innocent American killed by this group."

By contrast, the impending release of the prisoners was being celebrated by many in Puerto Rico, where the campaign on their behalf has become a cause celebre supported by former President Jimmy Carter, New York Archbishop John Cardinal O'Connor and others who said their prison terms were excessive. Although only a small minority of Puerto Ricans support independence, the prisoners received backing from many others who thought they were treated unfairly.

"Whenever they come out, there's going to be one hell of a party in East Harlem and all over New York," said East Harlem attorney Gloria Quinones, a childhood friend of one of the prisoners. "They are our freedom fighters. They are our Nelson Mandelas."

Such sentiments were echoed by a number of Puerto Rican politicians at a news conference Tuesday in Manhattan. Some prominent Latino leaders, who had already signed on to support Mrs. Clinton's campaign, said her reversal on the clemency plan might prompt them to withdraw their support.

"Hillary Clinton's statement was wrong. It was inappropriate," said Democratic state Assemblyman Roberto Ramirez. "It is an issue the first lady will have to address."

Rep. Nycha M. Velazquez (D-N.Y.) complained that Mrs. Clinton's statement distracted attention from serious discussion of the case. "She is on a listening tour, isn't she?" Velazquez asked. "I would advise her strongly to continue, and to come to our community to see what the issues are."

Critics charged that Mrs. Clinton was trying to have it both ways on a politi-



Amazon France Presse

The controversy over clemency intensified when Hillary Rodham Clinton said her husband should withdraw the offer.

cally sensitive issue. When the president first proposed clemency, Hillary Clinton had little to say, and the conventional wisdom was that the offer would help her among New York's 1.3 million Puerto Rican residents. But Saturday, she said the offer should be rescinded, since the prisoners had not responded quickly enough.

But the first lady ultimately spoke out against the deal after a parade of law-and-order opponents—most notably New York Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, her probable rival in the Senate race—denounced the offer as being soft on terror.

"I know she originally strongly supported it, but now she strongly opposes it," Giuliani said. "She'll have to answer questions on why she changed her position."

Republicans appeared likely to keep the issue alive by holding congressional hearings on the clemency proposal in the fall, all of which could have been an embarrassment and distraction for Mrs. Clinton's campaign.

The Clintons' Democratic allies appeared confused by the rapidly evolving controversy. The Democratic senator also hopes to succeed. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, also opposed the clemency. Sen. Charles E. Schumer of New York, for example, refused to speculate on why the president and Mrs. Clinton had taken their respective positions but insisted that it had no relationship to the U.S. Senate race. He urged the White House to release any documents showing that the prisoners, if freed, would no longer be a threat to public safety.

At first, several of the prisoners indicated they were inclined to reject the clemency offer. By law, they will be required to obey several conditions of parole, including a prohibition against associating with convicted felons—a condition that might prevent them from speaking to one another.

In the end, however, it became clear that the Clinton administration was not likely to make a better offer.

Among those accepting clemency were two sisters, Ida Luz and Alicia Rodríguez.

"I think it's better that they come out, even if this is not the way we wanted them to come out," said their mother, Josefina Rodriguez, 68, of Chicago. "You can imagine how we feel. They've been away from home for a long time."

Toby reported from Los Angeles. Gailin from New

PHOTO
PRESEF

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

GE A12 / WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1999 **

The Washington Post

FROM PAGE

Clinton reduced sentences in 3 out of 3,000 requests

Drug dealer won early release, only to return to prison

By Frank J. Murray
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

President Clinton has handed out 108 pardons, but commuted sentences only three times — freeing two smalltime drug dealers and one elderly hog farmer who said he broke the law only to feed his family and his pigs.

The fact that Mr. Clinton has reduced a sentence just three times out of 3,042 requests makes it all the more puzzling that he would conditionally approve freedom for 16 Puerto Rican separatists imprisoned for seditious conspiracy and firearms violations.

The Constitution gives presidents the power — without court or congressional review — to grant pardons, commute sentences or otherwise relieve federal convicts. Only impeachment is beyond the reach of presidential clemency.

Mr. Clinton is batting only 2 for 3 on commutations because the informant to whom he gave the most mercy quickly was returned to prison for getting back into the drug business.

Marijuana trafficker Johnny Palacios, 43, of Tampa, Fla., turned out to be the president's biggest clemency embarrassment when the president freed Palacios 15 months early on Aug. 21, 1995, at the Justice Department's request.

Within weeks of his release from a six-year sentence to repay testimony in other cases, Palacios was trucking with old associates in the drug business. Probation rules barred him from contacting other felons, but Palacios became an undercover informant for the Hillsborough County Sheriff, who paid him \$10,000 in advance.

Palacios was rearrested in 1997 and returned to prison for five more years for violating probation after the president released him. U.S. District Judge Steven D. Merryday, a Bush appointee, denounced Palacios as "an admitted, intractable, unapologetic drug dealer."

Another judge later added 10 more years on new charges of moving 500 pounds of marijuana a month from Texas to Florida.

The other two clemency grants involved cutting a total of 45 days of prison time.

Ernest C. Krikava, now 75, resumed life as a Nebraska hog farmer but on a smaller scale, acquiring 130 acres of the 1,000-acre Pawnee City spread he lost in a wrenching bankruptcy case in which he denied under oath that he secretly sold pigs to get \$35,000 because he was broke.

He got out on Nov. 23, 1994 — a scant five days early from a five-month sentence — weeks after the Supreme Court refused to review his case and the New York Times publicized the sentencing judge's complaint he had no choice under federal sentencing guidelines but to send the perjurer to prison.

On April 17, 1995, Mr. Clinton freed Jackie Trautman Esselburn, of Randolph, Ohio, cutting 40 days from her 33-month sentence for cocaine trafficking and conspiracy, which already had been reduced in court from 51 months for her cooperation.

Esselburn, a newlywed who discovered she was pregnant two days after federal agents arrested her, was rewarded for 1994 testimony about how she managed a cocaine ring under orders telephoned from

federal prison by Larry Dean Dusenberry. Each time, she would buy a kilo of the drug with \$24,000 he provided, returning \$34,000 to Dusenberry and keeping whatever profit she managed.

For commutation, petition forms, available at federal prisons, must be filed with the Justice Department.

Pardon applications generally are considered only five years after a sentence expires.

No matter how frivolous a petition may seem, Justice Department spokeswoman Chris Watney said, each one is investigated by the office of Pardon Attorney Roger Adams. His report to the deputy attorney general is the basis of the department's confidential recommendation to the White House.

