

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:

Press Briefing 05/27/93

Stack:

S

Row:

90

Section:

3

Shelf:

1

Position:

2

WHITE HOUSE PRESS GUIDANCE -- 03:00 PM
THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1993

Dole/Hyde Legislation to Lift Bosnia Arms Embargo

Q. What is the Administration's reaction to the introduction by Senator Dole and Congressman Hyde of legislation to lift the Bosnia arms embargo?

- A. -- The President has clearly stated that our preferred option to address the crisis in Bosnia is lifting the arms embargo and using U.S. air power if necessary to allow the re-arming of the Bosnians. The arms embargo now in place has had the unintended consequence of providing the Bosnian Serbs with an overwhelming arms advantage, which they have used to support their policy of "ethnic cleansing" and an extension of the violence throughout Bosnia.
- The Joint Action Program adopted by the United States, Britain, France, Russia, and Spain last Saturday left open options for new and tougher measures, including this one.
- The arms embargo now in place comes as a result of a resolution adopted by the United Nations. Lifting the embargo would thus require a new U.N. resolution.

Q. Do you support Senator Dole's legislation?

- A. -- We support the policy of terminating the arms embargo against Bosnia. We will have to review the proposed legislation to determine whether it can be pursued in a manner consistent with our U.N. obligations.
- Senator Dole has often expressed his sincere concern over the crisis in Bosnia. We have often consulted with Senator Dole on this issue and have appreciated his spirit of bipartisanship on foreign affairs issues.

North Korea-U.S. Talks

Q: Any reaction to Sen. Lugar's comment that the Administration is not taking the North Korean nuclear problem seriously enough?

A: -- You should not mistake the absence of sabre-rattling for lack of resolve.

-- We have made very clear, including in the UN Security Council, that North Korea's actions in the nuclear area create a potentially grave threat to international peace and to the global nonproliferation regime. We have been supported by the overwhelming majority of other nations.

-- Our diplomatic approach to North Korea is designed to create a political context in which North Korea can take the necessary actions to resolve this issue.

-- We will not reward North Korea or any other country for violating its safeguards obligations or withdrawing from the NPT. An improvement in North Korea's relations with us or others in the international community can come only after North Korea has demonstrated that it will honor its nonproliferation commitments.

Q: Does the U.S. have any contingency plans in the event this diplomatic approach fails?

A: -- Planning for a number of contingencies is underway.

-- I will not comment further on our contingency plans.

Q: What about these reports that the US and North Korea will meet to resolve the nuclear issue.

A: -- We will meet with the North Koreans in New York on Wednesday, June 2. The US side will be headed by Assistant Secretary of State Bob Gallucci and the North Korean side will be headed by First Vice Foreign Minister Kang Sok Chu.

Q. What do we want from the North Koreans?

A: -- Our goal in the talks will be to seek a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, by achieving North Korea's commitment to remain in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), to carry out all International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and to implement fully the North-South denuclearization declaration.

<ORIG> AP
<TOR> 930527133158

<TEXT>a0607-----u w PM-EuropeSanctions 1stLd-Writethru a0598-605-606 05-27 0448
PM-Europe Sanctions, 1st Ld-Writethru, a0598-605-606,450
Administration Imposing Trade Sanctions Against EC

Eds: Combines pvs
By MARTIN CRUTSINGER=
AP Economics Writer=

WASHINGTON (AP) _ The Clinton administration said today it will impose trade sanctions against the 12-nation European Community in a dispute involving government contracts for telecommunications equipment.

The administration said it would bar European companies from bidding for certain federal contracts starting on Friday, the day the official notice was to be published in the Federal Register.

Officials estimated that the sanctions would cover approximately \$20 million in annual contracts, a relatively minor amount in terms of two-way trade between the United States and its largest trading partner.

However, the sanctions prompted an immediate angry response from the Europeans, who threatened to retaliate.

Sir Leon Brittan, the EC's top trade negotiator, said he greatly regretted the American action, calling it "neither justified, wise nor necessary."

In a statement issued in Brussels, Brittan said he would begin immediate consultations with the member countries of the EC to determine "the appropriate reaction from the community," adding that "the United States cannot expect us to ignore wholly unjustified action of this kind."

Asked about the timing of possible European sanctions, Peter Guilford, Brittan's spokesman said, "We will not drag our feet."

In his statement, Brittan expressed hope that the dispute involving government contracts would not "poison the atmosphere" between Europe and the United States as the two sides try to develop a common negotiating strategy to end a stalemate that has stalled a seven-year effort to rewrite the rules governing world trade.

The prohibition on European companies bidding on about \$20 million in annual government contracts represented a reduction from a \$45 million total of contracts the administration had first targeted in February.

In April, the administration announced that the original sanctions would be scaled back because the two sides had been able to resolve differences in the area of sales of electrical generating equipment to government agencies.

However, negotiators were unable to resolve a dispute involving similar sales of telecommunications equipment to state-owned enterprises in Europe.

U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor had said at the time that negotiators would continue to search for a way to resolve the telecommunications dispute but at the same time the administration would go forward with the process required to impose the trade sanctions.

APTV-05-27-93 1330EDT

Guidance follows →

U.S. Sanctions Against EC

QUESTION: What do the sanctions cover?

ANSWER:

All EC member states except Greece, Spain, and Portugal are prohibited from the following procurements by the U.S. government:

- a) all procurements of goods and non-construction services by all federal agencies which are below the threshold provided for in the U.S.-EC agreement (the current code threshold of 130,000 special drawing rights or dols 176,000);
- b) all procurements of goods by federally-owned power generation facilities which are below the threshold in the U.S.-EC agreement of dols 450,000;
- c) all procurements of construction services by all federal agencies and federally-owned power generation facilities which are below the threshold in the U.S.-EC agreement of dols 6.5 Million;
- d) all services procurement, excluding construction, without any thresholds, by federally-owned power generation facilities;
- e) all procurements of services, by all federal agencies, without any thresholds, that are excluded from the U.S.-EC agreement (a list of these services is attached).

Note that the sanctions will not apply to any procurements made in support of national security interests, including all procurements made by the department of defense (including the army corps of engineers, not including the coast guard). The sanctions will not apply to procurements that are made outside the territory of the U.S. For goods and services used abroad.

