Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Kathryn Mack to Eric Schwartz, re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)
002. email	Pat Battenfield to Martha Ramsay, re: President's Mtg w/President Mugbe of Zimbabwe (6 pages)	05/16/1995	P1/b(1)
003. email	Robert Suttinger to Eric Schwartz, re: YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE, ASAP (7 pages)	06/25/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Non-Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 605000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/08/1994 - 06/28/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2075

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

MSMail

DATE-TIME 08 November 94 13:15

FROM Baker, James E.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Subject: FW: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Kreczko, Alan J.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

FYI.

From: Baker, James E.
To: Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: RE: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 01:14 PM

Eric,

I guess I need to be more direct. I am aware that all these issues raise legal and policy questions. The litigators are asking among other things whether policy makers have affirmatively considered these issues, and if not, whether and when you intend to do so. In the absence of affirmative decisions, the courts may dictate our policy to us, or more accurately, minimize our policy options. What is the policy timetable, for example, for deciding whether we are going to repatriate Haitians involuntarily? With or without screening?

It would be helpful to the Government's argument to be able to advise the court(s) that we intend to screen Haitians; or will not repatriate involuntarily; etc. To the extent such policy determinations alleviate the court's concern about how we are handling migrants at GTMO we may avoid broad sweeping TROs that prevent options. We may also avoid having to wait extended periods of time to win on the law, for as explained in the earlier E-mail, on all but the DP issue, we are confident that we will prevail on the law, but as a matter of policy we may not have the time or inclination to wait that long.

Why don't we meet to discuss. Can you suggest a time this late afternoon or evening? Thanks.

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Baker, James E.

CC: /R, Record at A1; @DEMOCRACY - Democracy Affairs
Subject: FW: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 11:00 AM

JAMIE: NOTE MY RESPONSES, THEN GIVE ME A CALL TO DISCUSS..

I THINK I NEED TO BE AT THE WEDNESDAY MEETING.

ERIC

From: Halperin, Morton H.
To: Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: FW: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 10:45 AM

I assume that this are your issues and you will get back to the lawyers. If I were you I would insist on being at the meeting on Wednesday.

From: Baker, James E.
To: Halperin, Morton H.; Longoria, Michael A.; Malley, Robert; Rossin, Larry; Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Kreczko, Alan J.; Wolin, Neal S.
Subject: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 10:25 AM

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

Justice has identified a number of issues that could arise in the context of the Cuba/Hatian litigation this week that raise serious policy considerations. In order for litigators to best represent the government's legal view and preserve its policy options it is important that we provide guidance on the questions presented below as soon as possible. A follow-on lawyers meeting is scheduled for Wednesday.

1. Parole: The Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order granting Haitians parity with Cuban migrants on parole decisions, i.e., parole for children, the elderly and medical hardships. This argument would likely be cast as an equal protection, due process, abuse of discretion claim.

NOTE: DOJ is not aware that the Administration has ever been asked, or considered parole concessions for Haitians. As a matter of law, parity is not required, although it is not clear how a five member CA panel would come out on this issue. Further, the scenarios are factually different -- Haiti is a democracy, Cuba is not, etc.

Jamie: I think we do want to make a distinction here. With the Haitians, we believe that a durable solution is in sight. This justifies a different way of treating them. They have a democracy to return to. We do medevac some Haitians, but that is a different issue involving acute situations.

2. Voluntary Repartiation: Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order similar to that issued by the Court of Appeals regarding Cuban migrants: no repatriation unless a migrant signs a form that such repatriation is voluntary.

NOTE: If policy-makers are considering, or are going to take, a different view, i.e., involuntary repatriation of Haitians, it would be useful for litigators to know now, so that they can prepare to distinguish the two groups and factual scenarios before the courts and be careful to preserve options if asked on the record, e.g., the Haitian case is distinguishable for among other reasons because we were offering safe haven from a regime whose days were numbered and therefore repatriation requires different analysis. As a matter of law, Justice believes involuntary repatriation is legally available and that we will ultimately win on the law if enjoined. It is also the lawyers' view that so long as this lawsuit is pending, more Haitians will not volunteer to return.

In the event, we were to get an injunction against involuntarily repatriating Haitians beyond the 14 Haitians already covered are we prepared to say to the court(s) that Haiti is in fact stable and safe in an effort to oppose? Are we considering moving to a policy of involuntary return? When? Are we prepared to repatriate before UNMIH. At what point will the sewage situation at GTMO dictate policy?

Jamie: This is tricky. I would think, as a legal matter, we would want to preserve the government's option to not only involuntarily return, but to do so summarily -- without screening -- though as a matter policy I would urge against any practice that creates the possibility of return of bonafide refugees.

We have not yet confronted the policy issue of involuntary return with prior screening. As a matter of law and of policy, I think we should argue that involuntary return is justified. We can distinguish with the Cuba case by arguing that nothing prevents us from either being more generous than the law requires, or from making a generalized judgment about non-return to avoid the burden of individualized adjudications.

I think there is an important policy/legal issue here, however, and we may need to seek higher level guidance on it -- whether we want to take a position on the legality of direct return (i.e., return without screening) from Guantanamo.

3. Request for a permanent injunction granting parole to all pregnant women.

For Haitians? I say not necessarily. For Cubans? Speak to Mort.

4. Cuban plaintiffs may request an order permitting Cubans at GTMO with visas to come directly to the U.S. from GTMO.

Check with Mort.

5. Due Process and other Constitutional Rights: While litigators think the law is clear, if not necessarily the results, on the issues above, the question of migrant due process rights to a particular standard of conditions at GTMO is a tougher question. For example, do migrants have a DP right to a particular standard of medical care, or safety. That we are providing safe haven to migrants and are not holding them against their will, does not end the discussion as there is a body of law, which courts may choose to apply to GTMO, involving the conditions of persons who voluntarily put themselves in state custody. Further, some groups of migrants, such as children and unborn babies, are not in a position to exercise the types of choices that makes one's presence in GTMO voluntary. Bottom line: it is not likely at all that we will get the votes in the Court of Appeals or S.Ct. that the only rights that apply to migrants at GTMO are non-enforceable standards under international law. Indeed, it is not clear this is a position Justice litigators are prepared to take as a matter of law. Clearly, there are remedies available other than brining migrants to the U.S., but planners should consider and anticipate a requirement to provide additional doctors, or facilities to improve conditions at GTMO.

Jamie: Need to explore this in greater detail.

6. 22 HIV Haitians. We understand that there remain 22 screened in HIV Haitians at GTMO. Lawyers consider it a matter of time, and short time given the availability of additional attorney access to GTMO, before these 22 sue for admission. Do we have plans to admit them?

Jamie: Awaiting a policy decision.

As noted above, your feedback on these matters is greatly appreciated.

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

MSMail

DATE-TIME	08 November 94 13:57
FROM	Fauver, Robert E.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	[UNCLASSIFIED]New assignments
TO	Sherman, David J. Walsh, Helen C.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[TASK.DOC : 3340 in TASK.DOC]]Could you two please review this before I send it out. Thanks
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	8 November 94 13:55
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TASK.DOC

(task.doc)

Distribution

RCF

Institution Review -- paper assignments

The following list of papers was agreed to this morning at the Deputies meeting. These new papers should be on the order of 5 -10 pages of detailed statement of the problem being addressed, the solution or solutions offerred, and the potential implications for international institutions. The next Deputies meeting will be scheduled for the week following Thanksgiving. Papers should be circulated on Wednesday, November 23 if possible so that deputies can read them over the holiday.

Lead drafter is responsible for coordinating with other named agencies.

Paper Lead Drafter

1. Post Chaos Fund Treasury
2. Education Treasury/State/AID

3. Financial Markets Treasury/NEC
4. New G-7,Financial Council NEC
5. Development Institutions Treasury/NEC/State/AID
6. Environment OVP/State
7. WTO/ USTR/NEC
8. Labor State
9. AIDs State/CEA
10. Technology CEA
11. Development -- health, hunger, (to be determined) infrastructure, etc

MSMail

DATE-TIME 10 November 94 14:26

FROM Sherman, David J.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT "Buck Slip" [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Mathiowetz, Nancy

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

[[BUCKNEW.DOC : 3657 in BUCKNEW.DOC]]

For your records so that you can have a copy of the memo format in your computer files.

Another task: please make one copy of the smaller set of Treasury papers ("A Fresh Start for the Poorest Countries"). Then do a cover memo (using the above as a model) to Sandy Berger from Bob Fauver.

Subject: Additional Institutions Review Papers.

Text: Attached are three papers on issues for the international economic institutions review that were passed out by Treasury at the Deputies meeting on Tuesday. Additional papers from Treasury were provided to you previously, as were copies of ones that we have done "in house." A complete listing of papers that have been drafted to date will accompany the agenda for our next meeting.

