

FOIA MARKER

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

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Communications
Series/Staff Member: George Stephanopoulos
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 553
FolderID:

Folder Title:
GS [George Stephanopoulos] Briefing 3/5/93

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	90	3	1	2

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. cable	RE: President Izetbegovic's Informal Briefing (3 pages)	03/05/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Communications
George Stephanopoulos
OA/Box Number: 553

FOLDER TITLE:

GS [George Stephanopoulos] Briefing 3/5/93

2011-0582-F
db4261

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]

file

"GS Briefing
03-05-93"

—

**HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE AND INTEREST GROUPS:
Talking Points**

ATTACK: INTEREST GROUPS ARE BEING LIMITED TO A PERIPHERAL ROLE.

FACT: Mrs. Clinton, Ira Magaziner and other White House officials have met with over 300 groups in more than 100 meetings since the Task Force was formed five weeks ago. This number does not include meetings held with officials at HHS and other departments or the more than 100 meetings held during the transition.

In addition, groups have been strongly urged to send in their specific policy proposals to the Health Care Intake Room. Over 500 policy proposals have been received and channelled to the appropriate working group^s

ATTACK: ... UNUSUAL, HIGHLY SECRETIVE DECISION MAKING PROCESS ...

FACT: Let's put this in context. Decisions in government have traditionally been made by a few people sitting in a room, without any input from the outside and sometimes dominated by a single special interest. In contrast, we have brought together the real-world expertise of more than 400 people from all over the country. These are people -- doctors, nurses, social workers, administrators and consumers -- who know firsthand the problems in our health care system.

However, given the possibility of conflict of interest, we cannot let interest groups make policy. For example, if we were to give the AMA a permanent role, we would have to do the same for every drug company or insurance firm that wanted in. That is just not workable given our time frame and the tremendous task we have undertaken -- and it also wouldn't be fair to those who don't have representatives in Washington.

**ATTACK: ... [OUR ADVISORS] STATUS IN THE GOVERNMENT IS MURKY ...
HOW MANY PEOPLE WORKING ON THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN WERE
FULL-TIME GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, SPECIAL GOVERNMENT
EMPLOYEES, PAID CONSULTANTS?**

FACT: In accordance with legal requirements, the more than 400 people who are working with the working groups fall into the following three categories: full time government employees, special government employees and consultants.

- **Full-time Government Employees:** **362 Total**
including 98 Congressional
 Individuals who work for the Executive Office of the President, for federal agencies, for Members of Congress or Senate and House committees. Federal employees are subject to the conflict of interest provisions in 18 U.S.C. Section 202-209 and Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch and all related ethics laws and regulations.
- **Special Government Employees:** **48 Total**
 Individuals who are employed by any agency or the Executive Office of the President for less than 130 days in a 365 day period. These employees must abide by the ethical standards of federal employees and can receive compensation from other entities such as universities and nonprofit foundations.
- **Consultants:** **18 Total**
Including 8 from State Governments
 Individuals who attend working group meetings on an intermittent basis with or without compensation from the federal government. They are subject to some provisions of 18 U.S.C. Section 201-208 and Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch and all related ethics laws and regulations. Such individuals are not considered members of the working groups: they may not serve as working group leaders and have other limitations on their participation.

NOTE ON LIST WE ARE RELEASING AND ALL NUMBERS: This is a snapshot as of March 5, 1993. (It differs from numbers included in the court papers submitted Wednesday). These numbers are constantly in flux because people (from all 3 categories) are constantly joining groups and leaving groups as informational needs of the working groups change.

ATTACK: OUR CONSULTANTS HAVE NO EXPERIENCE MANAGING HEALTH PROGRAMS OR CARING FOR PATIENTS.

FACT: Not true. In fact, we have over 100 health care professionals including 60 doctors, 20 nurses, 6 social workers. [If pressed on doctors, almost half of them were practicing medicine before they took a leave to help the Task Force.]

In addition, the Task Force is working with the Secretary of HHS to set up diverse panels of health care professionals will be brought in regularly from around the country to advise the working groups as they develop their recommendations.

ATTACK: CONSUMER GROUPS HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED

FACT: Many groups representing consumers have been brought in for meetings with the Public Liaison's Office and members of the working groups including: Citizen Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, Public Citizen, Consumer League, National Council of Senior Citizens, AARP, National Council on Aging, and the National Association of Community Health Centers.