Presidents may invoke an "act of forgiveness," restoring civil and legal rights to felons who have served their sentences, may correct a mistaken conviction, commute a federal death sentence, reduce the number of years in a prison sentence, or nullify conditions of release.

While commutation reduces a sentence, it does not erase the conviction as a pardon does. For instance, in 1979 President Carter shortened kidnapped heiress Patty Hearst's sentence for bank robbery to three years, but in the 20 years since, supporters have failed to win her a pardon.

Mr. Clinton has granted 8 percent of the 1,352 pardon applications received, but just one-tenth of 1 percent of clemency requests. Clemency petitions that are not granted rarely become public.



PHOTOCOPY PRESERVATION



Luis Nieves Falcon announces that 12 imprisoned Puerto Rican nationalists have accepted a clemency offer.

OFFER

From page A1

Does that mean in 10 years, some president will let him out of jail?" Mr. Fossella asked.

Sen. Paul Coverdell, Georgia Republican, said, "President Clinton's offer of clemency and the acceptance of that offer by the Puerto Rican terrorists is disturbing."

Mr. Coverdell said the president has "apparently" reversed the U.S. policy of zero tolerance for terrorists. Mr. Coverdell promised hearings next week before his Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on terrorism.

On Aug. 13, Mr. Coverdell wrote Mr. Clinton to express his "deep regret and concern," noting that Mr. Clinton offered clemency "against the advice of the Justice Department, the FBI and the U.S. Attorney's Office that originally prosecuted these terrorists."

On Aug. 11, Mr. Clinton offered clemency to the 16 terrorists. Most are members of the Armed Forces of National Liberation, a pro-independence terrorist organization known by its Spanish acronym, FALN. The group has taken credit for 130 bombings that killed at least six persons and injured dozens.

The 16 were convicted on charges of seditious conspiracy and possession of weapons and explosives. White House officials said none of the 16 to whom clemency was offered killed or injured anyone.

Some Republican lawmakers believe Mr. Clinton timed the offer to help Mrs. Clinton's expected Senate bid in New York.

"This was an effort by the president, by the first lady, to manipulate politics in New York. I think it blew up in their face," Sen. Phil Gramm, Texas Republican, said Sunday on ABC's "This Week."

Mrs. Clinton initially supported the clemency offer provided that

the prisoners renounced violence. On Saturday, Mrs. Clinton came out against Mr. Clinton's offer of clemency as law enforcement officials stepped up their criticism of the offer.

"It's been three weeks, and their silence speaks volumes," Mrs. Clinton said in a statement. "I believe the offer of clemency should be withdrawn."

Mr. Lockhart yesterday denied the political motive, saying human rights activists, such as South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu and former President Jimmy Carter, have supported clemency.

"I think there have been many who have sought to inject politics, and many who have thought to inject a motive here, and all I can say is that they're wrong," he said.

In New York, about 15 of the city's top elected officials of Puerto Rican descent met to discuss the FALN case and issued a statement that described Mrs. Clinton's remarks as "unfortunate and inappropriate."

The statement continued: "This is an issue that the First Lady will have to address as she continues her potential race for the U.S. Senate. As she goes on, she must make her case."

Assemblyman Roberto Ramirez, the Bronx Democratic leader who convened the meeting, said Mrs. Clinton telephoned him Monday in what seemed to be an effort to mend fences.

Mr. Ramirez, who described the consensus as "a warning signal to Mrs. Clinton," added that "she should have reached out to us and stated what she would do. Puerto Rican issues should be part of her learning curve."

Democratic City Council member Jose Rivera of the Bronx, who also attended the meeting, said: "We made it very clear that we're not going to allow the issue to be trivialized as political" by either Mrs. Clinton or by Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, Mrs. Clinton's likely Republican opponent.

"These people are in jail because they fought for the independence for their country," said Mr. Rivera.

In Chicago, Jan Susler, an attorney representing some of the prisoners, discounted a political motive.

"This is not about who is going to be the next senator from New York and it is not about who is going to be the next president of the United States," she said.

She said the "political prisoners" still object to conditions that would restrict their ability to travel and to associate with one another after they are released.

Rep. Dan Burton, Indiana Republican and chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform, says his investigation will proceed to explore the president's motive in granting clemency.

"It's hard to believe that in the wake of the bombings of our embassies in Africa, and with the bombing in Oklahoma City still fresh in the minds of all Americans, President Clinton would go soft on terrorism," Mr. Burton said.

"I hope the president won't try to hide behind executive privilege again. The American people have a right to know why President Clinton thinks he is justified in opening the jail-house door for convicted terrorists," he said.

An association of 9,000 FBI agents has told President Clinton his offer of clemency is "inconsistent with the intolerant stance our country seeks to maintain in the face of terrorism."

Earlier yesterday, Mr. Lockhart stepped up pressure on the felons, saying Mr. Clinton would not extend his offer of conditional clemency beyond the deadline of 5 p.m. Friday.

"The offer that he laid out now about a month ago remains open," Mr. Lockhart said.

• Liz Thotta, reporting from New York, John Godfrey and Audrey Hudson contributed to this report.

MUGGY
MUGGY 88¢, 10/19/78 — A23

The Wash

<http://www.washtimes.com>

WEDNE

12 of 16 terrorists accept clemency

Two reject offer;
two yet to decide

By Andrew Cain
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Twelve imprisoned Puerto Rican terrorists have agreed to accept President Clinton's conditional offer of clemency that includes a renunciation of violence, the White House said yesterday.

"The president expects all those who accept the conditional clemency grant to abide fully by its terms, including refraining from the use of advocacy of the use of violence for any purpose" and obeying parole restrictions, said White House Press Secretary Joe Lockhart.

Attorneys for 12 of 16 terrorists told White House officials that they would accept Mr. Clinton's conditions, he said. Two rejected the offer; two others who are not in prison have until Sept. 10 to decide whether to accept the deal, which would mean a reduction in fines.

The White House announcement came three days after first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, a likely Senate candidate in New York, urged her husband to withdraw the offer because the prisoners had not renounced violence.

The clemency offer and Mrs. Clinton's opposition are volatile issues in New York, home to about 1.3 million Puerto Ricans.

The clemency offer angered

Demographic
agers are big business in
tainment industry. Never
been so much opportu-

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

Clinton's Words: East Timor, Waco, Clemency Offer, and Other Issues

By The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 9 — Following are excerpts from President Clinton's statement on East Timor today at the White House and questions and answers, as recorded by The New York Times:

Statement by Clinton

PRESIDENT CLINTON Good afternoon. Before I leave on my trip for New Zealand I wanted to say a few words about the trip and a couple of other issues. These Apex summits started in 1993, when I first invited the leaders of the Asia-Pacific region to meet in Seattle, Wash. They bring together the leaders of more than half the world's people and help its economic activity. What we do there will help to decide whether the global economy continues to move in the direction of greater openness and integration, equity and growth in the next century.