Exceptions are permitted (1) in the "public interest," (2) to "avoid the restriction of competition . . .," And (3) "because there would be . . . insufficient . . . bidders to assure procurement . . . of requisite quality at competitive prices." Such exceptions can be made by the head of any federal agency. This authority cannot be delegated.

The sanctions apply to procurements by all federal agencies, which include judicial and legislative branch agencies, as well as executive agencies. The rule of origin for goods is substantial transformation, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 2518(4)(B). The rule of origin for services, including construction, is place of performance. The sanctions apply only to prime contracts, not subcontracts. The sanctions only apply to solicitations made after the effective date (which is expected to be May 27, 1993).

QUESTION: What is the value of the sanctions? How were the original sanctions modified?

ANSWER: The sanctions are valued at approximately \$29 billion in U.S. government procurement opportunities, taking the average procurements from 1989-1991. The original sanctions have been reduced by about half to reflect the u.s./ec agreement on the other sector--power generation equipment--that was subject to the Title VII action.

QUESTION: How much actual purchases from the EC will the agreement affect?

ANSWER: The value of ec sales to the u.s. government affected by the sanctions can fluctuate significantly from year to year. The average value of the sanctions from 1989-1991 is approximately \$20 million in ec sales to the u.s. government.

QUESTION: Do the sanctions apply only to telecommunications equipment?

ANSWER: No. The sanctions were never limited to telecommunications equipment because of the relatively small value of the U.S. government market in this sector. Unlike EC member state governments, the U.S. government does not operate public telecommunications networks and, consequently, does not procure significant amounts of telecommunications equipment. The sanctions include some procurements of telecommunications goods and services, but these procurements are not the focus, or even the largest element, of the sanctions.

QUESTION: How does the U.S. square imposition of title vii sanctions with its obligations under the GATT Code and the U.S./EC bilateral agreement? Has the U.S. entered into an agreement and immediately violated it by imposing sanctions?

ANSWER: The sanctions in no way violate U.S. obligations under the GATT Code or the U.S./EC agreement. The sanctions apply only to procurements that are not covered by these agreements, like procurements of goods and services below the threshold values in the agreements and services sectors are not covered by the GATT and that have been specifically excluded from the U.S./EC agreement. The U.S. can impose sanctions on these procurements without violating its bilateral obligations, just as the EC has felt free to discriminate against the U.S. in the telecommunications sector for which there is not yet an agreement.

QUESTION: Why are Spain, Greece, and Portugal exempted from the sanctions?

ANSWER: These countries are not yet required to apply the rules of the EC utilities directive, including the rule that their telecommunications firms discriminate against non-EC equipment. Each of these countries has assured the U.S. that their state-owned telecommunications firms do not discriminate against U.S. telecommunications equipment.

WHITE HOUSE PRESS GUIDANCE -- 12:00 PM
THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1993

Vietnam POWs

Q: Doesn't the document released by Senator Kerry Wednesday confirm that Vietnamese lied about the number of POW/MIAs? Doesn't it confirm the facts in the Russian document?

A: -- We are continuing to review the facts in both the Russian and Tan document.

-- We cannot make a final determination until the reviews are complete.

Q: How long have you known about these documents? Have they been taken into account in reviewing the Russian document?

A: -- As part of the government's ongoing efforts under the July 1992 Executive Order to declassify all possible POW/MIA related documents, the CIA and the State Department have unclassified documents relating to Dang Tan.

-- 7 CIA documents were classified in February 1993, and ten State Departments on May 25th. All of these documents are being provided to Congress and made available to the public.

-- The State Department located its documents on May 18 and worked to declassify them on an expedited basis given the questions surrounding the Russian document.

-- We are reviewing the information on an expedited basis and Senator Kerry will inquire about the documents during his visit to Vietnam this weekend.

Q: Is his information accurate? Were there 800 MIA/POWs in 1967?

A: -- Tan claimed there were 800 American pilots being held in 1967. However, the total number of aircrews in all of Indochina missing or held as prisoners at that time was 579.

-- However, we are reviewing the documents and cannot make a final determination until all the facts are in.

[If Asked:

Q: Who is Dang Tan? Where is he now?

A: -- Dang Tan held various medical positions in the railroads department in North Vietnam until his 1967 insertion into South Vietnam as Chief of a provincial dispensary. His highest party position was as a member of the current affairs committee of the Party executive committee of Gia Lai Province.

-- He surrendered to U.S. forces on September 26, 1969 and provided information to the U.S. until 1974.

-- Since 1974, the U.S. government has had no contact with him and we do not know his current whereabouts.

-- We are attempting to find him.

North Korea-U.S. Talks

Q: Any reaction to Sen. Lugar's comment that the Administration is not taking the North Korean nuclear problem seriously enough?

A: -- You should not mistake the absence of sabre-rattling for lack of resolve.

-- We have made very clear, including in the UN Security Council, that North Korea's actions in the nuclear area create a potentially grave threat to international peace and to the global nonproliferation regime. We have been supported by the overwhelming majority of other nations.

-- Our diplomatic approach to North Korea is designed to create a political context in which North Korea can take the necessary actions to resolve this issue.

-- We will not reward North Korea or any other country for violating its safeguards obligations or withdrawing from the NPT. An improvement in North Korea's relations with us or others in the international community can come only after North Korea has demonstrated that it will honor its nonproliferation commitments.

Q: Does the U.S. have any contingency plans in the event this diplomatic approach fails?

A: -- Planning for a number of contingencies is underway.

-- I will not comment further on our contingency plans.

Q: What about these reports that the US and North Korea will meet to resolve the nuclear issue.

A: -- We will meet with the North Koreans in New York on Wednesday, June 2. The US side will be headed by Assistant Secretary of State Bob Gallucci and the North Korean side will be headed by First Vice Foreign Minister Kang Sok Chu.

Q. What do we want from the North Koreans?

A: -- Our goal in the talks will be to seek a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, by achieving North Korea's commitment to remain in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), to carry out all International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and to implement fully the North-South denuclearization declaration.