ATTACK: THE ADMINISTRATION IS NOT LISTENING CAREFULLY TO ORDINARY CONSUMERS.

FACT: In addition to consulting with the Consumer Organizations, diverse panels of 10-12 consumers -- drawn from the membership of these Consumer Organizations and from letters written to the Task Force -- will be brought in regularly from around the country to advise the working groups as they develop their recommendations. The first of these consultations will be on March 11.

Mrs Clinton has also been traveling around the country meeting with the American people to listen to their concerns about rising health care costs. She has accepted the invitation of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to participate in roundtable discussions that will be held throughout the country in the next month -- where she can listen to the recommendations of all the people -- consumers, providers, and special interests -- who are eager to contribute to the Task Force as it develops its proposal for comprehensive health care reform.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 5, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS, BOB BOORSTIN AND
DEE DEE MYERS

SUBJECT: New York Times Health Interest Group Strategy

FROM: Mike Lux

The following groups have said they would be happy to speak to reporters about how pleased they are with our process, particularly in terms of the openness and inclusiveness issues:

AFL-CIO (Karen Ignani, Rex Hardesty, or Tom Donahue)
Citizen Action (Cathy Hurwit or Bob Brandon)
AARP (Jon Rother)
Leadership Coalition for Health Care Reform (Peggy Rhodes)
National Association of Social Workers (Sandy Harding)
American Hospital Association (Rick Wades)
American Nurses Association (Virginia Trotter Betts and Donna Richardson)
Consumer Federation of America (Steve Brobeck and Gene Kimmelman)

Both the American Hospital Association and Citizen Action were called yesterday by the NY Times reporter doing the story, and both had extremely positive quotes which he chose not to use.

cc: Ira Magaziner
Melanne Verveer
Alexis Herman
Steve Hilton

WHITE HOUSE PRESS GUIDANCE -- 11:30 AM
Friday, March 5, 1993

Bosnia: Air Drops

Q: What is happening at the Vance/Owen negotiations in New York? Are we pressing for an agreement today?

A: -- The talks are continuing in New York today on the outstanding issues.

-- With the Bosnian government signing the military accord, all three parties have now signed two of the three parts in the proposal.

-- The parties have agreed to the list of constitutional principles and the military accord.

-- However, all parties have not yet agreed to the proposed provincial map, so the entire package is not agreed to.

-- Co-Chairmen Vance and Owen continue to hold discussions with the parties and listen to their proposals on the map.

-- We do not wish to comment further on the details of the negotiations while they are going on.

Q: What do you think of the plan to evacuate civilians from eastern Bosnia?

A: -- We have long stressed the importance of getting relief and assistance to those in need.

-- We believe that the method for providing such assistance should be determined by those on the ground who know the situation best.

Q: Why are you continuing the air drops if the supplies are not reaching those in need?

A: -- The current phase of the air drops continues because we believe there are still areas that ground convoys have not sufficiently reached and people are still in great need. They remain a useful supplement to, and stimulus for, the efforts on the ground.

-- We have conducted five air drops without incident; the supplies are by and large reaching the targeted areas. The fluid and violent nature of the situation on the ground means that we can't guarantee who receives these supplies.

-- We do know that Muslims have received supplies. The alternative is to do nothing which would mean that in some areas those in need would get nothing.

Q: Is the Clinton Administration concerned about the numerous reports of atrocities by Serbs in the vicinity of the air drops?

A: -- We are consulting intensively in the Security Council and more broadly on ways to increase humanitarian deliveries as well as ways to back up the Security Council statement of yesterday that demanded, among other things, that the parties remain fully engaged in the talks, and that all concerned allow unimpeded access of humanitarian relief supplies throughout Bosnia, and especially in the besieged cities of Eastern Bosnia.

Q: Hasn't this operation actually led to increased fighting?

A: -- The violence in Eastern Bosnia has been going on for some time, and is, in fact, largely responsible for aid not getting to those who need it. The fighting near Cerska had been underway before the air drop operation was conducted.

-- We should be clear about where the responsibility lies for the escalation in fighting and intensified violence -- with the aggressors on the ground, not with the air drop operation.

Q: Did Izetbegovic sign the cease-fire agreement Wednesday? Does this commit the U.S. to provide ground troops to enforce a cease-fire?