This year, one of my most important goals is to get a commitment on the part of our Asian-Pacific partners to a rapid de-ranging market opening, so that can launch a new trade round at the W.T.O. meeting in Seattle in December. We must stand together against protectionism and a common future of prosperity. During the global financial crisis over the last two years, the fact that the United States kept its markets open, bolstered Asia and the world, helped to keep the crisis from becoming as worse, and it certainly helped to turn it

CLINTON ON OTHER ISSUES

At his news conference, President Clinton said his wife's probable Senate campaign played no role in his clemency offer to Puerto Rican militants. [Page A25.] He also asked for an inquiry into the deaths of cult members in Texas in 1993. [Page A19.]

munity to assist in restoring security. It must allow international relief agencies to help people on the ground. It must move forward with the transition to independence.

Having allowed the vote and gotten such a clear unambiguous answer, we cannot have a reversal of course here. The overwhelming weight of international opinion from Asia to Africa to Europe to North America strongly agrees with this position. Right now, the international financial institutions are not moving forward with substantial new lending to Indonesia. My own willingness to support future assistance will depend very strongly on the way Indonesia handles this situation. Today I have also ordered the suspension of all programs of military cooperation with Indonesia, effective immediately. Our military leaders have made crystal clear to senior military officials in Indonesia what they must do to restore our confidence. . . .

Questions and Answers

Q Mr. President, Republicans in Congress . . .



President Clinton speaking on East Timor yesterday at the White House.

two reasons. 1) None of them, even though they belonged to an organization which had espoused violent means, none of them were convicted of doing any bodily harm to anyone. And 2) They had all served sentences that were considerably longer than they would serve under the sentencing guidelines which would be applied now. Most

A Well, I, you know, they'll have to evaluate that as they please. You know what she said in her statement. I don't know that that's a flip-flop. I had a different position. I thought they should be given another week. If in the course of this week, if we had come to tomorrow and they hadn't taken it and I had revoked the offer, would that have been a flip-flop by me? I don't think so. But the reason I thought that they should — the reason I felt they should be given to this week is I knew that their lawyer was actually physically going around to see all of them and would not finish until, I think, yesterday. So I thought they ought to be given that amount of time, and it's the judgment I made.

Q Mr. President, what level of military support are you prepared to provide to any peacekeeping mission? And what recourse do you have if Indonesia continues to refuse an international mission for East Timor?

A Well, the answer to the first question is we're still — we're consulting with the Australians and with others and we're also talking to interested members of Congress about this, and no decision has been made. I want the American people to know two things. No. 1, the Australians have made it clear that they, being the nearest military authority, intend to play the largest role and provide the lion's share of the effort there, and that many other countries have already agreed to contribute.

But secondly, the United States has been, certainly since the Second World War, and indeed going back before, heavily involved in the Asia-Pacific region. The Australians

and any other number of leaders who are passionately concerned about this area. And obviously Prime Minister Howard in Australia, Prime Minister Shipley in New Zealand and others. We are doing our best. Kofi Annan is doing his best. He sent a U.N. delegation there, and they arrived there yesterday. So this may be a question that you'll have to ask me again tomorrow and the next day and the next day, because I don't have a clear answer for you yet.

Q . . . Have you thought of economic sanctions in Indonesia?

A Well, first of all, I think today the right thing to do is to make it clear what our intentions are. And our intentions are 1) to stop military-to-military cooperation right now, until this matter gets resolved, and 2) we have sent a clear signal about what we will do on economic cooperation if it is not resolved. It would be a pity if the Indonesian recovery were crashed by this. But one way or the other, it will be crashed by this if they don't fix it. . . .

Q You left a big blank on what kind of response you're getting from the Indonesian Government. . . .

A The reason I left a big blank there, the reason I left a big blank there is that so far both the political and military authorities have been unwilling. They have been very clear. They do not want to ask for international assistance. Now that is subject to one of two or three interpretations. Interpretation No. 1 is they believe they can stop this madness in East Timor and they want to do and they don't want to have to admit they have to have help to do it. Two is nobody's

In Hillary Clinton's Brain Trust, Exiles From V

CLINTON, From A1

The battle-scarred brain trust assembling on behalf of Hillary Clinton's emerging campaign illustrates a larger truth about her White House experience. The first lady, in many ways more than the president, has succeeded in forging deep emotional attachments with those who toil for her.

Williams's feelings, a blend of idealism and grievance, seem close to those that associates say are motivating the first lady herself to run for office in a state where she has never lived.

"I'm a person who's always been interested in politics and thought it was a very noble occupation," she said in an interview. "The whole notion of what it had become—investigations because people were making a political point—I found very disillusioning. I still want to hold on to my beliefs, and as long as I have them, I won't stray too far from politics."

Ickes, characteristically, offers a more blunt-spoken view of his involvement as a kind of Sherpa to Hillary Clinton's Empire State expedition. "There is some irony to it—I fired in the West Wing, hired in the East Wing," he said.

Ickes was not exactly fired by Clinton. As the first term drew to a close, the president chose North Carolina businessman Erskine B. Bowles over Ickes to be his new chief of staff. The move had been widely predicted within the White House, where even some Ickes fans thought Bowles would be a more politic choice than the hard-edged New York lawyer. Still, Ickes got word of Clinton's choice when he read it in the newspaper—a harsh form of thanks for a man who had managed Clinton's scandal damage-control operation and reelection campaign. Clinton said later he regretted how the episode was handled.

"Was I disappointed? Yes. We all have friends who have disappointed us," said Ickes, who added that he has not been shaken in his belief that

But this history has not prevented him and his wife, Toby, from helping plan a Westchester County fundraiser for Hillary Clinton next month.

"The explanation is fairly simple: I've known Hillary, Toby has known Hillary, for 25 years," Nussbaum said. "Whatever feelings I might have from time to time about the president—sometimes they're good ones, sometimes they're not good ones—this is the continuation of a relationship. She needs help; she's a friend; we help her."

Grunwald declined to be inter-

viewed for this story. But associates say that even after she was evicted from Clinton's inner circle, she remained close to Hillary Clinton. With experience on the campaigns of Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the New York Democrat Hillary Clinton wants to succeed, she is a logical choice to be playing a critical role in the first lady's venture.