Q. What can we do for the North Koreans?

A. -- We are prepared to give the North Koreans a careful hearing and will seek to respond to any questions they raise about U.S. intentions (which are purely defensive).

Q. Will there be further meetings?

A. We will see.

Q: How long will the talks last?

A: -- At this point, the only meeting scheduled is June 2.

Jordan-Iraq

[Background: Today's [Thursday's] New York Times reports King Hussein has criticized Iraq and Saddam Hussein in a private meeting with the Jordanian press. The King will see President Clinton on June 18.]

Q: What is your reaction to the reports King Hussein is stating his opposition to Iraq?

A: -- We welcome reports that King Hussein and the Jordanian government have expressed their opposition to the policies on the Saddam regime in Iraq.

-- U.S. policy remains committed to seeing full Iraqi compliance with all UN Security Council resolutions and full enforcement of the UN sanctions.

Saudi Arabia-Iraq

[Background: Reuters and other press services are reporting that the Saudi leadership, including Crown Prince Abdallah, met this week with the leadership of the Iraqi National Congress opposition. We understand King Fahd also met the INC. Vice President Gore met with the INC earlier this month.]

Q: What is your reaction to the meetings between Saudi leaders and the Iraqi opposition?

A: -- We welcome the Saudi decision to meet with the INC. The United States supports the INC as a democratic alternative to the Saddam regime. We urge other in the region to accord the INC the recognition and support it deserves.

U.S. Policy Toward Iran

Q: What can you tell us about the new U.S. policy of isolating Iraq, as reported in The New York Times?

A: -- Iran is currently pursuing policies which threaten the security of the Gulf region or which are at odds with international standards.

-- As long as that is the case, U.S. policy will be to work with other members of the international community to make Iran pay a price for their behavior.

Q: Are you prepared to allow the sale of civilian aircraft to Iran?

A: -- This is a difficult issue which combines a number of U.S. interests, including economic interests. It has been the subject of an intensive review in the Administration, and a decision has not yet been taken.

Cambodia Elections

Q: Special Representative Akashi has reportedly declared the Cambodian elections "free and fair". Does the US share that view?

A: -- The Secretary-General will be the one to make that formal determination.

-- However, we are extremely pleased with the polling process thus far. Over 87% percent of registered voters have already cast their ballots.

-- Even voters in Khmer Rouge held areas have turned out in stunning numbers.

-- We applaud the bravery and determination of the Cambodian people to decide their own destiny, despite widespread violence and intimidation.

-- UNTAC has done an outstanding job of ensuring that the polling has gone smoothly. The resolve of the UN troops and civilians on the ground in the face of attacks and repeated threats has been truly admirable.

-- Despite a great deal of violence in the run-up to the elections, we are optimistic that the polling will conclude successfully. If so, we hope that the Secretary-General will be able to certify that, although flawed in many respects, the campaign and elections have been sufficiently "free and fair".

Q: Prince Sihanouk now says he will no longer pursue a KR coalition government? Is this a hopeful sign?

A: -- We must wait to see the outcome of the poll and the composition of the new government. The future government of Cambodia will be for the people to decide.

Q: What role should the UN play after August in Cambodia?

A: -- The UN and the international community have invested a great deal in Cambodia. The Security Council will decide at an appropriate time if there should be any further role for the UN after UNTAC's mandate expires. In any case, we hope that the UN's development and humanitarian agencies can play an active role in assisting the Cambodian people once a new government is formed.

Background Briefing at State on U.S. Global Role

- Q. What can you tell us about the background briefing provided by a senior State Department official reflecting on the decline in American leadership in a post-Cold War era?
- A. -- The views expressed in that briefing do not reflect the views of the President or the Secretary of State. The President and Secretary Christopher have described his views on the role of the United States in the post-Cold War era on several occasions, most recently in an interview of Secretary Christopher on last night's Nightline program. I would refer you to his comments.
- Q. Doesn't the U.S. performance over the weekend on Bosnia seem to bear out the briefer's comments? Haven't we ceded leadership to the Europeans on this issue?
- A. -- No. The joint action program adopted Saturday in Washington is a direct result of American leadership on the Bosnian issue. It is an outgrowth of Secretary Christopher's determined efforts to move the Western allies into a more active and forceful policy.

(NOTE: All other questions, including speculation on the identity of the briefer, speculation on his/her motivations, or future role for the briefer should be referred to the State Department.)

China: MFN

Q: This morning the President made it clear that he will extend MFN for China, but he did not specify what sort of conditions would be demanded. Has he backed away from serious conditions?

A: -- The President's words speak clear for themselves.

-- As he has always said, the President's policy on MFN renewal will depend on steps the Chinese government takes to address the important issues of human rights, proliferation and trade.

-- We have no interest in isolating China. China is changing rapidly and growing quickly, and we hope it will be a partner in building a more secure and prosperous world. But continued progress in our relations must include progress in human rights, trade access and non-proliferation.

-- The President has consulted closely with key members of Congress on the issue of MFN.

-- We expect to make a formal announcement on this issue very soon.

Q: Does the Administration support the China MFN bill introduced in Congress by Pelosi and Mitchell, including the provision on Tibet?

A: -- We share the concerns of Congress over China's record. We share with a majority in Congress the belief that progress in our relations must include progress in human rights, trade and non-proliferation.

-- As to the issue of Tibet, we continue to urge Beijing to revive discussions with the Dalai Lama and to address the full range of concerns and issues of the people of Tibet, including human rights abuses.

+ hrs 5/27

"CBS this morning"

SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. We're going to come back live from the Rose Garden in just a second.
(Announcements.)

SMITH: This is the first national network town meeting since you've been elected president. We thank you for allowing us to come in. If you wouldn't mind standing up and asking your question. Your name?

Q: My name is Eleanor Phillips. I'm from Tarzana, California.

I've been going to China since 1980, seven or eight times. I've lived and worked in China for two years. I'm very concerned about what you're going to do with the most favored nation. On the one hand, if you don't give them this, you feel that you'll pressure the government into changing their attitude. On the other hand, the people don't want that to happen because they feel that they will be hurt financially and then when they're hurt economically and financially, then they'll get less rights and privileges.