A: -- President Izetbegovic signed the military agreement which is one of the three parts of the Vance/Owen plan. This is a significant positive development and talks continue on resolving the other issues.

-- Enforcement will only be discussed once the plan is agreed to by all parties.

World Trade Center Bombing

Q: In light of yesterday's (Thursday) arrest of a suspect in the Twin Towers bombing, is the U.S. the target of a terrorism campaign by Islamic fundamentalists?

A: -- The U.S. Government has in the past two decades devoted considerable resources to combatting the threat of terrorism.

-- Yesterday's (Thursday) arrests indicate how proficient our law enforcement and investigative agencies have become at this task.

-- At the present, it is too early to discern the implications of this incident.

Haiti: Aristide

Q: In a The New York Times article today (Friday), Aristide called on President Clinton to set a date for his return to Haiti. What is your reaction?

A: -- The Organization of American States and the United States are sponsoring a joint mission whose objective is to restore democracy and President Aristide to power in Haiti.

-- We are fully supportive of that international effort. President Clinton's meeting with President Aristide on March 16 will underscore that support.

-- Establishing at this time a date for the physical return of President Aristide would be artificial. Rather, the timing of his return must be a function of the pace of the negotiations.

Challenge on Gay Ruling

Q: Why has the government decided to appeal a lower court ruling that ordered the Navy to reinstate a homosexual sailor, Petty Officer Keith Meinhold?

A: -- The Department of Defense is appealing the lower court ruling because of the broader issue of civil court jurisdiction in military affairs -- not because Petty Officer Meinhold is a homosexual.

Q: When did the Navy decide to make this appeal?

A: -- I will have to refer you to DoD on that one.

-- I can say that the DoD leadership agreed with the Navy recommendation that this decision be appealed. DoD filed the appeal earlier this week.

Q: Petty Officer Meinhold's reinstatement was made before the President's January 29 announcement directing the Secretary of Defense to study the issue of homosexuals in the military. Why is the Navy trying to kick him out now?

A: -- The issue being appealed in the Meinhold case is the jurisdiction of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco over a violation of the Military Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Q: What will happen to Petty Officer Meinhold if the lower court ruling is overturned?

A: -- In his January 29 statement, President Clinton directed that Commanding Officers continue to process cases under current regulations related to homosexuality.

-- Final discharge for individuals who want to stay in the military will be suspended until the President acts on the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense which is due out in July.

Aid to Russia

Q: How do you respond to Oberdorfer's piece in the March 5 Washington Post which states that the Administration is considering creation of a multi-billion dollar social safety net fund for Russia?

A: -- The Administration is currently reviewing a range of economic assistance initiatives for Russia given the importance we attach to the continuation of democratic political and market economic reform.

-- The concept of a social safety net for Russia has been discussed by many outside and inside the Administration.

-- We and others understand the value of such a fund in supporting the reform process in Russia.

-- We have made no decisions on a U.S. role in the formation of such a fund.

Aid Levels for Israel

[Background: In FY93, Israel will receive \$3 billion in security assistance -- \$1.2 billion in economic support funds (ESF) and \$1.8 billion in Foreign Military Financing (FMF).]

Q: Is the U.S. planning to cut aid levels to Israel as suggested by Ambassador Harrop (U.S. Ambassador to Israel) in a speech yesterday?

A: -- The President has made it clear that it is his intention to continue significant levels of aid to Israel.

-- The Administration's FY94 budget assumes that security assistance to Israel will be maintained at current levels.

[IF ASKED]:

Q: Was Ambassador Harrop speaking for the U.S. Government?

A: -- Ambassador Harrop was not speaking on instructions.

-- His remarks on possible aid cuts may be a reflection of his own personal views.

ACDA's Future

Q: Do you have any comment on the article on the Federal Page of Thursday's Washington Post on the future of ACDA?

A: -- The Administration's position remains as expressed in the White House statement of February 11, 1993:

--- The Clinton Administration strongly endorses the role of ACDA and is moving to name a director of the agency.

--- No decision has been made about eventual restructuring of the agency.

Somalia

Q: What about Boutros-Ghali's report? What is the significance of the May 1 turnover date?