Still, the makeup of Hillary Clinton's inner circle presents numerous ironies. For instance, it was Ickes, the first-term enforcer, who had to tell Grunwald that the president no longer

desired her services. He had deliver the same message to Nussbaum.

Not all of Hillary Clinton's loyalists view her ambitions the same way. Increasingly, say a variety of White House and Democratic sources, time is focused on the exploratory campaign—and that has eclipsed the role of her close-knit White House staff. Sources outside the first lady's government office said most of the staff was skeptical of—and in some cases outright opposed to—her Senate candidacy. Aides within that

White House Ex-Aides Find 2nd Chance With First Lady

By JOHN F. HARRIS
Washington Post Staff Writer

Each morning at 7:30, the top advisers to first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's Senate exploratory campaign talk by conference call. On the line are two people who were shown the door at the Clinton White House—and another who walked out on her own.

The first lady's historic venture into electoral politics is in some ways a campaign of expatriates.

Her core group includes Harold Ickes, who served as President Clinton's deputy chief of staff but left feeling burned by the president's brusquely handled decision not to promote him after the 1996 election. It includes Mandy Grunwald, a

key consultant in the 1992 campaign who was effectively banished from the West Wing in 1994, after that year's twin disasters of the failed health care reform proposal and the Republican takeover of Congress.

It also includes Hillary Clinton's first-term chief of staff, Margaret A. "Maggie" Williams. She never had a falling-out of the sort that Ickes or Grunwald did. But by the start of the second term, she said she was burdened with legal bills of \$300,000 and weary of what she regarded as Washington's prosecutorial culture. Newly married, she was happy to retreat to a new life in Paris. Now, still on the other side of the Atlantic, Williams is back in the political mix.

See CLINTON, A18, Col. 1

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

NEW YORK POST, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1999

POSTOPINION



YOU KNOW, SOME PEOPLE ACTUALLY THINK MY DECISION WAS POLITICALLY MOTIVATED.

Hillary, Guard Your Back

Dem regulars don't want *their* party devoted to *her* ambition:

DANIEL Patrick Moynihan will endorse the presidential candidacy of Bill Bradley this morning, which comes as no surprise: Moynihan is a stand-up guy, and Bradley is a former colleague and a friend.

Whether the endorsement will carry any weight in a primary election six-plus months distant is an open question, however. The senator's influence with Democratic Party officials is, to put it mildly, minimal — in no small part because he is a stand-up guy, and because he makes no secret of his contempt for the hacks and hangers-on inhabiting the organization's upper echelons.

This includes President Clinton. And the first lady as well, as Hillary Rodham Clinton is likely to discover in the weeks and months ahead — notwithstanding the courtly introduction to the New York electorate that Moynihan rendered Mrs. Clinton at Pindars Corners last summer.

There is, moreover, little reason to believe that the state's Democratic establishment — of which Moynihan, again, is only nominally a part — will going to break its collective back for Hillary Clinton.

Why should it?

The first lady herself, as newly minted a New York Democrat as they come, has jumped to the head of long line of politicians who long ago paid their dues.

Has this generated resentment?

Only by the bushel-basket full.

Perhaps more to the point, not a single leading New York Democrat stands to benefit substantially from her elevation to the U.S. Senate.

There would be two obvious, immediate losers bobbing in the wake of a Hillary victory next November: Mark Green, whose mayoralty would be postponed by a year (and perhaps, reasonable people hope, forever), and Chuck Schumer, who would be shoved to the back of the self-promotion bus — for at least as long as it took Mrs. Clinton to establish herself for whatever it is that she's really



BOB McMANUS
ON
THURSDAY

For it is Mrs. Clinton's long-term agenda — as ill-defined as it may be at the moment — which stands to generate the most disquiet in the party hierarchy.

Will Hillary be satisfied with a seat in the Senate? Does she want to be governor of New York? Or does she ultimately seek a return to the White House — to be sure, on her own terms?

These are questions of little immediate relevance to most New Yorkers — but of critical import to those Democrats who themselves harbor electoral ambitions likely to be at odds with the first lady's needs.

Whatever it is that Mrs. Clinton wants — and even if it is just the

organizations are rare these days, and the Empire State is no exception.

But this doesn't comfort those New York Democrats now facing the need to reconcile their own ambitions with the first lady's.

Just how anxious can Andrew Cuomo be to compete for resource and influence with a Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton? Even given his close ties to Vice President Al Gore, how likely would Mario Cuomo's son be to supinely accept Mrs. Clinton's ascension?

Not very. Ditto Eliot Spitzer. And Carl McCall.

Each is — potentially, at least — a gubernatorial candidate in 2002, and so each has no reason to be rooting for Clinton next year.

Chuck Schumer, even less so.

It was thought, after the Brooklyn Democrat unhorsed D'Amato a year ago, that he would quickly set to building the kind of organization that Alfonse ran to such good effect.

So far, it hasn't happened. But this doesn't mean that Schumer doesn't have such plans — or that he harbors any enthusiasm at all for the prospect of living in Hillary's shadow for the rest of his career.

And so on.

Gather together all the New York Democrats who have been disadvantaged by Mrs. Clinton's muscling her way to the head of the political line and you'll find a crew that the first lady would do well not to turn her back on.

True, strong party organization — and financial and logistical support — isn't nearly as critical as it once was. This is an age of personality-based politics of a sort that nobody practices better than the Clintons.

But if it comes to pass that Mrs. Clinton needs the New York Democratic Party establishment, she'll certainly have it in form — but probably not in substance.

In this sense, she truly is a carpet-bagger.

Not a single leading New York Democrat stands to benefit substantially from Hillary's elevation to the U.S. Senate.

Senate — the goal is best obtainable through the creation and maintenance of a political organization that is loyal principally to her, and only then to the more parochial needs of the Democratic Party itself.

Think of Alfonse D'Amato's use of a Senate incumbency to transform the New York GOP into a wholly owned personal subsidiary, and you will better understand what it is that a lot of Democrats fear in the prospect of a Hillary win.

"The Clinton way in Arkansas," said one recently, "was to construct a personal, parallel party apparatus. They never shared, either. It was all about them."

This assessment, while self-evidently true, is a little naive in one re-

Neal Kumar Katyal

Executive Privilege, Confidentiality, Trust

The road to a compromise between the White House and Congress.

The upshot of President Clinton's decision to invoke executive privilege regarding his clemency offer to 16 Puerto Rican members of the Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) has been to prompt a constitutional impasse. To be sure, the president's constitutional arguments for privilege are strong. It's too bad, however, that this president has misused this mighty privilege in the past.