SMITH: Is this a done deal, your decision on this?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I think it is a done deal for the next year. Let me explain the issue here.

In order for a country to trade with us, they have to get what's called most favored nation status, in order to have big trade. China is a huge trading partner of ours. We have I think now our second biggest trading deficit with China, just behind Japan. They've got one of the fastest growing economies in the world. They've moving away from communism to market economics very quickly. They still put political prisoners in jail. They still, we think, have used prison labor to make products. And we have some other problems with them.

< China
MFN

The issue is should we revoke that or should we put conditions on it? I basically have decided to extent most favored nation status for a year because I want to support modernization in China and it's a great opportunity for America there. But I want to make it clear to them that there has to be some progress on human rights and the use of prison labor.

Our trade disputes and our disputes about arms sales, I'm going to take out of this issue and negotiate directly with them. I think they will appreciate the gesture I'm making but I hope they understand that the United States just can't turn its back on the abuse of lots of people, and especially the use of prison labor and just choking people off when they say their piece.

ZAHN: The next question?

Q: I'm Jan Wagner from Troy, Michigan.

My question, Mr. President, when you wake up in the morning, before you get out of bed, do you lie there and think what stupid little thing's going to happen today?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Some days I do. What I really think is stupid little things happen to everybody and I just hope that if some stupid little thing happens to me it won't overshadow all the big good things I'm trying to do.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Office of the Spokesman

For Immediate Release
5/26/93 Taken Question

May 26, 1993

PRC COMPLIANCE WITH MISSILE CONTROLS

Q: Is it the U.S. view that the Chinese have kept their
promise to comply with missile technology controls?

A: -- WE CONTINUE TO MONITOR CLOSELY AND CAREFULLY EXAMINE
REPORTS SUGGESTING THE CHINESE ARE NOT ABIDING BY THEIR
MTCR COMMITMENTS.

-- IF THE ADMINISTRATION CONCLUDES THAT CHINA HAS ENGAGED
IN IMPROPER TRANSFERS, IT WILL NOT HESITATE TO TAKE THE
ACTION REQUIRED UNDER U.S. MISSILE PROLIFERATION LAW.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Office of the Spokesman

For Immediate Release
TAKEN QUESTION 5/26/93

May 26, 1993

CHINA: RELEASE OF PRISONERS

Q. How many individuals were on the list given the Chinese by Winston Lord? How many others have been released besides Xu Wenli?

A. -- AT EVERY HIGH-LEVEL MEETING BETWEEN CHINESE AND AMERICAN OFFICIALS WE RAISE HUMAN RIGHTS CASES. XU WENLI'S WAS ONE OF A NUMBER OF CASES ASSISTANT SECRETARY LORD RAISED DURING HIS VISIT TO BEIJING TWO WEEKS AGO.

-- XU. A PROMINENT DEMOCRACY WALL ACTIVIST WHO SERVED 12 YEARS OF A 15-YEAR SENTENCE, IS THE ONLY ONE WHO HAS BEEN RELEASED SINCE THAT TIME.

China: Tibet Protests

[Background: There were two day of anti-Chinese protests in Lhasa on Monday and Tuesday.]

Q: Have you been in contact with the Chinese about the violence and protests in Tibet?

A: -- Yes. We raised our concerns about the unrest in Lhasa with Beijing.

-- We also expressed concern over reports that several Tibetans were recently arrested in Lhasa in connection with the visit this past week of a delegation of EC diplomats.

-- We urge the Chinese authorities to exercise maximum restraint in dealing with this matter.

-- We are following this situation very closely.

Sandy Berger and China-MFN

- Q. What can you say about the propriety of having Deputy National Security Advisor Samuel Berger involved in the decision-making process on whether to extend Most-Favored Nation status for China; given his previous representation of Payless Shoe Stores, a major importer of Chinese footwear?
- A. -- U.S. imports from China affected by MFN status totaled about \$24 billion in 1992, and involved tens of thousands, if not millions, of American companies and workers.
- As Deputy National Security Advisor, Samuel Berger is involved in all foreign affairs decision-making processes. When the question of Mr. Berger's role in the decision on extending China's MFN status was first raised, we requested a ruling from White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum as to whether Mr. Berger's previous activity for a U.S. company that imports Chinese-made footwear would preclude his involvement in the decision-making process.
- Mr. Nussbaum determined that the interest of Payless Shoe Stores in the decision on China MFN extension "is one shared by many persons and entities." He determined that "under the facts, therefore, I am aware of no reason why Mr. Berger should not participate in consideration of the extension of China's MFN status."
- Mr. Nussbaum advised that with respect to the MFN extension, to avoid the appearance of partiality, Mr. Berger should neither receive nor consider the views of Payless with respect to the MFN extension. Mr. Berger has lived up to that standard.
- Mr. Berger severed his relationship to Payless and to his former law firm, Hogan and Hartson upon entering government, has no financial interest in any decision taken on MFN for China and has signed the Administration's restrictions on his post-government activities.

Guatemala

Q: What is your reaction to the auto-coup in Guatemala by President Serrano?

A: -- The President deplores and condemns President Serrano's suspension of the Guatemalan Congress and courts and other democratic rights protected by the Guatemalan constitution.

-- This illegitimate course of action threatens to place Guatemala outside the democratic community of nations. We hope the Guatemalan leadership will reverse its course and immediately restore full constitutional democracy.

-- Yesterday [Tuesday], the Organization of American States agreed to send its Secretary General, Joao Baena Soares, to lead a fact-finding mission to Guatemala. We have also urged an immediate convocation of an emergency meeting of Foreign Ministers of the OAS, and we expect it to occur shortly.

Q: Will the U.S. impose sanctions?

A: -- We are undertaking a comprehensive review of our bilateral economic assistance and cooperation with Guatemala, as well as our support for lending by the international financial institutions.

-- Our military assistance was previously suspended due to Guatemala's human rights violations.

Q: How much aid does the U.S. give Guatemala?

A: -- In FY 1992, the U.S. provided about \$47 million in development and food aid.

-- \$20 million appropriated for economic support; of this, \$10.5 million has not disbursed.