A: -- The process of turning over to UNOSOM II is already underway. If May 1 is accepted by the UNSC, it would mark the end of the turnover process, not the beginning. It would be the day the last sector is taken over by UNOSOM II.

Q: Boutros-Ghali criticized the U.S. He said that U.S. troops had not deployed on the whole territory of Somalia, that you had deployed only in 40 percent of the territory and not in the northeast, the northwest and on the border with Kenya. Do you think that this criticism is valid?

A: -- We don't see this as a criticism by the Secretary General. The mission of the current UN operation, as agreed to by all parties, was to provide a secure environment for the delivery of food and relief supplies.

-- As Ambassador Oakley noted the other day, we have achieved this goal.

-- UNOSOM II will have as a goal creating a secure environment throughout Somalia.

Q: Where does the report stand in the UNSC?

A: -- The Secretary General filed his report with the Security Council yesterday (Wednesday), on the basis of which we expect a Security Council vote next week to create the new UN force.

Q: Can you comment on reports that the U.S. withdrawal from Somalia is being delayed?

A: -- There is no delay planned in the reduction of U.S. forces in Somalia. They are planned to be withdrawn as UN forces deploy over the next several weeks.

Q: Is it true that the Turkish General who will command the UN force will not be there until May?

A: -- The Turkish Commander of that force, General Bir, has informed the U.S. Commander that he will be in Somalia later this month to assume his command.

Q: How many U.S. troops will remain?

A: -- The U.S. has offered forces. The exact number of which is still being worked out with the UN.

Q: Has Ambassador Oakley left Somalia?

A: -- Ambassador Oakley has relinquished his post as U.S. Special Envoy for Somalia and is on his way back to the United States.

Q: Who is to succeed Mr. Oakley?

A: -- Mr. Robert Gosende has been named to succeed Ambassador Oakley as U.S. Special Envoy for Somalia.

-- A career diplomat who has previously served in Mogadishu, Mr. Gosende is a Senior Foreign Service Officer with the United States Information Agency.

-- He is expected to arrive in Mogadishu early next week.

Afghan Leaders

Q: What is the U.S. Government reaction to reports that Afghan leaders have negotiated a new political accord in Islamabad to end the civil war?

A: -- We welcome steps that move Afghanistan toward an end to the civil war and greater stability.

-- We have long urged the formation of a broad-based government in Kabul representing all of the Afghan people.

-- Stability and an end to the fighting are essential prerequisites to reconstruction.

Q: What about reports that Hekmatyar will become Prime Minister? You criticized him in the past for shelling Kabul.

A: -- It is an Afghan decision to choose their political leadership. We will judge that leadership by its actions.

Q: Will we open the U.S. embassy in Kabul now?

A: -- It is too soon to make such a decision.

-- We will monitor the security situation closely in the capital.

Yeltsin on Ethnic Conflicts in CIS

Q: On Wednesday, President Yeltsin asked the UN and others to give him special powers to deal with conflicts in the FSU. What do you think of the idea?

A: -- We share President Yeltsin's desire for peace and stability in the former Soviet Union.

-- At the same time, we strongly support the sovereignty and independence of the new states of the former Soviet Union.

-- We hope that Russia will continue to work with them to find peaceful solutions to regional conflicts.

-- We would hope that any Russian initiatives would be taken in consultation with those states.

-- We would expect that any Russian peacekeeping actions would be in accordance with CSCE principles and the UN Charter.

RESPONSE TO WALL STREET JOURNAL "SMOKE AND MIRRORS" PIECE MARCH 5, 1993

I. There is no "smoke and mirrors" in this budget. "Smoke and mirrors" describes devices used to deliberately obfuscate the truth about a budget or to be able to claim, falsely, that it complies with budget laws. Here are examples of **real** smoke and mirrors:

- **timing shifts**, such as the one-day shift of a Pentagon payday from 1990 to 1989 to fix the 1990 books;
- **black boxes and magic asterisks**, used in the Reagan 1982 budget and the Bush 1990 budget to claim non-existent savings with unspecified cuts;
- **accounting gimmicks**, such as the maneuver contained in the Bush 1993 budget which took anticipated savings from years ahead to pay for current programs;
- **rosy scenarios**, unrealistically optimistic economic projections used by Presidents nearly every year during the 1980's to make deficits appear smaller.

That's smoke and mirrors.