Have Bob initial; then take memo and copies of papers to Berger. Isn't this fun!
dave

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 10 November 94 14:12

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME BUCKNEW.DOC

November 10, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO LAURA TYSON
SANDY BERGER
LEON FUERTH
JEFF GARTEN
KATY MCGINTY

JOAN SPERO
LARRY SUMMERS
RUFUS YERXA

FROM BOB FAUVER

SUBJECT INSTITUTIONS REVIEW -- PAPER ASSIGNMENTS

The following list of drafting assignments was agreed to at Tuesday morning's Dep
uties meeting on the review
of the international institutions. These new papers should be approximately 5 -10 p
ages in length, and include: (1)
a detailed statement of the problem being addressed; (2) the solution or solutions o
ffered; and (3) the potential
implications for the international institutions. The next Deputies meeting will be scheduled for the week
following Thanksgiving. Papers should be circulated by Wednesday, November 23 if po
ssible so that deputies
can read them over the holiday. Please note that the lead drafter is responsible fo
r coordinating with the reviewing
agencies listed.

Each lead drafter is responsible for coordinating with the reviewing agencies l
isted below.

Paper Lead Drafter Reviewers

1. Post Chaos Fund Treasury
2. Education Treasury State/AID
3. Financial Markets Treasury NEC
4. New G-7 Financial Council NEC
5. Development Institutions Treasury NEC/State/AID
6. Environment OVP State
7. WTO USTR NEC
8. Labor State
9. AIDS State CEA
10. Technology CEA
11. Development -- health, hunger, (To be determined)
infrastructure, etc.

cc: Bo Cutter

MSMail

DATE-TIME	14 December 94 08:21
FROM	Baker, James E.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Schwartz, Eric P.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

Eric:

There is nothing attached?

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Baker, James E.; Beers, Rand R; Halperin, Morton H.; Kreczko, Alan J.; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED]hiv memo
Date: Tuesday, December 13, 1994 07:12 PM

<<Attached File: 8745.2>>

Enclosed is a revised version of the memo, for your comments/clearance. It reflects a new development that I learned of from Seth Waxman: the willingness of NGOs to sponsore the HIV positive refugees.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	14 December 94 08:22
FROM	Baker, James E.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Schwartz, Eric P.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

???

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Baker, James E.; Beers, Rand R; Halperin, Morton H.; Kreczko, Alan J.; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED]hiv memo
Date: Tuesday, December 13, 1994 07:12 PM

<<Attached File: 8745.2>>

Enclosed is a revised version of the memo, for your comments/clearance. It reflects a new development that I learned of from Seth Waxman: the willingness of NGOs to sponsore the HIV positive refugees.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Kathryn Mack to Eric Schwartz, re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Non-Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 605000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/08/1994 - 06/28/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2075

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Pat Battenfield to Martha Ramsay, re: President's Mtg w/President Mugbe of Zimbabwe (6 pages)	05/16/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Non-Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 605000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/08/1994 - 06/28/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2075

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

MSMail

DATE-TIME	06 June 95 18:15
FROM	Tyler, John T.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Danvers, William C.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[NEWBAD.DOC : 4650 in NEWBAD.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	6 June 95 16:52
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	NEWBAD.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 6, 1995

Administration Fights

American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

This week the House resumes debate on legislation that threatens America's ability t
o preserve our global

leadership and to safeguard the security and prosperity of the American people. H.R
. 1561, the "American
Overseas Interests Act of 1995," would limit the President's ability to respond to f
oreign threats and carry out
foreign policy. By slashing our budget for foreign affairs, it would deprive our na
tion of the resources
necessary to meet the challenges and seize the opportunities of the post-Cold War wo
rld. The bill would
undercut Administration efforts to streamline its foreign affairs agencies --where s
taff is already being cut by
4700 -- and would create new, inefficient layers of bureaucracy.

The Clinton Administration stands ready to work with Congress to craft a bill that t
he President can sign. But the
President -- in order to protect our nation and advance the interests of the America
n people and on the advice of
his senior foreign policy advisors -- will veto the bill as it now stands.

H.R. 1561 includes provisions that would, among other things:

ù Compel changes in our refugee and migration policy and restrict the President's a
bility to
respond to boat migration, which could precipitate a mass migration to the United S
tates and increase illegal
alien smuggling (Sections 2104/ 2252).

ù Obstruct our efforts to stop North Korea's nuclear program by blocking the release
of funds to implement the
Framework Agreement we secured with Pyongyang. The bill requires that cumbersome, u
nnecessary
Presidential Determinations and advance notification be provided to Congressional co
mmittees before the
release of funds (Section 2641-2645).

ù Derail our support for democratic reform in Russia and the other New Independent S
tates by undercutting
Presidential flexibility in promoting free market and democratic reform (Section 322

4).

ù Impair the President's ability to manage American relations with China by:

- Lifting current restraints on arms sales to Taiwan, which could destabilize U.S .-Chinese relations without enhancing Taiwan's long-term security (Section 260 1) .

- Requiring the President to appoint a Special Envoy to Tibet -- an action that w ould harm relations with China without improving the status of the Dali Lama or helping the Tibetan people (Section 2302).

ù Reduces funding for developing country debt reduction by 75%. If it were to becom e law, H.R. 1561 would force the United States to renege on its pledge to join other developed countries an d reduce by two thirds debts owed by the world's poorest, most indebted countries--many of them in Africa.

ù Stop, in any meaningful sense, American leadership in international organizations by placing restrictions on assistance to international organizations and our ability to meet certain internatio nal treaty obligations.

ù Numerous reductions in world-wide programs that would, for example: cut the Devel opment Fund for Africa by almost 25%, cut aid to Central and Eastern Europe by 32%, and reduce world-wide development assistance funding by 34% from the President's FY 1996 request.

ù Force the sacrifice of any aid that has been authorized but not spent, after three years. H.R. 1561 would return to the Treasury $2.1 billion in aid now in the "pipeline" that is being used by private, non-profit American organizations to provide direct services in developing countries. This wou ld include $250 million in assistance to Africa targeted to reduce infant mortality, improve basic education f

or girls and slow the spread
of AIDS. (Section 3286)

ù Require the President to give Congress 15 days notice before responding to "unanti
cipated contingencies" and
require that he determine that providing emergency assistance is in our "vital natio
nal interests." This would

hinder the President's ability to act rapidly and effectively in the face of a cri
sis (Section 3401-3403).

ù Require the President to establish an elaborate program to monitor the end use of
all military equipment and
technology transferred to our friends and allies and prevent their diversion to una
uthorized recipients It
provides no mechanism to fund or implement this scheme -- except to use borrowed wor
kers from the
Defense and Treasury Departments. (Section 3192).

ù Returns the U.S. to the Mexico City policy of denying funds to any international o
rganization --private or
public -- which receives funds from any source for abortion-related services, such a
s counseling. This
provision in the bill would deny funds for UNFPA so long as it continues to support
family planning
programs in China.

MSMail

DATE-TIME 07 June 95 08:54

FROM Jones, Steven R.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Bell, Robert G.

CARBON_COPY Sestak, Joseph A.

TEXT_BODY

Re: point 7. Given the Administration's position to make abortion "safe, legal, and rare," the HCONS bill could be viewed as "discriminatory." In actually practice, there would be little change. To my knowledge no abortion has been performed in an oversees military hospital since all military doctors there have refused to perform them.

From: Bell, Robert G.
To: Danvers, William C.; @NSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:52 PM

Re my read on the DoD auth bill as reported out by HCONS: It is not my prerogative to threaten the "v-word" (nor would I venture an opinion on it as a policy option in any discussions outside the White House) but I think that is where we should be postured vis-a-vis this terrible bill. In taking a "v-word" position on the bill I would recommend the Administration cite the following "top 10" deficiencies and misplaced priorities approved by the Republican majority on the committee:
1. authorizes $9.5 billion more than Administration (and Senate) believe appropriate for defense in FY96 (money that comes at expense of other national priorities in foreign and domestic accounts);
2. wastes hundreds of millions on unnecessary, high-priced weapons systems, including "Star Wars" and the B-2;
3. foolishly slashes Nunn-Lugar funding by one-third;
4. unconstitutionally infringes on President's authority to deploy US forces in support of UN peacekeeping;
5. unconstitutionally infringes on President's authority to conduct international negotiations (i.e., to negotiate an appropriate ABM/TMD demarcation agreement, as opposed to the one (and only one) demarcation the House seeks to impose unilaterally through this legislation;
6. micromanages Pentagon organization (bill mandates 25% personnel cut and elimination of various senior positions);
7. discriminates against female servicemembers/dependents (bill prohibits performance of abortion services in overseas military hospitals);

8. unwisely terminates program (TRP) that is crucial to our ability to remain competitive in defense technology and to encourage "dual-use" approach that will keep more companies in defense R&D and production business than otherwise would bethe case;
9. discriminates against certain service personnel (bill requires discharge of all those diagnosed as HIV-positive);
10. needlessly micromanages foreign policy matters (bill prohibits funds for US military to have contact with PRC military).
Taking a "v-word" posture on this bill is not without risks (e.g., it is the defense authorization bill (and not a CR) that provides the military an annual pay raise and that authorizes new-starts in MILCON), but I believe if we are to get the House majority's attention and make them understand the fun and games must end and that they MUST negotiate with us in conference, then we should be prepared to step up to this decision on this bill.,

---

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @NSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: FW: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:12 PM

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @up; @nsa
CC: Record; @legislat; fuerth; wise
Subject: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:07 PM

Note for Tony and Sandy:

On Bosnia, Tarnoff briefed the Senate Dem Caucus today. Understand it went well. SFRC (and Dole) staff briefed on op plan this afternoon. SASC and HCONS hearings tomorrow with Perry and Shali.