-- \$400,000 was appropriated for military training, of which \$270,000 was disbursed.

-- For FY 1993, We had planned about \$45 million in food aid and development assistance, \$2.5 million in antinarcotics aid, and \$400,000 for military training.

The White House

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 25th, 1993

Statement on Guatemala

The President was very disappointed to hear that President Serrano of Guatemala has suspended the Congress and courts and other democratic rights protected by the Guatemalan Constitution. This illegitimate course of action threatens to place Guatemala outside the democratic community of nations. We strongly condemn such efforts to resolve Guatemala's problems through non-democratic means. We hope the Guatemalan leadership will reverse its course and immediately restore full constitutional democracy.

U.S. Department of State
Office of the Spokesman

2

For Immediate Release

May 25, 1993

STATEMENT BY RICHARD BOUCHER, SPOKESMAN

GUATEMALA: SUSPENSION OF CONGRESS, COURTS

The United States is disappointed over the events this morning in Guatemala. It is a clear interruption of the democratic process that demands the immediate attention of the inter-American community. There is no justification for resorting to non-democratic means to resolve Guatemala's problems.

We understand Guatemalan President Serrano announced he was acting under transitional article 21 of the Guatemalan constitution to suspend the Guatemalan Congress, Supreme Court and Constitutional Court and to ask the Electoral Tribunal to call elections within two months for a constituent assembly. Some military elements have deployed in Guatemala City and have surrounded the houses of the president of Congress and the human rights ombudsman.

Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs Bernard Aronson telephoned President Serrano this morning to make our strong opposition clear and urged him to reverse these steps. We are in touch with the Organization of American States, the United Nations and the governments in the region to urge them to help persuade President Serrano not to proceed along the lines he announced.

If these steps are not reversed immediately the United States will press for an emergency meeting of foreign ministers of the OAS under the Santiago Declaration. OAS Secretary-General Baena Soares informed Assistant Secretary Aronson he would call for a meeting of the Permanent Council of the OAS immediately, the first step in the Santiago process.

South-North Korea Dialogue

Q: What can you tell us about reports that South and North Korea will have direct talks about the nuclear issue? Where does this fit in with U.S.-North Korea talks?

A: -- South Korea's prime minister on May 20 proposed to his North Korean counterpart direct contacts to discuss issues of concern to both sides.

-- North Korea responded on May 25 by proposing that both sides meet at the vice-ministerial level to discuss preparations for an exchange of special envoys at the deputy-prime ministerial level.

-- We view the fact that North Korea has responded to the South's proposal as a positive step toward a full resumption of North-South dialogue, which we would welcome.

-- Our consistent policy is that all differences between North and South Korea should be settled through North-South dialogue. We coordinate very closely with the Republic of Korea on our approach to North Korea and see these talks as mutually reinforcing our objectives.

Haiti

Q: Are President's Aristide's supporters about to give up on the U.S. and UN/OAS efforts to return democracy to Haiti, as reported in The Washington Post?

A: -- We are committed to the restoration of constitutional government and the return of President Aristide to Haiti. We have made that view clear to the current military leaders in Haiti.

-- We believe that the negotiations will succeed. We will not back off from our commitment to the Haitian people, nor will we accept delaying tactics. All Haitian parties must come together to ensure the restoration of democracy quickly.

-- We believe UN and OAS Special Representative Dante Caputo is making progress, and we continue to support his efforts.

Q: What is your reaction to the rejection by the de facto government and military of the plan to send an international police force to Haiti?

A: -- The international community put together a plan for a multilateral police contingent because the Haitian parties said such a plan would be useful as part of a broader political settlement of the Haiti crisis.

-- It is regrettable that the parties chose not to take the political responsibility for accepting this plan.

-- We are now reviewing our policies in close consultations with the UN and OAS.

-- We remain deeply committed to our objectives of restoring democracy to Haiti and Aristide to his presidency.

Q: Do you plan to implement sanctions now?

A: -- We are considering a whole range of additional measures, including sanctions.

Funds for Humanitarian Aid to Bosnia and Croatia

[Background: The State Department announced Monday that the President has directed the State Department to provide an additional \$30 million to Bosnia and Croatia to meet urgent and unexpected humanitarian needs of refugees and victims of conflict in those countries.]

Q. What will the funds be used for?

A. -- These funds will support the invaluable work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross and other international agencies. Funds are needed for food, gasoline for transport of assistance, medical supplies, use and maintenance of vehicles and support of UN humanitarian operations. The U.S. assistance could be used for any or all of these purposes.

Q. What is the total amount of U.S. support for the humanitarian aid effort in the former Yugoslavia?

A. -- For 1993, it is just over \$200 million.

Q. Why don't others come forward and help?

A. -- They do. In fact, the European Community has provided about 70 percent of humanitarian aid to the former Yugoslavia over the past year. Moreover, we have urged other governments to come forward with assistance.

Q. How can we be spending \$30 million for Bosnia and Croatia when there is so much suffering at home?

A. -- We can meet our humanitarian obligations at home without neglecting such commitments overseas.

-- Moreover, the \$30 million comes from an account dedicated to refugee assistance overseas. The contribution is therefore not at the expense of any domestic program.

Talking Points on Bosnia Joint Action Program

- The Joint Action Program on Bosnia adopted on Saturday by the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, and Spain is an important step forward.
- It reinforces our determination to **end the violence and ethnic cleansing**, prevent the spread of the conflict to other areas in the region, and ensure a **coordinated plan of action** among the United States, our European allies, and Russia.
- The 13-point program includes a wide-range of measures achieve these goals, including humanitarian assistance, enhanced enforcement of existing sanctions and the threat of additional sanctions, new security measures for neighboring areas of Kosovo and Macedonia, protection for "safe havens" and a U.N. War Crimes Tribunal.
- The creation of safe havens **does not "legitimate genocide."**
 - In fact, the Joint Action Program firmly reasserts the **refusal of the Western allies to accept territorial gains in Bosnia through aggression.**
 - For example, it clearly states that economic sanctions will remain in place until the withdrawal of Bosnian Serb troops from territories occupied by force.
 - It **leaves open options for new and tougher measures** proposed by the United States, including the lifting of the arms embargo on the Bosnians and the threat of air strikes to allow the rearming to take place.
- The joint program adopted Saturday in Washington is a direct result of **American leadership** on the Bosnian issue.
 - It is an outgrowth of Secretary Christopher's determined efforts to move the Western allies into a more active policy towards the Bosnian crisis.
 - The important role played by the Russian Foreign Minister stems in part from President Clinton's leadership in Vancouver in supporting President Yeltsin at a crucial moment.
- The United States will continue to play its **appropriate role** in a coordinated effort to resolve the Bosnian situation.
 - This role includes enforcing the "No Fly" zone, provision of humanitarian assistance, assisting UNPROFOR troops if they come under attack, and possibly providing troops in Macedonia.
 - We will **not put U.S. groundtroops into Bosnia** except to support a comprehensive political settlement.