II. The issues raised by the Journal piece do not involve obfuscation or dishonesty. Some involve legitimate technical differences that have existed for years between Treasury/OMB and Joint Committee on Taxation/CBO. Some are judgments that go out of the way to put the worst possible light on legitimate decisions. And some are flat-out inaccurate. See point-by-point rebuttal which follows.

III. Concerning CBO's reestimates, as the Journal piece grudgingly points out in the last paragraph, **we end up in the same place**. Like the Administration, the CBO projects that the Clinton budget will bring the deficit down to just over \$200 billion in FY 1997, and CBO says the Clinton program will produce a deficit \$13 billion lower than we project for FY 1998. In other words, when all is said and done, **CBO thinks our budget will produce a lower long-term deficit even than we do**. Contrast that to reestimates of past Reagan and Bush budgets, which by the fourth year out, comparable to estimates for FY 1997, CBO consistently stated that the Administration was **understating** deficits. The **average** in the Reagan-Bush years was \$58 billion, and that includes several years when the difference was \$80 billion or more and one year at \$111 billion.

IV. Following is a point by point rebuttal:

- The five-year savings from delaying construction of the superconducting super collider **are real**, and the Journal doesn't provide any evidence to the contrary. The delay is necessary because of legitimate questions about the performance and cost of the electromagnetic technology which is essential to the collider. The stretch-out provides insurance against possible **larger** cost overruns in the future if premature procurement results

in acquisition of substandard hardware that only has to be replaced later. That is sensible budgeting, not smoke and mirrors.

- The Journal states that Congressional Budget Office estimates were used to project the revenues produced by increased taxation of Social Security benefits for the top one-fifth of recipients. If Treasury agreed with the CBO estimates in this case, what's wrong with that? Indeed, as the journal points out, deficit reduction from this proposal will be even greater than we projected. No smoke and mirrors here.

- The Journal equates our estimates of deficit reduction resulting from future health cost controls with Darman's use of such estimates in association with "caps" on entitlement spending proposed by the Bush Administration. There's a big difference. **Darman and the Bush Administration never said how they would actually limit entitlement spending, and they never intended to. The cap was a gimmick. We have stated very clearly that we will propose comprehensive health care reform within the next few months that will contain health care costs. We will be specific about it, as we have been with every item in this budget.** Smoke and mirrors is claiming savings without ever planning on being specific about how you will achieve the savings. We will be specific, and we have continually stated that. Indeed, we provide for substantial, specific, and real Medicare savings over the next five years in this budget. But unless we control health care costs for the future, deficits will rise again beginning in 1998. We state that very clearly. Again, where's the smoke and mirrors?

- CBO and the Administration have different estimates of the savings from changes in Medicare and Federal employee pay. The Journal claims the Administration made mistakes in these areas; we believe our numbers are good. But in either case, that's not smoke and mirrors. Even if the Journal were correct, these would simply be honest mistakes created by the need for swift action on a budget.

- Regarding compliance with the discretionary spending cap for FY 1994, the Journal completely misinterprets comments by OMB Director Panetta. The Administration is not considering merely shifting spending from one year to the next. If additional savings are achieved for FY 1994, those will be real savings. This is theoretical smoke and mirrors on the part of the Journal.

- The Journal implies that there is something wrong with the Administration's defense numbers without ever quite saying what it is. We are proposing four-year defense savings through FY 1997. In the coming months, the Defense Department is going to carry out a thorough analysis of the nation's defense needs into the future. We don't think it makes sense to provide any changes, up or down, in the FY 1998 defense number until that analysis is complete. Going ahead and projecting that far into the future without a real plan -- that would have been problematic. Instead, we assumed that the defense budget would be maintained at the same size in FY 1998, with an increase for inflation, pending the defense review. That's not smoke and mirrors. That's simply honest budgeting.

To: WHITE HOUSE STAFF
Fr: Gene Sperling
Re: CBO Estimates: Bush versus Clinton
Dt: March 4, 1993

Just to give us some perspective on how dramatic and real our deficit plan is compared to Bush's last budget, it is worth comparing how CBO scored our five year plan compared to Bush's last five year plan.

Because CBO uses a baseline that includes caps, and because of some scoring disputes, CBO scored our five year deficit reduction plan at \$355 billion -- compared to our \$473 billion. (There is really only a \$61 billion difference between our plan and how CBO scored it, because the other chunk comes simply from starting at different baselines.)