And it's also too bad that this Congress has gone astray when it comes to handling sensitive information. The loss of public trust in both branches of government necessitates that both act now to avoid an arcane constitutional clash and instead seek a prudential compromise that recognizes the principled arguments each has advanced. There were welcome hints yesterday of such a possible compromise, at least in the Senate.

Executive privilege, which has a pedigree going back to George Washington, serves several important functions. It prevents disclosure of information that can subvert crucial military or strategic objectives. It affords executive branch officials some privacy. And it ensures that the advice the president gets is candid and frank. As the Supreme Court said regarding President Nixon's invocation of privilege, "Human experience teaches that those who expect public dissemination of their remarks may well temper candor with a concern for appearances and for their own interests to the detriment of the decision-making process."

The FALN case may implicate all three of these functions. Important information relating to the situation in Puerto Rico may be at issue. Privacy concerns could also exist. And publicizing the pardon process will make officials reluctant to give frank advice to the president.

The idiosyncratic pardon context also raises additional concerns that weigh in favor of privilege. People are sometimes reluctant to provide exculpatory information to the pardon attorney if they fear this information will be made public. Reputations, and even lives, might be ruined. As any good prosecutor (or journalist) will understand, promising confidentiality of sources is important. What's more, providing information about FALN will open the door to congressional interference in other pardon matters. Imagine, for example, the Senate opening up the files on Jonathan Pollard.

The Constitution gives the president an absolute right to grant pardons that neither Congress nor anyone else can ever undo.



And the practice of the Justice Department for more than 100 years has been not to provide information about clemency to Congress—at least when that material concerns internal deliberations. Given all this, Congress should think twice before trying to uncover the reasons motivating a particular pardon.

Nevertheless, there are circumstances in which political necessity might demand an explanation. Due to the weighty arguments against doing so, such an explanation should be made only when absolutely necessary, such as when President Ford testified before Congress about his pardon of Nixon. The real question is whether the necessity for piercing privilege in the FALN case is genuine and urgent enough. There are all sorts of allegations about the first lady's involvement, and the White House doesn't have a pure track record when it comes to asserting privilege. President Clinton asserted it in federal courts in Arkansas and Washington to try to prevent information coming out regarding the Whitewater and the Monica Lewinsky matters, but both courts rebuked his assertions, and the White House was forced to drop these claims on appeal.

We are therefore in a quandary: There may be valid grounds for claiming executive privilege, but many don't trust this president's motives given his track record. And so, even with valid grounds, it is a political nightmare to assert it. This hurts everyone—those who seek pardons, those in the Justice Department who evaluate them and the American public, which lives

in doubt of what the president believes.

For its part, Congress says, "Trust us." We won't release any sensitive information. And yet this Congress has had a habit of leaking all sorts of classified and otherwise sensitive material when it suited its ends. Can we—or this president—really trust Congress?

Perhaps one way out of this quandary is for the president to follow his predecessors and strike a deal with Congress. After a bitter privilege fight regarding the Environmental Protection Agency, President Reagan voluntarily turned over material to Congress that he deemed covered by privilege.

Now that both sides have taken their political hits, President Clinton should provide the documentation on two conditions. First, that the material remain appropriately confidential—perhaps given only to the chair and ranking member of the relevant committees. Second, that Congress publicly recognize that the documents are protected by executive privilege. This solution would acknowledge and address Congress's worry about this unique and troubling matter, while also honoring the president's compelling concerns about precedent and principle. If both sides work together and realize that each has to give to make up for past wrongs, as perhaps is now occurring in the Senate Judiciary Committee, maybe trust can be restored.

The writer is an associate professor at Georgetown University Law Center.

PHOTOCOPY PRESERVATION

Hillary & Rudy do battle in minimum-wage war



HILLARY CLINTON
Going uptown

By GREGG BIRNBAUM
and MAGGIE HABERMAN

Potential U.S. Senate opponents Hillary Rodham Clinton and Mayor Giuliani yesterday butted heads over whether to increase the minimum wage.

Campaigning in The Bronx, the first lady threw her support behind pending Democratic-sponsored federal legislation that would phase in a \$1 hike in

the current \$5.15 minimum wage over two years.

"Raising the minimum wage is a matter of social justice, but also good economic sense," Mrs. Clinton told reporters outside the Kleener King dry cleaner.

"The minimum wage [increase] is a win-win for workers and for businesses. We want to create more consumers... which is good for the local economy which creates more job op-

portunities."

Bronx Borough President Fernando Ferrer, a Clinton backer, grabbed the microphone to reporters to ask the "sup Republican candidate for governor" — Giuliani — what his position on the minimum wage is.

"I haven't looked at it quite some time," Giuliani responded when questioned by a reporter about it later at a conference.

"The raising of the minimum wage always sounds like a good thing. One of the things that has to be looked at is, you're always gonna lose some jobs when you do it. Many jobs, and are you improving people's lives? It's a complex question."

"And what is it gonna do in the time in which you're in not only in New York but throughout America in a welfare-to-work effort?"

Meanwhile, Mrs. Clinton wrapped herself in her husband's record, pointing to his veto of the GC cut plan as his latest bow to New York.

"I'm a little biased, but the president has been good for New York and New Yorkers," the first lady said.

"His policies have proved the kinds of policies that the vast majority of New Yorkers respond to and support."

She added that her husband vetoed the Republican plan partly "because it would do what needs to be done to continue the economic program and to spread it to every lives in The Bronx, who live in the city, who live in the state."

In the wake of the FBI flop, Mrs. Clinton surprised herself with Hispanic support during her visit to The Bronx, where she was greeted enthusiastically by supporters on the street.

Flanking her through the appearances were Ferrer, Assemblyman Robert R. L. who also is the county executive boss, and she also was at a news conference with Aguiar, the president of the King and a Puerto Rican

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

THE WASHINGTON POST
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1999 A392A

Robert D. Novak

Just the Ticket for Hillary Clinton?

NEW YORK—When Gov. George Pataki last month suddenly tapped Mayor Rudolph Giuliani instead of Rep. Rick Lazio for the Senate nomination, Republican regulars beamed in relief over avoidance of a bruising intraparty fight. But Michael R. Long was not smiling then and still isn't.

Long, a liquor store owner in the Bay Ridge section of Brooklyn, is the longtime chairman of the state's Conservative Party. He was not exactly thrilled that Pataki, the state's first and only governor elected with the Conservative as well as the Republican designation, had not informed him in advance that he was dumping Lazio. What worries Long now is whether he can—or should—make Giuliani the Conservative nominee to oppose Hillary Rodham Clinton for the Senate. If he doesn't, it might be time to address the first lady as senator.