Hoyer still on track to offer his unilateral lift amendment.

Sandy Vershbow met with Rep. Armey today to give him an overview on Bosnia.

It went well.

Dole will introduce legislation soon that would authorize U.S. participation in the withdrawal of UNPROFOR but with strict conditions and unilateral lift on the other end.

HR 1561 comes up tomorrow. We will get a whip count at around one. We may need to ask you to make some calls to members to vote against the bill. I spoke to Rep. Neal and to Rep. McNulty's office about the bill. White House LA has been working it hard as well.

SFRC goes back to its mark up tomorrow. We have a copy of an en bloc amendment that we will get to directorates tomorrow.

DoD auth bill moves to the floor next week. We will hold an interagency conference call on how to work the bill in the House tomorrow morning. Problems with N-L funds and peacekeeping, among other things. We hope a SAP will be circulated by OMB tomorrow. Understand that DoD does not particularly like the bill. Unclear just how much. Bob Bell's office has a copy and is looking it over.

Terrorism bill should be finished by tomorrow morning. Only vote left will be habeus tomorrow. They then move to telecom bill.

We had an interagency leg meeting on the approps process this afternoon. Agencies will be making calls. We have asked you to make calls in a separate E-Mail.

Meeting with Kennedy staff on Cuban Adjustment Act. Meeting went well. Looks like we have come to an understanding with Kennedy and he will try to help. We told him that we are opposed to repeal but gave him language in case they do repeal the overall act, we can protect our equities.

MSMail

DATE-TIME 07 June 95 10:27

FROM Stern, Jessica E.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Bell, Robert G.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

great adverbs. like them verbs, too!

From: Bell, Robert G.
To: Danvers, William C.; @NSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:52 PM

Re my read on the DoD auth bill as reported out by HCONS: It is not my prerogative to threaten the "v-word" (nor would I venture an opinion on it as a policy option in any discussions outside the White House) but I think that is where we should be postured vis-a-vis this terrible bill. In taking a "v-word" position on the bill I would recommend the Administration cite the following "top 10" deficiencies and misplaced priorities approved by the Republican majority on the committee:
1. authorizes $9.5 billion more than Administration (and Senate) believe appropriate for defense in FY96 (money that comes at expense of other national priorities in foreign and domestic accounts);
2. wastes hundreds of millions on unnecessary, high-priced weapons systems, including "Star Wars" and the B-2;
3. foolishly slashes Nunn-Lugar funding by one-third;
4. unconstitutionally infringes on President's authority to deploy US forces in support of UN peacekeeping;
5. unconstitutionally infringes on President's authority to conduct international negotiations (i.e., to negotiate an appropriate ABM/TMD demarcation agreement, as opposed to the one (and only one) demarcation the House seeks to impose unilaterally through this legislation;
6. micromanages Pentagon organization (bill mandates 25% personnel cut and elimination of various senior positions);
7. discriminates against female servicemembers/dependents (bill prohibits performance of abortion services in overseas military hospitals);
8. unwisely terminates program (TRP) that is crucial to our ability to remain competitive in defense technology and to encourage "dual-use" approach that will keep more companies in defense R&D and production business than otherwise would bethe case;

9. discriminates against certain service personnel (bill requires discharge of all those diagnosed as HIV-positive);
10. needlessly micromanages foreign policy matters (bill prohibits funds for US military to have contact with PRC military).

Taking a "v-word" posture on this bill is not without risks (e.g., it is the defense authorization bill (and not a CR) that provides the military an annual pay raise and that authorizes new-starts in MILCON), but I believe if we are to get the House majority's attention and make them understand the fun and games must end and that they MUST negotiate with us in conference, then we should be prepared to step up to this decision on this bill.,

---

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @NSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: FW: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:12 PM

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @up; @nsa
CC: Record; @legislat; fuerth; wise
Subject: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:07 PM

Note for Tony and Sandy:

On Bosnia, Tarnoff briefed the Senate Dem Caucus today. Understand it went well. SFRC (and Dole) staff briefed on op plan this afternoon. SASC and HCONS hearings tomorrow with Perry and Shali.

Hoyer still on track to offer his unilateral lift amendment.

Sandy Vershbow met with Rep. Armey today to give him an overview on Bosnia.

It went well.

Dole will introduce legislation soon that would authorize U.S. participation in the withdrawal of UNPROFOR but with strict conditions and unilateral lift on the other end.

HR 1561 comes up tomorrow. We will get a whip count at around one. We may need to ask you to make some calls to members to vote against the bill. I spoke to Rep. Neal and to Rep. McNulty's office about the bill. White House LA has been working it hard as well.

SFRC goes back to its mark up tomorrow. We have a copy of an en bloc amendment that we will get to directorates tomorrow.

DoD auth bill moves to the floor next week. We will hold an interagency conference call on how to work the bill in the House tomorrow morning. Problems with N-L funds and peacekeeping, among other things. We hope a SAP will be circulated by OMB tomorrow. Understand that DoD does not particularly like the bill. Unclear just how much. Bob Bell's office has a copy and is looking it over.

Terrorism bill should be finished by tomorrow morning. Only vote left will be habeus tomorrow. They then move to telecom bill.

We had an interagency leg meeting on the approps process this afternoon. Agencies will be making calls. We have asked you to make calls in a separate E-Mail.

Meeting with Kennedy staff on Cuban Adjustment Act. Meeting went well. Looks like we have come to an understanding with Kennedy and he will try to help. We told him that we are opposed to repeal but gave him language in case they do repeal the overall act, we can protect our equities.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	07 June 95 17:39
FROM	Fetig, James L.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Final: Newbad [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Wozniak, Natalie S.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	[[NEWBAD.DOC : 4371 in NEWBAD.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	7 June 95 17:30
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	NEWBAD.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 7, 1995

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

A Threat to American Leadership:
American Overseas Interests Act of 1995 (H.R. 1561)

The House today resumed debate on legislation that threatens America's ability to pr
eserve our global leadership
and to safeguard the security and prosperity of the American people. H.R. 1561, the

"American Overseas
Interests Act of 1995," would limit the President's ability to respond to foreign th
reats and carry out foreign
policy. By slashing our budget for foreign affairs, it would deprive our nation of
the resources necessary to meet
the challenges and seize the opportunities of the post-Cold War world. The bill wo
uld undercut Administration
efforts to streamline its foreign affairs agencies --where staff is already being cu
t by 4700 -- and would create
new, inefficient layers of bureaucracy.

The Clinton Administration stands ready to work with Congress to craft a bill that t
he President can sign. But the
President -- in order to protect our nation and advance the interests of the America
n people and on the advice of
his senior foreign policy advisors -- will veto the bill as it now stands.

H.R. 1561 includes provisions that would, among other things:

ù Compel changes in our refugee and migration policy and restrict the President's ab
ility to
respond to boat migration, which could precipitate a mass migration to the United S
tates and increase illegal
alien smuggling (Sections 2104/ 2252).

ù Obstruct our efforts to stop North Korea's nuclear program by potentially blocking
the release of funds to
implement the Framework Agreement we secured with Pyongyang. The bill requires that
cumbersome,
unnecessary Presidential Determinations and advance notification be provided to Cong
ressional committees
before the release of funds (Section 2641-2645).

ù Derail our support for democratic reform in Russia and the other New Independent S
tates by undercutting
Presidential flexibility in promoting free market and democratic reform (Section 322
4).

ù Impair the President's ability to manage American relations with China by:

- Lifting current restraints on arms sales to Taiwan, which could destabilize U.S .-Chinese relations without enhancing Taiwan's long-term security (Section 260 1) .

- Requiring the President to appoint a Special Envoy to Tibet -- an action that w ould harm relations with China without improving the status of the Dalai Lama or helping the Tibetan people (Section 2302).

- more -
ù

ù Reduce funding for developing country debt reduction by 75%. If it were to become law, H.R. 1561 would
force the United States to renege on its pledge to join other developed countries an d reduce by two thirds
debts owed by the world's poorest, most indebted countries--many of them in Africa.

ù Stop, in any meaningful sense, American leadership in international organizations by placing restrictions on
assistance to international organizations and our ability to meet certain internatio nal treaty obligations.

ù Potentially cripple world-wide development programs by cutting the Development Fun d for Africa by almost
25%, cutting aid to Central and Eastern Europe by 32%, and reducing world-wide devel opment assistance
funding by 34% below the President's FY 1996 request.

ù Force the sacrifice of any aid that has been authorized but not spent, after three years. H.R. 1561 would
return to the Treasury $2.1 billion in aid now in the "pipeline" that is being used by private, non-profit
American organizations to provide direct services in developing countries. This wou

ld include $250 million in
assistance to Africa targeted to reduce infant mortality, improve basic education fo
r girls and slow the spread
of AIDS. (Section 3286)

ù Require the President to give Congress 15 days notice before responding to "unanti
cipated contingencies" and
require that he determine that providing emergency assistance is in our "vital natio
nal interests." This would
hinder the President's ability to act rapidly and effectively in the face of a cri
sis (Section 3401-3403).

ù Require the President to establish an elaborate program to monitor the end use of
all military equipment and
technology transferred to our friends and allies and prevent their diversion to unau
thorized recipients It
provides no mechanism to fund or implement this scheme -- except to use borrowed wor
kers from the
Defense and Treasury Departments. (Section 3192).