Bosnia

Q: Doesn't President Izetbegovic's rejection of the new plan make the safe havens untenable? Hasn't the President himself said the plan rewards genocide?

A: -- The safe havens will be a way of stopping the fighting in and around the six enclaves and a way of protecting the innocent civilians inside the enclaves.

-- We and our allies will continue to work with the Bosnian parties to reach a negotiated settlement which will address the long-term future of the Bosnian people.

-- As President Clinton has said, the new action program for Bosnia strengthens the possibility of ending ethnic cleansing and limiting the conflict.

Q: How do we stand on resolutions before the UN Security Council?

A: -- The UNSC voted Tuesday to establish a war crimes tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

-- Later this week, we expect the Council to consider a resolution implementing Safe Areas in Bosnia.

-- We also expect a resolution preparing the way for placing international monitors along the border of Serbia and Bosnia. [The six safe areas under consideration are Sarajevo, Srebrenica, Tuzla, Bihac, Gorazde, and Zepa. We have no indication as to whether additional areas might be added later.]

INTERNATIONAL NEWS SUMMARY -- NSC PRESS OFFICE
THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1993

Bonn Ends Asylum Rights: Germany revoked its constitutional guarantee of asylum to any politically oppressed person, sharply limiting the number of foreigners who can seek asylum in the country. (WP A1, NYT A1, WT A7, LAT A1)

Russian Aid Plan Clears a House Appropriations Panel: President Clinton's promised \$1.8 billion Russian aid package quietly cleared its first legislative hurdle, winning approval from a key House subcommittee. (WSJ A2)

U.S. Considers Move to Isolate Iran: The Clinton Administration is preparing a broad new effort to weaken Iran by persuading reluctant allies to cut off loans, investment and arms sales to what American officials regard as a permanently hostile government. (NYT A1)

Vietnamese Defector Cited 500 Additional POWs: A North Vietnamese defector told U.S. officials that his country held 500 more POWs than it acknowledged, but U.S. officials doubted his story and decided not to reveal the numbers. (WP A43, LAT A5)

Sihanouk Opposes Khmer Rouge Role: Prince Sihanouk announced that he had abandoned plans to set up a coalition government that included the Khmer Rouge. He said internationally supervised elections proved that the Maoist rebels had no place in Cambodia's future. (NYT A3, WP A42, WT A9, LAT A3)

U.S. May Bargain with North Korea: In a new attempt to defuse a dispute over nuclear weapons, the U.S. (in the person of Robert Gallucci) said that it was prepared to make some concessions to North Korea if it agreed to rejoin the NPT. (NYT A6, WP A43, WT A9)

Chinese Dissident Released: The Chinese Government freed a prominent pro-democracy campaigner who had spent the last 12 years in prison; the move appeared to be an olive branch to President Clinton. (NYT A5, WP A37)

NATO Talks Fail to Reach Accord on Bosnia: Amid sharp differences over policy toward Bosnia, NATO defense ministers failed to endorse a plan to create safe havens. (NYT A12, WP A45, LAT A2)

Sarajevo Balks at Backing Latest Peace Proposal: President Izetbegovic told UN negotiator Stoltenberg that the Muslim-led government would not accept an allied proposal for containing the war here unless the UN sets a deadline for Serbs to return Bosnian territory. (NYT A12)

Haitians Raise Threat of Violence: Supporters of ousted President Aristide, angered by failure of the Clinton Administration and the UN to restore democracy, are losing hope in negotiations and fear a new wave of violence could plunge the nation into chaos. (WP A38)

Mandela Says Arrests Won't Halt Talks: The ANC declared that despite its outrage at the widespread arrests of black nationalists on Tuesday, it would press ahead with negotiations aimed at ending white rule. (NYT A11)

Pakistan Chief's Dismissal Overturned: The Pakistan Supreme Court overturned a presidential order of last month dismissing Prime Minister Sharif and dissolving the National Assembly. (NYT A3, WP A37, WT A7)

King Hussein Breaks with Iraq: King Hussein has openly broken with Baghdad. Charging the Iraqi Government with "practices" that had deeply harmed Jordanian interests, the King said that he now opposed the continued leadership of Iraq by President Hussein. (NYT A15)

3rd Security Review Is Out of Shadows: Excessive secrecy has suddenly become a hot topic in the Clinton Administration, which yesterday announced the start of a third major review of Cold War-era rules that govern creation of "classified" information. (WP A23)

Americans' Bridge to Africa: More than 1,000 African American civil rights leaders, politicians and businessmen are meeting in Libreville, Gabon to strengthen American economic and cultural ties to Africa. (WP A1, NYT A10)

Teledyne and Chilean Indicted in Iraq Bomb Sales: A Chilean arms dealer who says he supplied bombs to Iraq for more than eight years with the knowledge of the U.S. Government was indicted here along with a California military contractor on charges that they violated laws controlling the export of munitions. (NYT A23, WP A3, LAT A1)

WHITE HOUSE PRESS GUIDANCE -- 09:00 AM
THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1993

Vietnam POWs

Q: Doesn't this document confirm that Vietnamese lied about the number of POW/MIAs? Doesn't it confirm the facts in the Russian document?

A: -- We are continuing to review the facts in both the Russian and Tan document.

-- We cannot make a final determination until the reviews are complete.