Making matters worse, Long could hardly keep the Conservative Party

from putting Patrick J. Buchanan on its presidential line if he became the nominee of the Reform Party or any other splinter group. Thus the New York Republican establishment's 2000 dream ticket of George W. Bush and Rudy Giuliani to carry the state is beginning to look like a nightmare.

"This could set us back to where we were 25 years ago," Long told me. The Conservative Party was born in 1962 as a conscious protest against a left-of-center Republican Party owned and operated by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. The new party, running its own candidates for statewide office over the next dozen years, had its intended effect of moving the GOP to the right. Sen. Alfonse D'Amato and his protégé, Pataki, each won office as the standard bearer of both the Republican and Conservative parties. Not since Sen. Jacob Javits's election in 1974 has a Republican been elected statewide without the Conservative designation.

Now Giuliani as the GOP Senate nominee threatens this pattern. He was twice elected mayor of overwhelmingly Democratic New York City with the Liberal Party, not the Conservative, designation. It is clear that he cannot run on both the Liberal and Conservative lines. Pataki and Republican State Chairman William Powers are determined that this time Giuliani will be the Conservative-Republican nominee.

That is no easy task. The Liberal Party, ridiculed by Democratic politicians as neither liberal nor a party, is a patronage machine tied to the Giuliani-directed city payroll. But the Conservative Party is indeed conservative, and it is a party. So, while a nod from Liberal leader Ray Harding is sufficient for nomination, Long cannot dictate to the filing-station operator who is seen as the typical registered Conservative voter. Many of the Conservative rank and file were

unhappy when the party did not run a candidate against Giuliani's reelection as mayor in 1997, quite apart from endorsing him.

The basic Republican complaint against Giuliani always has been procedural, not ideological: He supported Democratic Gov. Mario Cuomo against Pataki's successful 1994 challenge. But that sin has long since been forgiven by GOP power brokers in Albany and Washington, and Republicans like Giuliani's anti-welfare, anti-crime, anti-bureaucracy record and rhetoric. Lazio, much preferred by the Conservatives, sounds softer and has a centrist voting record in Congress.

The New York Conservative quarrel with the mayor is Giuliani's social liberalism, particularly his opposition to banning partial-birth abortion (which the nominally pro-choice Lazio supports). Can the mayor undergo an electoral conver-

sion against a technique labeled akin to "infanticide" by the retiring senator, Democrat Daniel Patrick Moynihan? Not a chance, his official spokesman told me.

It is hard to imagine the New York Conservative Party nominating a supporter of partial-birth abortions. It would be equally tough for Mike Long to keep his party from endorsing Buchanan if he bolts from the Republican Party.

The importance of this prospect for the GOP can be seen by looking at 1994 returns for governor, the last close major election in the state. Pataki could not have been elected save for 329,000 Conservative voters—almost four times the Liberal vote for Cuomo. If Giuliani runs as a Rockefeller-Javits Republican, with a Liberal but not a Conservative designation, that looks like a formula for propelling the first lady to the U.S. Senate.

© 1999, Creators Syndicate Inc.

After Years of Clinton White House Scandals

By JEANNE CUMMINGS
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
SYRACUSE, N.Y. — By all rights, Blanche Conley, a retired teacher and registered Democrat, ought to be an easy political target for Hillary Clinton's prospective U.S. Senate campaign. But she isn't.

Mrs. Clinton is "a lovely person," but "I just don't think she will represent the interests of New York," says Ms. Conley, passing by a quilt exhibit at the New York State Fair where the first lady and her husband are about to drop by. And besides, she adds, "I'm tired of all that nonsense that's been going on at the White House."

Such sentiments, fueled by years of Clinton White House scandals, could pose a big problem for the first lady's hopes of a history-making win next year over the expected GOP candidate, New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. "It's exciting to watch," observes Chuck Mason, head of the Democratic Committee in upstate Cayuga County, "but there is a fatigue factor."

For months now, political pundits have debated the potential drag that so-called Clinton fatigue might have on the White House bid of Vice President Al Gore, the 2000 Democratic front-runner. Though Mr. Clinton emerged from last winter's impeachment trauma with high approval ratings, Mr. Gore trailed GOP front-runner George W. Bush by 13 percentage points in July's Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll.

Republican pollster Robert Teeter, who helps conduct the Journal/NBC poll, points to the vice president's lagging support among independents, his minimal ability to draw Republicans, and his loss of some 20% of the Democratic vote to Mr. Bush as evidence that he is suffering a scandal hangover.

But independent pollster Andrew Kohut, who publicized the phenomenon this spring, predicts that "burn-out factor" could crimp Mrs. Clinton's Senate bid just as badly. Though Mrs. Clinton jumped out to an initial lead over Mr. Giuliani early this year in this Democratic-leaning state, a Quinnipiac College poll showed the first lady and the mayor in a dead heat.

It's clear that Mrs. Clinton benefits politically from her celebrity, and even sometimes from the scandals as well. Polls have shown that many voters—not to mention Democratic campaign donors—have been put off by the GOP's vigorous use of investigations and the impeachment process to confront the Clinton Administration.

And when the president, Mrs. Clinton and their daughter Chelsea arrived in Syracuse early this week, they were greeted like rock stars by more than 2,300 people. "I'm going to work for her," gushed Martha Sue Ramsey, an addiction counselor who was on hand. Local Democratic officials say each new headline about the first lady's visits to the state triggers fresh offers of volunteer help; Board of Elections clerk Pat Hunter, in fact, says some eager partisans are seeking absentee ballots so they can vote for her this November.

But Mr. Mason, the Cayuga County Democratic official, frets that a wave just as big may crash in from the opposite direction. Her campaign also is energizing a hostile GOP, whose national chairman Jim Nicholson trailed the First Family to New York to needle both Clintons over tax cuts and their post-White House plans. Any weariness among voters over her continued prominence could prove damaging, especially since many New Yorkers may still be worn out from last year's vituperative Senate race in which GOP veteran Alfonse D'Amato was knocked off by Democrat Charles Schumer.

"Hillary is definitely a lightning rod," says Mr. Mason. "People love her or hate her."

"People are sick of the Clinton thing," adds Joe Stallone, a high school student in Auburn who is active in a Young Democrats organization. He plans to vote with his party in the Senate race after turning 18 next year, but says many people he knows "don't want any more" of the Clintons. The president himself underscored the

Hillary's Summer Vacation



THE ROADMAP

Visited Rochester, Ithaca, Coopers-town, Syracuse, Long Island, Skaneateles and more than a dozen other cities this summer.