ù Cut almost a billion dollars from our support for the multilateral development ban
ks and other international
lending institutions, the activities of which created nearly $5 billion in jobs and
exports for U.S. firms in the
past two years.

# # #

MSMail

DATE-TIME	07 June 95 19:47
FROM	Boorstin, Robert O.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Bell, Robert G.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

That is one impressive list. Would make a great veto threat statement.

From: Bell, Robert G.
To: Danvers, William C.; @NSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: RE: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:52 PM

Re my read on the DoD auth bill as reported out by HCONS: It is not my prerogative to threaten the "v-word" (nor would I venture an opinion on it as a policy option in any discussions outside the White House) but I think that is where we should be postured vis-a-vis this terrible bill. In taking a "v-word" position on the bill I would recommend the Administration cite the following "top 10" deficiencies and misplaced priorities approved by the Republican majority on the committee:
1. authorizes $9.5 billion more than Administration (and Senate) believe appropriate for defense in FY96 (money that comes at expense of other national priorities in foreign and domestic accounts);
2. wastes hundreds of millions on unnecessary, high-priced weapons systems, including "Star Wars" and the B-2;
3. foolishly slashes Nunn-Lugar funding by one-third;
4. unconstitutionally infringes on President's authority to deploy US forces in support of UN peacekeeping;
5. unconstitutionally infringes on President's authority to conduct international negotiations (i.e., to negotiate an appropriate ABM/TMD demarcation agreement, as opposed to the one (and only one) demarcation the House seeks to impose unilaterally through this legislation;
6. micromanages Pentagon organization (bill mandates 25% personnel cut and elimination of various senior positions);
7. discriminates against female servicemembers/dependents (bill prohibits performance of abortion services in overseas military hospitals);
8. unwisely terminates program (TRP) that is crucial to our ability to remain competitive in defense technology and to encourage "dual-use" approach that will keep more companies in defense R&D and production business than otherwise would bethe case;

9. discriminates against certain service personnel (bill requires discharge of all those diagnosed as HIV-positive);
10. needlessly micromanages foreign policy matters (bill prohibits funds for US military to have contact with PRC military).

Taking a "v-word" posture on this bill is not without risks (e.g., it is the defense authorization bill (and not a CR) that provides the military an annual pay raise and that authorizes new-starts in MILCON), but I believe if we are to get the House majority's attention and make them understand the fun and games must end and that they MUST negotiate with us in conference, then we should be prepared to step up to this decision on this bill.,

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @NSC - NSC Staff; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1; @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
Subject: FW: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:12 PM

From: Danvers, William C.
To: @up; @nsa
CC: Record; @legislat; fuerth; wise
Subject: Legislative Update [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, June 06, 1995 08:07 PM

Note for Tony and Sandy:

On Bosnia, Tarnoff briefed the Senate Dem Caucus today. Understand it went well. SFRC (and Dole) staff briefed on op plan this afternoon. SASC and HCONS hearings tomorrow with Perry and Shali.

Hoyer still on track to offer his unilateral lift amendment.

Sandy Vershbow met with Rep. Armey today to give him an overview on Bosnia.

It went well.

Dole will introduce legislation soon that would authorize U.S. participation in the withdrawal of UNPROFOR but with strict conditions and unilateral lift on the other end.

HR 1561 comes up tomorrow. We will get a whip count at around one. We may need to ask you to make some calls to members to vote against the bill. I spoke to Rep. Neal and to Rep. McNulty's office about the bill. White House LA has been working it hard as well.

SFRC goes back to its mark up tomorrow. We have a copy of an en bloc amendment that we will get to directorates tomorrow.

DoD auth bill moves to the floor next week. We will hold an interagency conference call on how to work the bill in the House tomorrow morning. Problems with N-L funds and peacekeeping, among other things. We hope a SAP will be circulated by OMB tomorrow. Understand that DoD does not particularly like the bill. Unclear just how much. Bob Bell's office has a copy and is looking it over.

Terrorism bill should be finished by tomorrow morning. Only vote left will be habeus tomorrow. They then move to telecom bill.

We had an interagency leg meeting on the approps process this afternoon. Agencies will be making calls. We have asked you to make calls in a separate E-Mail.

Meeting with Kennedy staff on Cuban Adjustment Act. Meeting went well. Looks like we have come to an understanding with Kennedy and he will try to help. We told him that we are opposed to repeal but gave him language in case they do repeal the overall act, we can protect our equities.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Robert Suttinger to Eric Schwartz, re: YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE, ASAP (7 pages)	06/25/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Non-Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 605000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/08/1994 - 06/28/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2075

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

MSMail

DATE-TIME	27 June 95 09:13
FROM	Blinken, Antony J.
CLASSIFICATION	******** CLASSIFICATION NOT FOUND ********
SUBJECT	FW: africa
TO	Benjamin, Daniel
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

dan -- voila

From: Rice, Susan E.
To: Blinken, Antony J.
CC: /R, Record at A1; @AFRICA - African Affairs
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED]TRansAfrica
Date: Monday, June 26, 1995 07:09 PM

[[TLSPEECH.DOC : 2396 in TLSPEECH.DOC]]

Hope this is something you can work with. Many thanks.

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	26 June 95 19:8
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLSPEECH.DOC

Thank you Randall and thank you for pulling together such an impressive group of Ame
ricans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with such a distinguished group of peo
ple who care so deeply about
Africa, a place that captured my heart three decades ago.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and right here in America. Almost two
-thirds of Africa has moved
squarely to democracy, transparency, and free-market economies. American leadership
and assistance has played
a major role in that effort. But our success in continuing to help Africa move

forw
ard is in danger. Foreign
assistance is under attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right. A
nd, as a result, American
leadership is at risk.

African countries that are walking bravely along the path of democracy and free-mark
et reform are asking why the
United States is retrenching at exactly the time they are doing what we have asked o
f them for decades. When I
traveled to nine African states last December, presidents, opposition leaders and in
dividuals from all walks of civil
society told me that the people of Africa do not want our charity. They want a part
nership -- a partnership in
peace, democracy, and economic growth. American economic assistance through a range
of international
programs is an absolutely critical link in that partnership.

Foreign assistance is spent not out of the goodness of our hearts, but out of the co
nviction that we can and we
must protect and advance our own vital interests. And the return on our investment
-- in terms of increased
security and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial.
This Administration recognizes that, as we struggle to reduce the federal deficit, f
oreign assistance too must
decline. Yet, the President and I believe that, by combining our efforts through fo
rums such as this one, we
can minimize the damage and hence the impact of these cuts on our ability to play a
leadership role in world
affairs. As you know, the House [yesterday] voted to cut development assistance to
Africa by a full one-third
-- while assistance to other parts of the world will decline by only 10-to-17 percen
t. This disproportionate hit for
Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise.

The American people want to know how we are going to pursue our national interests.
They want to know how
we are going to sustain economic growth and prosperity in a dynamic global economy.
They want to know how

we are going to protect them against terrorism, narcotics, new and dangerous disease
s and environmental disasters
such as global warming and the loss of biodiversity. They want to know how we are g
oing to exercise our
international stewardship as the only superpower by accomplishing more with less as
we seek to reduce our
deficit. Sustaining engagement in Africa is an important part of the answer to thes
e questions.

Too many people see Africa as an easy target from which to cut our assistance. Dras
tically reducing our modest
support reminds me of an old adage: You will reap what you sow. And ladies and gent
lemen, the American public
will not be pleased with the results of such significant cuts to Africa.

Let me tell you what cuts of this magnitude will mean for Africa: Four million chil
dren will not be inoculated
against infectious disease and many of them will die. Nearly 100,000 children will
die from lack of oral
rehydration therapy. And our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV may be el
iminated. These are just a
few examples of what these cuts will mean for Africa.

The nearly 700 million people who live south of the Sahara make up one of the larges
t potential markets in the
world. And Africa's wealth of resources -- from oil and uranium to cocoa and coffee
-- are in great demand here
in America. Yet we have barely begun to tap the continent's potential.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- a full 22-percent more than our exports to all of the former
Soviet Union combined. More than 80,000 American jobs depend on exports to Africa.
And for every $1 billion
increase in exports, we can expect to add an estimated 19,000 additional jobs. But

exports are still no where near
what's possible. They can be vastly increased -- provided we continue to help stabi
lity take hold and democracy

take root throughout the continent. As the Corporate Council on Africa
concluded, t
he United States government
should maintain consistent and coherent policies toward Africa which
aggressively pr
omote increased trade and
investment.

Even more important than exports are investments, for they are the true engine of
ec
onomic growth and job
creation for any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free
markets, W
ashington should
pursue long-term policies that will energize the American and African private
sector
s to expand investments in the
vast potential market that Africa represents. With U.S. investment, exports in sect
ors like capital goods, high
technology and services where we are extremely competitive will follow. These
inves
tments are inextricably
linked to job creation here in this country. As Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown
sta
ted plainly at last month's
African-African American Summit in Dakar -- America will not play second to
anyone i
n this arena.

Through the Commerce Department's promotional programs and the partnership
of EXIM b
ank, OPIC, and TDA
the United States plays a catalytic role in encouraging American investment and
trad
e with Africa. What has
worked in East Asia will also work in Africa -- but only if we sustain our
engagemen
t with that continent. It will
not happen, if we withdraw as the neo-isolationists demand.