The real story, however, is the dramatic difference between the magnitude of President Clinton's deficit reduction plan, and what CBO thought Bush's proposed budget would accomplish even if Bush got everything he wanted. CBO thought that Bush's deficit reduction plan had **only a cumulative total of only \$3 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years**. Thus, by the CBO's estimate, we achieve 118 times more deficit than the last Bush budget would have had -- \$355 billion vs. \$3 billion.

Below is a comparison of how our plans were judged according to CBO's estimate of deficit savings from their March 1992 Report (p.3) and their March 1993 Report, (Table I).

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	TOTAL
Clinton Plan 2/93	+6.8	-18.6	-27.4	-68.1	-116.7	-\$355
Bush Plan 2/92	+5.0	-4.0	+10.0	+11.0	-5.0	-\$3

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

3/5

1100

TZ:

Per AMB Walker at USUN,
Sacicbey said he would
be delighted to have us
disclose the GOB opinion
of the airdrops, as noted
in para 2. of USUN 1000:
(".... Sacicbey told us that the
GOB wanted to counter the
charges that the air drops
had failed, and to publicly
thank the Administration for
its efforts to alleviate
humanitarian suffering in Bosnia.")

CEK

INFORMATION PAPER

3/4/93

Subject: Relief Convoys to Eastern Bosnia-Herzegovina Since 22 Feb

Before airdrop announcement 25 Feb.

Zepa - On 20 Feb. a convoy with 70 metric tons of medicine and food reached Zepa. Part of this convoy was made up of trucks which had been refused entry into Gorazde.

Tuzla - On 23 Feb. a convoy reached Tuzla with 70 metric tons.

Gorazde - On 25 Feb. 102 tons of food and medicine were delivered.

Total before the announcement -- 3 convoys with 242 metric tons.

After the airdrop announcement 25 Feb.

Tuzla - 6 convoys with 630 metric tons of aid.

Gorazde - 1 convoy arrived 3 Mar with 110 metric tons.

Total since the announcement - 7 convoys with 740 metric tons.

No convoys since 22 Feb.

Cerska, Konjevici, Srebrenica

*inaccessible.
+
under siege*

INFORMATION PAPER

4 March 1993

Subject: Air Drops into Eastern Bosnia

1. Purpose: To provide information on the air drops into eastern Bosnia Staff.

2. Key Points

- Airdrops over the past 4 days were successful in dropping 78.4 metric tons of aid in or near their target areas. Around Cerska and nearby Konjevici the local population reportedly has been unable to recover much of the supplies because of fighting.

Leaflets

- On February 27, US C-130s dropped leaflets over four locations in Bosnia and Hercegovina. Local press and Serbian officials claim that none of the leaflets were found near the proposed drop zones.

Airdrops

* Overall, Sarajevo press reports that some 30 relief pallets out of a total of 92 dropped on the first three nights have been recovered by the civilian population.

-- Cerska. Fighting continues in and around the region but at least half of the 30 bundles dropped by US C-130s on February 28 were observed near the town. The Serbs launched a successful offensive shortly after the drop and some of the bundles probably were captured by Serb forces.

-- Zepa. Three C-130s dropped 30 bundles on March 1. Local ham radio operators report that 11 have been recovered so far and are being distributed.

-- Konjevici. Four C-130s dropped a total of 28 bundles on March 2 and 32 bundles on March 3. Local radio operators reported at least two bundles from the initial airdrop had been recovered. Local Bosnian officials report that 18 of the 32 bundles from the March 2 airdrop have been located but the population has been unable to recover them because of Serb fire.

Assessment

- The airdrops have been successful in getting food to encircled Muslim enclaves in eastern Bosnia but local fighting has prevented the population from recovering the supplies. The Serb offensive around Cerska reportedly overran part of the drop zone. Recovery of supplies from the airdrops around Zepa and Konjevici have also been hampered by local fighting.

Prepared by: Yugoslav Task Force
Ext 71888

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. cable	RE: President Izetbegovic's Informal Briefing (3 pages)	03/05/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Communications
George Stephanopoulos
OA/Box Number: 553

FOLDER TITLE:

GS [George Stephanopoulos] Briefing 3/5/93

2011-0582-F
db4261

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]