THE CASH

Raised \$700,000 for her all-but-announced campaign during her two week vacation.

THE POLLS

Tied at 45% with New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani in late July Quinnipiac College poll.

at the state fair. As he campaigned for a fifth term as Arkansas governor in 1990, Mr. Clinton recalled, "This old boy in overalls came up to me and said, 'Are you going to run again?'" "I said, 'Well, aren't you sick of me after all these years?'" Mr. Clinton went on. "And he said, 'No, I'm not. But everybody else I know is.'"

The remark "kind of hurt," Mr. Clinton said. But he noted that it reinforced the need for office-holders to give voters a strong reason to keep them around, which he called a "very important lesson for any-

one contemplating running for any office."

Mrs. Clinton tried to do just that on this week's visit to New York, where, among other things, they appear to be honing in on a \$1.7 million Georgian colonial in Westchester County as a potential post-White House residence. In addition to her usual emphasis on health care and education, she highlighted the need to lower transportation costs, utility costs, and state and local taxes in New York.

"There's a lot of good work that has been done and a lot more we can do together," said Mrs. Clinton, who has formed a Senate exploratory committee, but still hasn't formally announced her candidacy.

Yet she also touched off a major media storm last month with her interview in the debut issue of *Talk* magazine, in which she drew mixed reviews for her attempt to explain her husband's extramarital adventures. To Mr. Kohut, who heads the Washington-based Pew Center for the People and the Press, the interview highlighted just the sort of subject that Mrs. Clinton doesn't need to be wallowing in.

"If the race becomes a rehash of her behavior in Whitewater or a replay of her personal life," he says, "many New Yorkers—particularly independents—will say, 'Who needs this?'"

That's certainly the view of Laurie Podsiadly of Lancaster, who attended the state fair with her 10-year-old daughter Emma. Ms. Podsiadly, an uncommitted voter, muses that a home-grown candidate might make more sense than a newcomer "because their heart belongs to New York." And for Mrs. Clinton and the country alike, she adds, it's time to "go on to the next chapter and get all of this behind us."

PHOTOCOPY PRESERVATION

Hillary takes day off as GOP comes by to rip her

By GREGG BIRNBAUM
Post Correspondent

SKANEATELES, N.Y. — First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton yesterday shelved a trip to town — even as Republicans came to her doorstep to blast her for using taxpayer bucks to fund her campaign.

While President Clinton played a round of golf and daughter Chelsea popped in to the local library, Mrs. Clinton remained out of sight on the upstate lakefront estate where the first family is spending its five-day vacation in the Finger Lakes.

"She spent the day relaxing and reading," said Mrs. Clinton's campaign spokesman, Howard Wolfson.

Earlier, a White House spokesman said he expected the first lady to be "out and about," a group of reporters were put on notice that she was heading into town, and a local restaurant was told to be ready for her.

But Mrs. Clinton never came, disappointing many in the village.

"Where is she? I came on purpose to see her. I'm a Hillary admirer, but this could cost her some votes," Carolyn Kelly said.

Meanwhile, GOP national Chairman Jim Nicholson flew to the Finger Lakes to slam Mrs. Clinton for spending taxpayer dollars to fund her still-undeclared Senate campaign.

Nicholson charged that the "so-called vacation" in Skaneateles was nothing more than "fund-raisers and taxpayer-funded campaign stops."

"Most folks in this part of New York, or anywhere else really,



FILLING IN: With Mom, nowhere to be seen, Chelsea Clinton mingles in upstate Skaneateles yesterday. *N.Y. Post Tamara Beckwith*

don't get to stay for free at a multimillion-dollar vacation estate," Nicholson said, referring to the \$14 million home on Lake Skaneateles owned by developer Thomas MacDonald.

"They don't get to travel for free on airplanes that are provided by the taxpayers," Nicholson added at a news conference in nearby Auburn.

A White House spokesman

said Mrs. Clinton's Senate exploratory committee will reimburse the federal government for parts of the trip to Skaneateles that are deemed to be political, including a portion of the expense for Monday's campaign-like visit to the state fair.

Officials with the first lady's campaign and the White House have so far refused to release any information about the campaign's reimbursement to the federal treasury and have not said how much has been paid back or when it will be.

That information will be made public at the end of the year in a required financial-disclosure report, Wolfson said.

Nicholson also unveiled a 30-second ad that Republicans are running on Skaneateles cable TV that attacks the Clintons for opposing the congressional GOP's nearly \$800 million tax-cut bill, which the president has promised to veto.

"Mr. Clinton, we hear you and the missus are thinking about moving to New York," the ad says. "If so, we Republicans can help. Our tax-relief plan would let the average New York family keep over 10,000 more of the dollars they earn."

Bill set to unpack golf clubs at new Westchester home

By ANGELA C. ALLEN

The first family could make it official as early as today. They're leaving the White House for a white house.

The Clintons' final choice on new digs — a \$1.695 million spread at 10 Old House Lane in the tony suburb of Chappaqua in Westchester County — appears to have passed the required security clearance, which was the last hurdle to gaining first family approval.

And while the Clintons' apparent choice may lack the historical grandeur of 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., their 11-acre dream home has its amenities.

The 110-year-old, three-story, five-bedroom Colonial boasts an in-ground pool, gardens, a two-car garage and even a large barn.

Meanwhile, the president — an avid golfer — is sure to find plenty of places to practice his stroke at any of the county's numerous private or public golf courses.

One, the private Whippoorwill Club, is just minutes from Chappaqua and boasts lush, rolling greens.

But there's a snag: The club has a waiting list of several years.

"You have to wait until either a member dies or skips out," said Vincent Trerotola, a member for 35 years.

"If you do get accepted, you become an associate member with limited golf privileges," said club golf pro John LaRosa. "It could be eight years until you get full membership."

If the president won't wait that long, he can always try the county's five public golf courses.

Cashier Gene Berto at the Maple Moor course said the president can play — despite their political differences.

"We'd welcome him here to play," he said. "But he's not my kind of guy. He's an embarrassment to the government."



PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

NEW YORK POST, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1993

PETE: Jewish seed.
AILING tennis ace **Pete Sampras** is even more Jewish than **Hillary Clinton**. "Not too many people know that I am Jewish," Sampras recently told *London's Jewish Chronicle*, noting his father's mom was Jewish. But, Pete, who's never set foot in a synagogue, says: "I was raised as a Greek Orthodox and went to Greek Orthodox church. [My parental] decree that was the way it should go."