U.S. economic interests in Africa are matched by a broad array of security and
human
itarian concerns. We can
hardly be indifferent to a continent to which so many American trace their roots.
But the plain truth is that
nurturing Africa's tremendous economic potential, and helping it contend with its
in
ternal problems, are in
America's interest.

If we walk away from the challenges and opportunities Africa presents, we will be do
ing ourselves a grave
disservice. Sudan, for example, has worked its way into the major leagues of countr
ies supporting and
exporting terrorism. It poses a direct threat to our interests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40 percent of the heroin
that enters the United States passes through that nation. The problems that plague

many African countries today
-- such as overpopulation, disease and environmental decay -- could well exacerbate
the world's problems
tomorrow.

The small fraction of our foreign policy budget that we devote to Africa -- which is
only one-half of one-tenth of
one-percent of the federal budget-- can help to contain such global problems and eve
n turn some of them around.
These funds are crucial to sustaining the remarkable progress toward development and
democracy that so many
nations in Africa have already achieved. And it can help prevent and resolve region
al conflicts before they
become major disasters whose cost -- in both human and financial terms -- is exponen
tially greater than the costs
of preventive action.

Conflict prevention and economic partnership don't materialize out of thin air. The
y must be preceded and
buttressed by aggressive efforts to promote sustainable development, which is what t
he Development Fund for
Africa is all about.

Let me tell you about just about just a few of the ways our foreign assistance has m
ade a measurable impact: Over
the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates in the developing world have bee
n reduced by 50 percent, and
global health conditions have improved more during this period than in all of human

history. Life expectancy in
the developing world has increased by nearly 33 percent, and the percentage of rural
families with access to safe
water has risen from less than 10 percent to almost 60 percent. Smallpox has been e
radicated worldwide.
Whereas in 1980, only 20 percent of the world's children were immunized, today 80 pe
rcent are. In the past 20
years, the number of the world's chronically undernourished has been reduced by 50 p
ercent. Literacy rates are
up 33 percent worldwide in the last 25 years, and primary school enrollment has trip
led in that period. And
average real incomes since World War II have doubled in the developing world and the
global economy has
grown from \$3.4 trillion in 1946 to \$23.3 trillion today. These tremendous achievem
ents are due in large part to
American innovation, American technical expertise and American resources.

U.S. foreign assistance in Africa, by and large, has had a record of success. In Gh ana, for example, U.S.
programs to remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investment code resulted in
a 73-percent increase in
American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone. In the last decade, American assistan
ce has fostered the opening
of stock markets in Botswana, Mauritius, Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya. USAID democr
atization programs
played an important role in South Africa's historic elections last April and in Moza
mbique in November --
educating voters, election officials, and the media. In education, U.S. assistance to Guinea has increased school
attendance by 43-percent, helped train 7,000 teachers and build 1,900 new classrooms
. In sustainable food
production, AID programs in Malawi have opened up private markets to small-holder fa
rmers increasing annual
income for 20,000 people from \$200 to \$700 per year.

AID is also the world's preeminent donor in family planning in Africa. Funding cuts

would wipe out much of the
progress made in slowing Africa's high population growth rates. We risk losing
the
successes achieved in such
places as Kenya, Zimbabwe, Ghana and Tanzania, since other donors are unlikely
to ju
mp in to fill the breach. If
Africa's population growth rates are not slowed, all other development advances
will
be undermined. This in turn
will lead to increased disease, malnutrition, environmental degradation and
increase
d political instability as too many
people compete for too few resources.

As painful as these cuts to the DFA may be, it appears the Congressional budget
ax m
ay fall hardest on the little
known lending window of the World Bank known as the International
Development Associ
ation -- or IDA. IDA is
essential. It is the seed money for capitalism. It is the concessional lending fac
ility available to the poorest of the
reforming countries whose economic progress is still too fragile to allow them to
qu
alify for commercial loans.
For these poor countries poised to make the transition to long-term growth, IDA
is t
he life-jacket that keeps them
afloat.
And without it, the poorest countries of the world would lose their major source
of
external finance, and the United
States would in turn lose our most influential means of spurring economic reform
and
opening new markets.
Begun under the Eisenhower administration, IDA directly reduces trade and
investment
barriers, expands the

import capacity of countries and provides new opportunities for the American
private
sector. Almost half of IDA
support goes to Africa with total global commitments next year projected at $3.9
bil
lion.

IDA is also cost effective. For every dollar the U.S. contributes, IDA lends $6, an
d current repayments on past
credits now finance 18-percent of new lending. Other donors are not likely to

compe
nsate for a reduction in
American support. Instead, they may establish procedures that restrict
procurement
by U.S. firms or shift their
resources into bilateral programs where assistance is tied and less emphasis is
plac
ed on privatization and other
market reforms.

In the medium to long-term, sharp cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for
U.S. b
usiness and U.S. exports. The
20 countries that have successfully graduated from IDA together purchased $42
billi
on in U.S. exports in 1993.
U.S. exports to current IDA borrowers rose from $14.5 billion in 1988 to $20.3
billi
on in 1993. In the 19
sub-Saharan African countries with IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP
grew by 4.
5 percent. The
remaining countries recorded a decline.

The Economic Structural Assistance Fund is another important lending window
vulnerab
le to the budget ax. It is
run by the IMF and provides concessional loans for countries willing to
undertake st
rong economic stabilization
programs that are jointly designed by the IMF and the World Bank.

Also on the chopping block is the African Development Foundation. This small,
innov
ative organization with an
annual budget of only $17 million plays an independent yet complementary role
to tha
t of AID in supporting local
self-help and community development activities at comparativ4ely low-cost.
Unfortu
nately, many in Congress
hope to zero it out in just two short years.

The many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as U.S. indebtedness
moun
ts. UN agencies play a
critical role and are a proven means of promoting sustainable development in
Africa.
UNHCR, UNDP,
UNICEF, WFP and WHO operate on the front-lines in the international effort to

heal s
uffering in Africa and help its
people progress. UN peacekeeping is yet another important burden-sharing tool
that
Congress must not discard,
because it often enables us to assist in resolving destabilizing regional conflicts
without committing U.S. forces or
bearing the entire bill.

In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that prevention is far le
ss expensive than reacting to
crises after prevention has failed. When the all-seeing eye of CNN finds real
suffe
ring abroad, Americans want
their government to act -- as they should, and we should. But funding a large-
scale
humanitarian effort after a
tragedy costs many times more than the investment in prevention. By looking and
act
ing ahead, we can protect
lives, defend our interest and save money.

We must continue to bear the burden of leadership because it is in our interest to
d
o so. We know from our own
experience that democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to
which p
eople all over the world
aspire: security, freedom and prosperity. We can and we should help them share
in
the benefits of our
knowledge and experience.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and
Africa
must be a integral part of that
focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House
Conference
on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. It is why Commeerce Secretary
Ron
Brown has made an historic 3
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent
wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts to a range of international programs
that
benefit Africa will undermine
our ability to promote sustainable development, spur U.S. exports and prevent
deadly

conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed draconian cuts in
fore
ign assistance. We welcome
your efforts to raise awareness of the importance of sustained assistance to Africa

and, on behalf of the President,
I applaud you for this effort.

Thank you.

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 09:48
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	TRANSAFRICA [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Rice, Susan E.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	

Susan--

Can you give this one quick read-through? If you could supply the group name for the header and answer or confirm the phrasing on the one or two cks, I'll send it to TL.
[[TLAFRIC.DOC : 2394 in TLAFRIC.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 9:46
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC.DOC

6/28/95 10 a.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO TKWHO
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have
moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and

assistan
ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by
new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The return on our in
vestment -- in increased security
and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

But this Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal defi
cit, foreign assistance must also
be reduced. There is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Develo
pment Fund for Africa by
fully one-third -- while assistance to other parts of the world will only be reduced roughly half as much.
Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come b
ack to haunt us. They will
erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American

workers.
They will undercut our
ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine our efforts to prevent humanitarian crises
before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise one of the great emerging markets in the world. And Africa's wealth
of resources -- from oil
and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we
have barely begun to tap
the continent's potential.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 Americ
an jobs depend on those
exports. Those numbers -- which exceed the figures for exports to the former Soviet
Union by nearly a quarter
-- can be vastly increased. But to do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root
throughout the continent. As the Corporate Council on Africa concluded, the United
States government should
maintain policies toward Africa that aggressively promote trade and investment.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld pursue policies that
will encourage American investment in Africa and strengthen the continent's private
sector. U.S. investment will
spur demand for American exports in areas such as capital goods, high-tech and servi
ces -- and create good,
high-wage jobs. As Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown said at last month's African-Afr
ican American Summit
in Dakar -- [America will not play second to anyone in this arena.] exact quote tk.

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM
bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration been a catalyst in encouraging
American trade
and investment with
Africa. What has worked in East Asia will also work in Africa -- but only if we
sta
y engaged. It will not happen

if the neo-isolationists get their way.