Q: How long have you known about these documents? Have they been taken into account in reviewing the Russian document?

A: -- As part of the government's ongoing efforts under the July 1992 Executive Order to declassify all possible POW/MIA related documents, the CIA and the State Department have unclassified documents relating to Dang Tan.

-- 7 CIA documents were classified in February 1993, and ten State Departments on May 25th. All of these documents are being provided to Congress and made available to the public.

-- The State Department located its documents on May 18 and worked to declassify them on an expedited basis given the questions surrounding the Russian document.

-- We are reviewing the information on an expedited basis and Senator Kerry will inquire about the documents during his visit to Vietnam this weekend.

Q: Is his information accurate? Were there 800 MIA/POWs in 1967?

A: -- Tan claimed there were 800 American pilots being held in 1967. However, the total number of aircrews in all of Indochina missing or held as prisoners at that time was 579.

-- However, we are reviewing the documents and cannot make a final determination until all the facts are in.

[If Asked:

Q: Who is Dang Tan? Where is he now?

A: -- Dang Tan held various medical positions in the railroads department in North Vietnam until his 1967 insertion into South Vietnam as Chief of a provincial dispensary. His highest party position was as a member of the current affairs committee of the Party executive committee of Gia Lai Province.

-- He surrendered to U.S. forces on September 26, 1969 and provided information to the U.S. until 1974.

-- Since 1974, the U.S. government has had no contact with him and we do not know his current whereabouts.

-- We are attempting to find him.

China: MFN

Q: Will the Administration place conditions on MFN through an Executive Order?

A: -- The President has not yet taken a decision. Our approach to MFN renewal will depend on steps the Chinese government takes to address the important issues of human rights, proliferation and trade.

Q: During the campaign, Bill Clinton spoke out on concerns over humans rights abuses and criticized the previous administration for coddling China. What is the Administration policy on this issue?

A: -- We have no interest in isolating China. China is changing rapidly and growing quickly, and we hope it will be a partner in building a more secure and prosperous world. But continued progress in our relations must include progress in human rights, trade access and non-proliferation.

-- As we chart our China policy, the President is consulting closely with key members of Congress, including on the issue of MFN.

Q: Does the Administration support the China MFN bill introduced in Congress by Pelosi and Mitchell, including the provision on Tibet?

A: -- We share the concerns of Congress over China's record. We share with a majority in Congress the belief that progress in our relations must include progress in human rights, trade and non-proliferation.

-- As to the issue of Tibet, we continue to urge Beijing to revive discussions with the Dalai Lama and to address the full range of concerns and issues of the people of Tibet, including human rights abuses.

7 hrs 5/27

CBS This Morning

SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. We're going to come back live from the Rose Garden in just a second. (Announcements.)

SMITH: This is the first national network town meeting since you've been elected president. We thank you for allowing us to come in. If you wouldn't mind standing up and asking your question. Your name?

Q: My name is Eleanor Phillips. I'm from Tarzana, California.

I've been going to China since 1980, seven or eight times. I've lived and worked in China for two years. I'm very concerned about what you're going to do with the most favored nation. On the one hand, if you don't give them this, you feel that you'll pressure the government into changing their attitude. On the other hand, the people don't want that to happen because they feel that they will be hurt financially and then when they're hurt economically and financially, then they'll get less rights and privileges.

SMITH: Is this a done deal, your decision on this?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I think it is a done deal for the next year. Let me explain the issue here.

In order for a country to trade with us, they have to get what's called most favored nation status, in order to have big trade. China is a huge trading partner of ours. We have I think now our second biggest trading deficit with China, just behind Japan. They've got one of the fastest growing economies in the world. They're moving away from communism to market economics very quickly. They still put political prisoners in jail. They still, we think, have used prison labor to make products. And we have some other problems with them.

The issue is should we revoke that or should we put conditions on it? I basically have decided to extent most favored nation status for a year because I want to support modernization in China and it's a great opportunity for America there. But I want to make it clear to them that there has to be some progress on human rights and the use of prison labor.

Our trade disputes and our disputes about arms sales, I'm going to take out of this issue and negotiate directly with them. I think they will appreciate the gesture I'm making but I hope they understand that the United States just can't turn its back on the abuse of lots of people, and especially the use of prison labor and just choking people off when they say their piece.

ZAHN: The next question?

Q: I'm Jan Wagner from Troy, Michigan.

My question, Mr. President, when you wake up in the morning, before you get out of bed, do you lie there and think what stupid little things are going to happen today?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Some days I do. What I really think is stupid little things happen to everybody and I just hope that if some stupid little thing happens to me it won't overshadow all the big good things I'm trying to do.

China-
INF

China: Tibet Protests

[Background: There was a second day of anti-Chinese protests in Lhasa Tuesday.]

Q: Have you been in contact with the Chinese about the violence and protests in Tibet?

A: -- Yes. We raised our concerns about the unrest in Lhasa with Beijing.

-- We also expressed concern over reports that several Tibetans were recently arrested in Lhasa in connection with the visit this past week of a delegation of EC diplomats.

-- We urge the Chinese authorities to exercise maximum restraint in dealing with this matter.

-- We are following this situation very closely.

Sandy Berger and China-MFN

- Q. What can you say about the propriety of having Deputy National Security Advisor Samuel Berger involved in the decision-making process on whether to extend Most-Favored Nation status for China, given his previous representation of Payless Shoe Stores, a major importer of Chinese footwear?
- A. -- U.S. imports from China affected by MFN status totaled about \$24 billion in 1992, and involved tens of thousands, if not millions, of American companies and workers.
- As Deputy National Security Advisor, Samuel Berger is involved in all foreign affairs decision-making processes. When the question of Mr. Berger's role in the decision on extending China's MFN status was first raised, we requested a ruling from White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum as to whether Mr. Berger's previous activity for a U.S. company that imports Chinese-made footwear would preclude his involvement in the decision-making process.
- Mr. Nussbaum determined that the interest of Payless Shoe Stores in the decision on China MFN extension "is one shared by many persons and entities." He determined that "under the facts, therefore, I am aware of no reason why Mr. Berger should not participate in consideration of the extension of China's MFN status."
- Mr. Nussbaum advised that with respect to the MFN extension, to avoid the appearance of partiality, Mr. Berger should neither receive nor consider the views of Payless with respect to the MFN extension. Mr. Berger has lived up to that standard.
- Mr. Berger severed his relationship to Payless and to his former law firm, Hogan and Hartson upon entering government, has no financial interest in any decision taken on MFN for China and has signed the Administration's restrictions on his post-government activities.