NEW YORK POST, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1999

PHOTOCOPY
 PRESERVATION

Hillary Rodham Clinton makes my list for her pandering tour all summer. She puts on a Yankee hat after being a lifelong Cub fan. Then she announces she once had a step-relative who was Jewish. Then she endorses the upstate cow cartel, which means higher milk prices for poor people in the city. Then her husband offers conditional clemency to 16 **FALN** terrorists, who maimed cops and blew up buildings — against the advice of the FBI and other federal law-enforcement agencies. This pandering was meant to help Hillary, but it has exploded in her hands like a terrorist bomb. The "first enabler" should decide who she is, and why she is running in New York, before she can even have an honest listening tour.

The Washington Times

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1999 **

No widget wizard

By no accident, potential Senate candidate Hillary Rodham Clinton, along with her husband Bill and daughter Chelsea, are winding up their 16-day family vacation this week in the Finger Lakes region of upstate New York.

Bob Brown, of Montour Falls, N.Y., writes to the editor of one local newspaper in the region about Mrs. Clinton's qualifications to be his state's next senator.

"The other person we would look at is someone who ran a widget company someplace else and did such a good job that we want to hire them for their expertise and knowledge. Hillary never worked in a widget company, or even ran one, yet somehow thinks she can run ours.

"I would hope New Yorkers would not get duped into voting for someone because of name recognition. Let's hire somebody who has at least worked in the field before and has a track record to go by."

No cash, please

Hillary Rodham Clinton yesterday declined what her campaign called an illegal cash contribution she was offered while working the rope line at the New York State Fair in Syracuse.

Robert E. Lenz of Warners, N.Y., pulled a pair of crisp \$50 bills from his wallet and informed the first lady that he would give her the money on the spot if she ran for the soon-to-be-vacant Senate seat in New York.

Mrs. Clinton summoned her campaign spokesman, Howard Wolfson, to deal with the dilemma. Mr. Wolfson politely declined the money, explaining to Mr. Lenz that cash contributions to political campaigns are illegal. The spokesman did not take the would-be donor's address.

Mr. Lenz, a retired supervisor for a local natural gas utility, said he was disappointed at the first lady's refusal to accept his money. But he brightened at the idea of a backup use for the money.

"If she don't run," he said, "I want her to turn it over to the Clinton defense fund."

A bad boy

While Hillary Rodham Clinton campaigned in upstate New York yesterday, her husband golfed with Democratic fund-raiser Terry McAuliffe, a native of nearby Syracuse.

"I was a bad boy," Mr. Clinton said on the way to the golf course. "I slept in today."

As the president prepared to walk toward the first tee, a Secret Service agent noticed a foursome of elderly ladies on the 18th hole, close to Mr. Clinton's path. The agent summoned them over and checked them for weapons.

• Greg Pierce can be reached at 202/636-3285 or by e-mail at Pierce@twthail.com.

PHOTOCOPIED
PRESERVATION

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1999

GOP takes gloves off with ad needling Clinton on tax cut

National chairman also hits Hillary on campaign costs

By Bill Sammon
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

AUBURN, N.Y. — Republican National Committee Chairman Jim Nicholson showed up at President Clinton's vacation spot yesterday to ridicule the president's opposition to the GOP tax cut and accuse the first lady of campaigning on the taxpayers' dime.

Mr. Nicholson held a news conference in this upstate New York town to hammer home the tax-cutting message of a television ad that the RNC has been running on local cable stations for the president's consumption. In the ad, Mr. Nicholson displays a briefcase filled with \$10,000 — the amount an average New York family would save if Mr. Clinton signs the GOP tax cut.

"I don't know if Bill and Hillary Clinton will be able to squeeze in some TV time during their so-called vacation here," Mr. Nicholson told reporters a block away from the hotel where a White House spokesman was about to give a press briefing. "After all, they do have a rather hectic schedule of R&R — revenue and rope lines."

"But if they do get to watch the television — in between fund-raisers and taxpayer-funded campaign stops and mulligans — I want them to see that New Yorkers deserve to keep more of the money they earn," he continued. "I want them to see this."

Mr. Nicholson then played the TV spot.

"Mr. Clinton, we hear you and the missus are thinking about moving to New York," the RNC chief says into the camera. "If so, we Republicans can help. Our tax-relief plan would let the average New York family keep over 10,000 more of the dollars they earn."

Opening the cache of \$20 bills, Mr. Nicholson continues: "This is \$10,000. This money belongs to working families, not Washington bureaucrats and special interests. Won't you take a moment from your vacation to talk about real tax relief with Hillary and Al?"

"You'll be glad you did when you are living in New York," Mr. Nicholson concludes, "or whatever state you decide to call home."

Minutes later, White House



Chelsea Clinton gets a kiss from Brooke Coleman, 2, yesterday as the president's daughter vacations with her parents in Skaneateles, N.Y.

Deputy Press Secretary Jake Siewert was peppered with reporters' questions about Mr. Nicholson's latest broadside.

"We believe that the longer the Republicans talk about their tax cut, the less popular it seems to be," Mr. Siewert said. "And that's for a good reason, because the American people recognize that now is not the time for a massive tax cut that might imperil the prosperity that Americans are enjoying today."

But recent polls by Rasmussen Research suggest public support for the GOP tax cut is growing. While only 43 percent of Americans supported the cut on July 28, the percentage had grown to 50 by Aug. 23.

"What you said at the lake is fake, Jake," Mr. Nicholson shot back in a statement issued after the White House briefing. "The skinny is that the more folks learn about the Republican plan to let them keep more of the money they earn, the more they like it. And Americans aren't buying Bill Clinton's histrionics about the tax cut any more than they believe his golf scores."

Mr. Siewert sought to minimize

the purchasing power of money that would be saved over the 10-year life of the tax cut, saying: "Well, \$10,000 — I don't know what that buys you here."

He added there is "not a snowball's chance" that Mr. Clinton will be swayed by the RNC's arguments and sign the tax-cut bill that has been passed by Congress.

"That's what Clinton said about welfare reform, too," countered RNC spokesman Mark Pfeiffer. "And guess what? He signed it."

Mr. Nicholson also needled the Clintons for vacationing at the posh home of developer Thomas McDonald on Skaneateles Lake.

"You know, most folks in this part of New York, or anywhere else really, don't get to stay for free at a multimillion-dollar vacation estate," he said. "And they don't get to travel free on airplanes that are provided by the taxpayers."

Mr. Siewert defended Hillary Rodham Clinton, who spent part of yesterday campaigning for the New York Senate seat that will be up for grabs next year. He said she is using tax dollars for portions of the trip considered vacation and campaign contributions for portions considered political.

PHOTOCOPY PRESERVATION