Our economic interests in Africa are matched by a broad array of security and
humani
tarian concerns. We could
hardly be indifferent to a continent to which so many American trace their roots.
B
ut the plain truth is that helping
Africa contend with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous
eco
nomic potential -- is in
America's interest.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away
from.
Sudan, for example, has
worked its way into the big leagues of countries that support terrorism. It poses a
direct threat to our interests. Or
take Nigeria -- some 40 percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes t
hrough that nation. Left
unchecked, the problems that plague many African countries today --
overpopulation,
disease and environmental
decay -- could overflow borders and be the world's problems tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-
hundred
th of one percent of the
Federal budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them
around.
Resources such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for sustaining the remarkable progress
that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. The Fund promotes sustainable development on a broad front --
developmen
t that is essential to
preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has made a difference in Africa and
throughout the developing
world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates have been reduced in half
.
ù Life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù Today 80% of the world's children are immunized -- up from only 20% in 1980.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished has been ha
lved.
ù And average real incomes have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations after another, U.S. foreign assistance in recent y
ears has established a solid
record of success. For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance over the last decade has fostered the opening of stock markets in B
otswana, Mauritius,
Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which resulted
in a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.
ù Our work in Guinea has helped increase school attendance by 43-percent -- training
7,000 teachers and
building 1,900 new classrooms.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the House cuts
in our foreign policy spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV may be eliminated.

ù Declining population growth rates in many countries -- a key to stable development
-- could shoot back up.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. It may fall ha
rdest on our contribution to the
World Bank's International Development Association. The IDA is essential -- it is t
he seed money for capitalism. It
provides loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fr
agile to qualify for commercial
loans. Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make th
e transition to long-term
growth, IDA is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

IDA is also cost effective. For every dollar the U.S. contributes, other nations do
nate five. (ck) Other donors are
not likely to compensate for a reduction in American support. Instead, they may est
ablish procedures restricting
procurement from U.S. firms. Or these countries may shift their resources into bilat
eral programs where
assistance is tied and there is less emphasis on privatization and other market refo
rms.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in

U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP grew by 4.5 percent WHEN.

Another appropriation on the chopping block is the African Development Foundation.
This small, innovative
organization with an annual budget of only $17 million supports local self-help and
community development
activities at low-cost. Unfortunately, many in Congress hope to zero it out in ju
st two short years.

Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S. contrib
utions. The UN High
Commission on Refugees, the UN Development Program and UNICEF operate on the front-l
ines to improve the
health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward. UN peacekeeping is another t
ool that Congress must not
discard: it enables us to assist in resolving destabilizing regional conflicts witho
ut committing U.S. forces or
bearing the entire bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention we can pay
now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck. When
the all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their governme
nt to act -- as they should,
and we should. But looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our inter
ests and save money. Nickel
and dime policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from o
ur own experience that
democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over t

he world aspire: security,
freedom and prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free mar
kets, America
becomes more secure, more free and eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be a central part of that
focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House Conference
on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to raise awareness of the importance of sustained assistance to Africa and, on behal
f of the President, I applaud
you for this effort.

Thank you.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 10:35
FROM	Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	Africa speech[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Bass, Peter E. Cicio, Kristen K. Emery, Mary C. Hall, Wilma G. Veit, Katherine M.
CARBON_COPY	NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY	Here are the remarks for tomorrow. Please pass to TL. [[TLAFRIC.DOC : 2604 in TLAFRIC.DOC]]
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 10:31
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	TLAFRIC.DOC

6/28/95 10 a.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third
s of Africa's nations have

moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistan
ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by
new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The return on our in
vestment -- in increased security
and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

But this Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal defi
cit, foreign assistance must also
be reduced. There is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Develo
pment Fund for Africa by
fully one-third -- while assistance to other parts of the world will only be reduced roughly half as much.
Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come b
ack to haunt us. They will

erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers.
They will undercut our
ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine our efforts to prevent humanitarian crises
before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise one of the great emerging markets in the world. And Africa's wealth
of resources -- from oil
and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we
have barely begun to tap
the continent's potential.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 Americ
an jobs depend on them. The
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can
be vastly increased. But to
do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root througho
ut the continent. As the
Corporate Council on Africa concluded, the United States government should maintain
policies toward Africa that
aggressively promote trade and investment.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld pursue policies that
will encourage American investment in Africa and strengthen the continent's private
sector. U.S. investment will
spur demand for American exports in areas such as capital goods, high-tech and servi
ces -- and create good,
high-wage jobs. As Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown said at last month's African-Afr
ican American Summit
in Dakar, "The United States no longer concedes Africa's markets to European supplie

rs."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration been a catalyst in encouraging American trade
and investment with
Africa. We must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia will also wor
k in Africa -- but only if

we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists get their way.

Our economic interests in Africa are matched by a broad array of security and humani
tarian concerns. We could
hardly be indifferent to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. B
ut the plain truth is that helping
Africa contend with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous eco
nomic potential -- is in
America's interest.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
Sudan, for example, has
worked its way into the big leagues of countries that support international terroris
m. It poses a direct threat to our
interests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40 percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that
nation. Left unchecked, the problems that plague many African countries today -- ov
erpopulation, disease and
environmental decay -- could overflow borders and be the world's problems tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for sustaining the remarkable progress that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. The DFA along with the African Development Foundation promote

sustainabl
e development on a broad
front -- development that is essential to preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has made a difference in Africa and
throughout the developing
world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates have been reduced in half
.
ù Life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù Today 80% of the world's children are immunized -- up from only 20% in 1980.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished has been ha
lved.
ù And average real incomes have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations after another, U.S. foreign assistance in recent y
ears has established a solid
record of success. For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance over the last decade has fostered the opening of stock markets in B
otswana, Mauritius,
Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which resulted
in a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.
ù Our work in Guinea has helped increase school attendance by 43-percent -- training
7,000 teachers and
building 1,900 new classrooms.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the House cuts
in our foreign policy spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and

many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV may be eliminated.
ù Declining population growth rates in many countries -- a key to stable development
-- could shoot back up.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. It may fall ha
rdest on our contribution to the
World Bank's International Development Association. The IDA is essential -- it is t
he seed money for capitalism. It
provides loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fr
agile to qualify for commercial
loans. Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make th
e transition to long-term
growth, IDA is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

IDA is also cost effective. For every dollar the U.S. contributes, other nations do
nate five. (ck) Other donors are
not likely to compensate for a reduction in American support. Instead, they may est
ablish procedures restricting
procurement from U.S. firms. Or these countries may shift their resources into bilat
eral programs where
assistance is tied and there is less emphasis on privatization and other market refo
rms.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.(ck)

Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S. contrib
utions. The UN High
Commission on Refugees, the UN Development Program and UNICEF operate on the front-l
ines to improve the
health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward. UN peacekeeping is another
tool that Congress must not
discard: it enables us to assist in resolving destabilizing regional conflicts witho
ut committing U.S. forces or
bearing the entire bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention we can pay
now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops af
ter tragedy has struck. When
the all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their governme
nt to act -- as they should,
and we should. But looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our inter
ests and save money. Nickel
and dime policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from o
ur own experience that
democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all over t
he world aspire: security,
freedom and prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and free mar
kets, America
becomes more secure, more free and eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and Africa
must be a central part of that
focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House Conference
on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to raise awareness of the importance of sustained assistance to Africa and, on behal
f of the President, I applaud
you for this effort.

Thank you.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME 28 June 95 11:10

FROM Halperin, Morton H.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: TL's Africa Remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Kammerer, Kelly C.
Tyler, John T.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

I will try to get to Mort but do you have any comments?

From: Benjamin, Daniel
To: Clarke, Richard A.; Danvers, William C.; Halperin, Morton H.; McCormick, Shawn H.; Rice, Susan E.; Simon, Steven N.; Walsh, Helen C.; Soderberg, Nancy E.
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1
Subject: TL's Africa Remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, June 28, 1995 10:34 AM

[[TLAFRIC.DOC : 2897 in TLAFRIC.DOC]]

Attached are remarks that Tony Lake will deliver tomorrow at a roundtable at Transafrica. Please review them asap and e-mail or call me (6-9179) with comments and changes. Thanks.

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 28 June 95 10:31

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME TLAFRIC.DOC

6/28/95 10 a.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so
dee
ply about Africa, a place that
captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young
foreign s
ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-
third
s of Africa's nations have
moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and
assistan
ce has played a major role
in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig
n assistance is under attack by
new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at
risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic
reform
are asking why the United
States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are
doing what we have asked of
them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December,
presidents,
opposition leaders and
individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want
our
charity. They want a
partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S.
e
conomic assistance is a
vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the
g
oodness of our hearts, but
out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The return on our in
vestment -- in increased security
and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation
must
be engaged. Your presence
here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to
ma
intaining the involvement
abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

But this Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal defi cit, foreign assistance must also
be reduced. There is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Develo pment Fund for Africa by
fully one-third -- while assistance to other parts of the world will only be reduced roughly half as much.
Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come b ack to haunt us. They will
erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers.
They will undercut our
ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine our efforts to prevent humanitarian crises
before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million p eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise one of the great emerging markets in the world. And Africa's wealth
of resources -- from oil
and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we
have barely begun to tap
the continent's potential.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 Americ an jobs depend on them. The
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can
be vastly increased. But to
do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root througho ut the continent. As the
Corporate Council on Africa concluded, the United States government should maintain
policies toward Africa that
aggressively promote trade and investment.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho uld pursue policies that

will encourage American investment in Africa and strengthen the continent's
private
sector. U.S. investment will
spur demand for American exports in areas such as capital goods, high-tech and
servi
ces -- and create good,
high-wage jobs. As Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown said at last month's
African-Afr
ican American Summit
in Dakar, "The United States no longer concedes Africa's markets to European
supplie
rs."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM
bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration been a catalyst in encouraging
American trade
and investment with
Africa. We must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia will also
wor
k in Africa -- but only if

we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists get their way.

Our economic interests in Africa are matched by a broad array of security and
humani
tarian concerns. We could
hardly be indifferent to a continent to which so many American trace their roots.
B
ut the plain truth is that helping
Africa contend with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous
eco
nomic potential -- is in
America's interest.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away
from.
Sudan, for example, has
worked its way into the big leagues of countries that support international terroris
m. It poses a direct threat to our
interests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40 percent of the heroin that enters the United
States passes through that
nation. Left unchecked, the problems that plague many African countries today --
ov
erpopulation, disease and
environmental decay -- could overflow borders and be the world's problems
tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth

o
f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around.
Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for sustaining the remarkable progress
that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. The DFA along with the African Development Foundation promote
sustainabl
e development on a broad
front -- development that is essential to preventing the conflicts that explode into
tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has made a difference in Africa
and
throughout the developing
world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates have been reduced in
half
.
ù Life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù Today 80% of the world's children are immunized -- up from only 20% in
1980.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished has
been ha
lved.
ù And average real incomes have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations after another, U.S. foreign assistance in recent
y
ears has established a solid
record of success. For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's
historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the
med
ia.
ù Our assistance over the last decade has fostered the opening of stock markets in
B
otswana, Mauritius,
Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the
investme
nt code, which resulted

in a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.
ù Our work in Guinea has helped increase school attendance by 43-percent -- training
7,000 teachers and
building 1,900 new classrooms.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the House cuts
in our foreign policy spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV may be eliminated.
ù Declining population growth rates in many countries -- a key to stable development
-- could shoot back up.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. It may fall ha
rdest on our contribution to the
World Bank's International Development Association. The IDA is essential -- it is t
he seed money for capitalism. It
provides loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fr
agile to qualify for commercial
loans. Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make th
e transition to long-term
growth, IDA is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

IDA is also cost effective. For every dollar the U.S. contributes, other nations do

nate five. (ck) Other donors are
not likely to compensate for a reduction in American support. Instead, they may
est
ablish procedures restricting
procurement from U.S. firms. Or these countries may shift their resources into
bilat
eral programs where
assistance is tied and there is less emphasis on privatization and other market refo
rms.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA
recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in
U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-
Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.(ck)

Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S.
contrib
utions. The UN High
Commission on Refugees, the UN Development Program and UNICEF operate
on the front-l
ines to improve the
health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward. UN peacekeeping is
another
tool that Congress must not
discard: it enables us to assist in resolving destabilizing regional conflicts witho
ut committing U.S. forces or
bearing the entire bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention we can
pay
now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working
early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops
af
ter tragedy has struck. When
the all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their
governme
nt to act -- as they should,
and we should. But looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our
inter
ests and save money. Nickel
and dime policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from
o
ur own experience that
democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all
over t
he world aspire: security,
freedom and prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and
free mar
kets, America
becomes more secure, more free and eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and
Africa
must be a central part of that
focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House
Conference
on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce
Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent
wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will
unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign
assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to raise awareness of the importance of sustained assistance to Africa and, on
behal
f of the President, I applaud
you for this effort.

Thank you.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME 28 June 95 11:12

FROM Halperin, Morton H.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: TL's Africa Remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Lorin, Matthew E.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Per our chat.

From: Benjamin, Daniel
To: Clarke, Richard A.; Danvers, William C.; Halperin, Morton H.; McCormick, Shawn H.; Rice, Susan E.; Simon, Steven N.; Walsh, Helen C.; Soderberg, Nancy E.
CC: /N, NonRecord at A1
Subject: TL's Africa Remarks [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, June 28, 1995 10:34 AM

[[TLAFRIC.DOC : 2876 in TLAFRIC.DOC]]

Attached are remarks that Tony Lake will deliver tomorrow at a roundtable at Transafrica. Please review them asap and e-mail or call me (6-9179) with comments and changes. Thanks.

ATTACHMENT FILE DATE 28 June 95 10:31

ATTACHMENT FILE NAME TLAFRIC.DOC

6/28/95 10 a.m.
ANTHONY LAKE
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
REMARKS TO ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINED U.S. ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA
TRANSAFRICA FORUM
JUNE 29, 1995

Thank you Randall for that warm introduction and for bringing together such an impre
ssive group of Americans.

I am delighted to be here today -- especially with a group of people who care so dee ply about Africa, a place that captured my heart three decades ago when I first traveled there as a young foreign s ervice officer.

Much has changed since then -- both in Africa and here in America. Almost two-third s of Africa's nations have moved to democracy and free-market economies -- and American leadership and assistan ce has played a major role in that effort. But our success in helping Africa press ahead is in danger. Foreig n assistance is under attack by new isolationists from both the left and the right -- and American leadership is at risk.

African countries that have bravely chosen the path of democracy and economic reform are asking why the United States appears to be on the verge of retreat -- at exactly the moment that they are doing what we have asked of them for decades. When I traveled to nine African states last December, presidents, opposition leaders and individuals from all walks of life told me that the people of Africa do not want our charity. They want a partnership -- a partnership in peace, in democracy, and in economic growth. U.S. e conomic assistance is a vital link in that partnership.

This partnership benefits us. We spend money on foreign assistance not out of the g oodness of our hearts, but out of the conviction that it serves America's best interests. The return on our in vestment -- in increased security and greater prosperity for the American people -- is substantial.

Americans know that the world is growing closer -- and that to lead, our nation must be engaged. Your presence here shows that you share this belief. Your actions demonstrate a commitment to ma intaining the involvement abroad that is essential for our nation's future.

But this Administration also recognizes that, as we struggle to cut the federal defi

cit, foreign assistance must also
be reduced. There is a right way and a wrong way to make these reductions.

Let me tell you about the wrong way: [Yesterday,] the House voted to cut the Develo
pment Fund for Africa by
fully one-third -- while assistance to other parts of the world will only be reduced roughly half as much.
Singling out Africa is not only unfair, it's unwise. These drastic cuts will come b ack to haunt us. They will
erode our support for free markets -- ones that produce jobs for American workers.
They will undercut our
ability to fight terrorism and drug-trafficking. They will undermine our efforts to prevent humanitarian crises
before they happen. In short, these cuts put our leadership in peril at a time when we can make a difference.

Staying engaged in Africa is in America's interest. Today, the nearly 700 million p
eople who live south of the
Sahara comprise one of the great emerging markets in the world. And Africa's wealth
of resources -- from oil
and uranium to cocoa and coffee -- are in permanent demand here in America. Yet we
have barely begun to tap
the continent's potential.

U.S. exports to Africa totaled $4.4 billion last year -- and more than 80,000 Americ
an jobs depend on them. The
exports -- which exceed those to the former Soviet Union by nearly a quarter -- can
be vastly increased. But to
do so, we must continue to help stability take hold and democracy take root througho
ut the continent. As the
Corporate Council on Africa concluded, the United States government should maintain
policies toward Africa that
aggressively promote trade and investment.

Indeed, investment is even more important than exports because it is the real engine
of growth and job creation for
any economy. As Africa progresses toward democracy and free markets, Washington sho
uld pursue policies that
will encourage American investment in Africa and strengthen the continent's

private
sector. U.S. investment will
spur demand for American exports in areas such as capital goods, high-tech and servi
ces -- and create good,
high-wage jobs. As Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown said at last month's African-Afr
ican American Summit
in Dakar, "The United States no longer concedes Africa's markets to European supplie
rs."

Through the Commerce Department's promotion efforts and the work of EXIM bank, OPIC,
and the Trade and
Development Agency, the Administration been a catalyst in encouraging American trade
and investment with
Africa. We must continue those efforts. What has worked in East Asia will also wor
k in Africa -- but only if

we stay engaged. It will not happen if the neo-isolationists get their way.

Our economic interests in Africa are matched by a broad array of security and humani
tarian concerns. We could
hardly be indifferent to a continent to which so many American trace their roots. B
ut the plain truth is that helping
Africa contend with its internal problems -- along with nurturing its tremendous eco
nomic potential -- is in
America's interest.

Today in Africa, we face challenges and opportunities that we cannot walk away from.
Sudan, for example, has
worked its way into the big leagues of countries that support international terroris
m. It poses a direct threat to our
interests. Or take Nigeria -- some 40 percent of the heroin that enters the United States passes through that
nation. Left unchecked, the problems that plague many African countries today -- ov
erpopulation, disease and
environmental decay -- could overflow borders and be the world's problems tomorrow.

The small fraction of our spending that we devote to Africa -- less than one-tenth o

f one percent of the Federal
budget -- can help contain these problems and even turn some of them around. Resour
ces such as our
Development Fund for Africa are crucial for sustaining the remarkable progress that
so many nations in Africa
have already achieved. It helps create stable, democratic societies of consumers -
- not masses of victims in need
of relief. The DFA along with the African Development Foundation promote sustainabl
e development on a broad
front -- development that is essential to preventing the conflicts that explode into tragedy.

Consider some of the ways our foreign assistance has made a difference in Africa and
throughout the developing
world:

ù Over the past 50 years, infant and child mortality rates have been reduced in half
.
ù Life expectancy has increased by nearly a third.
ù Today 80% of the world's children are immunized -- up from only 20% in 1980.
ù In the past two decades, the numbers of the chronically undernourished has been ha
lved.
ù And average real incomes have doubled since World War II.

And in a range of African nations after another, U.S. foreign assistance in recent y
ears has established a solid
record of success. For example:

ù USAID democratization programs played an important role in South Africa's historic
elections last April and in
Mozambique's polling in November -- educating voters, election officials and the med
ia.
ù Our assistance over the last decade has fostered the opening of stock markets in B
otswana, Mauritius,
Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Kenya.
ù Our programs in Ghana helped remove regulatory bottlenecks and revise the investme
nt code, which resulted
in a 73-percent jump in American exports between 1992 and 1993 alone.

ù Our work in Guinea has helped increase school attendance by 43-percent -- training
7,000 teachers and
building 1,900 new classrooms.

Deep cuts in our assistance would endanger all of these successes. Consider some li
kely results if the House cuts
in our foreign policy spending in Africa go through:
ù Four million children will not be inoculated against infectious disease, and many
of them will die.
ù Nearly 100,000 children will die from lack of oral rehydration therapy.
ù Our ability to track and limit the spread of HIV may be eliminated.
ù Declining population growth rates in many countries -- a key to stable development
-- could shoot back up.
AID is the foremost sponsor of family planning in Africa. But without the funds to
continue its work, the
progress in slowing Africa's high population growth rates could evaporate. That wou
ld increase the chances
for epidemics, malnutrition, environmental degradation and political instability.

The Congressional budget ax is not just aimed at bilateral programs. It may fall ha
rdest on our contribution to the
World Bank's International Development Association. The IDA is essential -- it is t
he seed money for capitalism. It
provides loans to the poorest reforming countries -- those whose progress is too fr
agile to qualify for commercial
loans. Half of IDA's funding goes to Africa. For these countries poised to make th
e transition to long-term
growth, IDA is a lifesaver.

Take away our contribution to the IDA and the United States loses one of its most ef
fective means of spurring
economic reform and opening new markets. Begun under the Eisenhower administration
-- and backed by both
parties for decades -- IDA directly reduces these nations' trade and investment barr
iers, supports private sector
growth and provides new opportunities for the American exports and investment.

IDA is also cost effective. For every dollar the U.S. contributes, other nations do
nate five. (ck) Other donors are

not likely to compensate for a reduction in American support. Instead, they may
est
ablish procedures restricting
procurement from U.S. firms. Or these countries may shift their resources into
bilat
eral programs where
assistance is tied and there is less emphasis on privatization and other market refo
rms.

Deep cuts in IDA will diminish opportunities for U.S. business. The IDA
recipients
of yesterday include South
Korea, Indonesia and Chile. The IDA recipients of today imported $20 billion in
U.S
. goods in 1993 -- about a
third more than in 1988. These are the markets of tomorrow: In the 19 sub-
Saharan
African countries with
IDA-supported reforms, real annual GDP has been growing by 4.5 percent.(ck)

Many agencies of the United Nations also stand to lose as Congress cuts U.S.
contrib
utions. The UN High
Commission on Refugees, the UN Development Program and UNICEF operate
on the front-l
ines to improve the
health of Africa's peoples and help them move forward. UN peacekeeping is
another
tool that Congress must not
discard: it enables us to assist in resolving destabilizing regional conflicts witho
ut committing U.S. forces or
bearing the entire bill. This is burdensharing at its best.

Like our foreign assistance, peacekeeping is an investment in prevention we can
pay
now -- or we can pay a lot
more later. In Africa, as in other parts of the world, we have learned that working
early to avert a crisis is far less
than expensive than mounting a large humanitarian effort or sending in our troops
af
ter tragedy has struck. When
the all-seeing eye of CNN finds real suffering abroad, Americans want their
governme
nt to act -- as they should,
and we should. But looking and acting ahead, we can protect lives, defend our
inter
ests and save money. Nickel
and dime policies always cost more in the end.

American leadership in the world is not a luxury; it is a necessity. We know from
o
ur own experience that
democracy and free markets are the best means to the ends to which people all
over t
he world aspire: security,
freedom and prosperity. And we know that when others embrace democracy and
free mar
kets, America
becomes more secure, more free and eventually, more prosperous.

If we are to remain a great nation, we must maintain our focus abroad -- and
Africa
must be a central part of that
focus. That is why President Clinton sponsored last summer's White House
Conference
on Africa and why I
took my first and only official visit to Africa. And that's why Commerce
Secretary
Ron Brown has made three
trips to Africa and is preparing to launch a major trade mission to the continent
wi
thin the next year. This
Administration knows that significant cuts in programs that benefit Africa will
unde
rmine our ability to promote
sustainable development, increase U.S. exports and prevent deadly conflicts.

President Clinton is fully committed to fighting the proposed cuts in foreign
assist
ance. We welcome your efforts
to raise awareness of the importance of sustained assistance to Africa and, on
behal
f of the President, I applaud
you for this effort.

Thank you.
###

MSMail

DATE-TIME	28 June 95 11:37
FROM	McCormick, Shawn H.
CLASSIFICATION	UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT	BET Points [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO	Rice, Susan E.
CARBON_COPY	Battenfield, Pat Deshazer, Macarthur X. McCormick, Shawn H.
TEXT_BODY	[[SMBET.DOC : 2895 in SMBET.DOC]] Suggested talking points for TL interview on BET.
ATTACHMENT FILE DATE	28 June 95 11:29
ATTACHMENT FILE NAME	SMBET.DOC

MEMORANDUM

TO SUSAN E. RICE

FROM SHAWN H. McCORMICK

SUBJECT TALKING POINTS FOR TL APPEARANCE ON BET

DATE JUNE 27, 1995

U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY AND ECONOMIC INTERESTS IN AFRICA

-Capturing the potential of a huge, largely un-tapped market for U.S. exports and investments;

-Countering the threats of terrorism, narcotics and environmental degradation;

-Mitigating humanitarian crises;

-Assisting the people of Africa to achieve democracy and sustainable development.

ANGOLA

-- We are encouraged by the commitment of both the government and UNITA to the Lusaka Protocol and welcome the initiative of President dos Santos to invite Savimbi into the government as a Second Vice President.

-- The United States is actively working with the United Nations to overcome logistical hurdles concerning the deployment of peacekeeping forces.

-- U.S. will pay in excess of $100 million annually to support the UN operation in Angola.

-- The U.S. has been the largest provider of humanitarian food relief to Angola since 1989 contributing on average $80 million per year.

-- The U.S. played a critical role through its special representative in helping to bring about the Lusaka Protocol negotiated under UN auspices.

BURUNDI

-- The United States remains extremely concerned about the situation in Burundi.

-- We are spearheading an international preventive diplomacy effort to avert a further deterioration of the situation.

-- We are supporting efforts to establish a Commission of Inquiry into the 1993 coup attempt.

-- Several high-level administration officials have recently visited Burundi in an effort to encourage reconciliation (i.e. myself, Talbott, Shattuck, Moose)

-- We have helped deploy human rights monitors to Burundi.

RWANDA

-- We are supporting the newly established War Crimes Tribunal with $3 million and personnel to assist with investigations.

-- Supporting the establishment of a regional political conference, noting the inter-related nature of dynamics with neighboring countries.

-- The U.S. dispatched 4,000 troops and $400 million in assistance to alleviate the humanitarian crisis last year

ZAIRE

-- In the event that we believe that conditions for free and fair elections develop in Zaire we would look carefully to assist an electoral process.

-- We remain actively engaged with our allies France and Belgium in pressuring President Mobutu to adopt a credible political and economic reform agenda.

-- We cut all foreign assistance and military links with the Mobutu regime back in 1991.

SOUTH AFRICA

-- The United States is the largest international aid donor to South Africa. President Clinton announced a $600 million aid program covering FY 1994-96 shortly after the elections last year.

-- We actively promote U.S. investment in South Africa. The Commerce Department has named it one of 10 "Big Emerging Markets" and over 500 American companies have a presence there.

-- South Africa is a larger market for U.S. goods than is all of Eastern Europe combined.

-- We have just signed a Peace Corps agreement with South Africa.

-- The United States was the largest donor in support of the historic 1994 election process contributing more than $35 million.

SUSTAINED FUNDING FOR AFRICA

-- Congress wants to cut our assistance to Africa by one-third, nearly double cuts to any other part of the world.

-- Africa is an important economic market for the U.S. -- our exports totaled $4.4 billion last year, a full 22-percent more than our exports to the entire former Soviet Union.

-- Congressional cuts will end programs that inoculate four million children against disease, end oral rehydration therapy for 100,000 other children who could die unless another country picks up this program and our ability to track the spread of AIDS will end.

-- The fraction of our budget that we devote to Africa is paltry in any sense -- one-half or one-tenth of one-percent.