North Korea-U.S. Talks

Q: Any reaction to Sen. Lugar's comment that the Administration is not taking the North Korean nuclear problem seriously enough?

A: -- You should not mistake the absence of sabre-rattling for lack of resolve.

-- We have made very clear, including in the UN Security Council, that North Korea's actions in the nuclear area create a potentially grave threat to international peace and to the global nonproliferation regime. We have been supported by the overwhelming majority of other nations.

-- Our diplomatic approach to North Korea is designed to create a political context in which North Korea can take the necessary actions to resolve this issue.

-- We will not reward North Korea or any other country for violating its safeguards obligations or withdrawing from the NPT. An improvement in North Korea's relations with us or others in the international community can come only after North Korea has demonstrated that it will honor its nonproliferation commitments.

Q: Does the U.S. have any contingency plans in the event this diplomatic approach fails?

A: -- Planning for a number of contingencies is underway.

-- I will not comment further on our contingency plans.

Q: What about these reports that the US and North Korea will meet to resolve the nuclear issue.

A: -- We will meet with the North Koreans in New York on Wednesday, June 2. The US side will be headed by Assistant Secretary of State Bob Gallucci and the North Korean side will be headed by First Vice Foreign Minister Kang Sok Chu.

Q: What do we want from the North Koreans?

A: -- Our goal in the talks will be to seek a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, by achieving North Korea's commitment to remain in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), to carry out all International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and to implement fully the North-South denuclearization declaration.

Q. What can we do for the North Koreans?

A. -- We are prepared to give the North Koreans a careful hearing, and will seek to respond to any questions they raise about U.S. intentions (which are purely defensive).

Q. Will there be further meetings?

A. We will see.

Q: How long will the talks last?

A: -- At this point, the only meeting scheduled is June 2.

Jordan-Iraq

[Background: Today's [Thursday's] [New York Times reports King Hussein has criticized Iraq and Saddam Hussein in a private meeting with the Jordanian press. The King will see President Clinton on June 18.]

Q: What is your reaction to the reports King Hussein is stating his opposition to Iraq?

A: -- We welcome reports that King Hussein and the Jordanian government have expressed their opposition to the policies on the Saddam regime in Iraq.

-- U.S. policy remains committed to seeing full Iraqi compliance with all UN Security Council resolutions and full enforcement of the UN sanctions.

Saudi Arabia-Iraq

[Background: Reuters and other press services are reporting that the Saudi leadership, including Crown Prince Abdallah, met this week with the leadership of the Iraqi National Congress opposition. We understand King Fahd also met the INC. Vice President Gore met with the INC earlier this month.]

Q: What is your reaction to the meetings between Saudi leaders and the Iraqi opposition?

A: -- We welcome the Saudi decision to meet with the INC. The United States supports the INC as a democratic alternative to the Saddam regime. We urge other in the region to accord the INC the recognition and support it deserves.

Background Briefing at State on U.S. Global Role

- Q. What can you tell us about the background briefing provided by a senior State Department official reflecting on the decline in American leadership in a post-Cold War era?
- A. -- The views expressed in that briefing do not reflect the views of the President or the Secretary of State. The President and Secretary Christopher have described his views on the role of the United States in the post-Cold War era on several occasions, most recently in an interview of Secretary Christopher on last night's Nightline program. I would refer you to his comments.
- Q. Doesn't the U.S. performance over the weekend on Bosnia seem to bear out the briefer's comments? Haven't we ceded leadership to the Europeans on this issue?
- A. -- No. The joint action program adopted Saturday in Washington is a direct result of American leadership on the Bosnian issue. It is an outgrowth of Secretary Christopher's determined efforts to move the Western allies into a more active and forceful policy.

(NOTE: All other questions, including speculation on the identity of the briefer, speculation on his/her motivations, or future role for the briefer should be referred to the State Department.)

Guatemala

Q: What is your reaction to the auto-coup in Guatemala by President Serrano?

- A: -- The President deplores and condemns President Serrano's suspension of the Guatemalan Congress and courts and other democratic rights protected by the Guatemalan constitution.
- This illegitimate course of action threatens to place Guatemala outside the democratic community of nations. We hope the Guatemalan leadership will reverse its course and immediately restore full constitutional democracy.
- Yesterday [Tuesday], the Organization of American States agreed to send its Secretary General, Joao Baena Soares, to lead a fact-finding mission to Guatemala. We have also urged an immediate convocation of an emergency meeting of Foreign Ministers of the OAS, and we expect it to occur shortly.

Q: Will the U.S. impose sanctions?

- A: -- We are undertaking a comprehensive review of our bilateral economic assistance and cooperation with Guatemala, as well as our support for lending by the international financial institutions.
- Our military assistance was previously suspended due to Guatemala's human rights violations.

Q: How much aid does the U.S. give Guatemala?

- A: -- In FY 1992, the U.S. provided about \$47 million in development and food aid.
- \$20 million appropriated for economic support; of this, \$10.5 million has not disbursed.
- \$400,000 was appropriated for military training, of which \$270,000 was disbursed.

The White House

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

May 25th, 1993

Statement on Guatemala

The President was very disappointed to hear that President Serrano of Guatemala has suspended the Congress and courts and other democratic rights protected by the Guatemalan Constitution. This illegitimate course of action threatens to place Guatemala outside the democratic community of nations. We strongly condemn such efforts to resolve Guatemala's problems through non-democratic means. We hope the Guatemalan leadership will reverse its course and immediately restore full constitutional democracy.

U.S. Department of State
Office of the Spokesman

2

For Immediate Release

May 25, 1993

STATEMENT BY RICHARD BOUCHER, SPOKESMAN

GUATEMALA: SUSPENSION OF CONGRESS, COURTS

The United States is disappointed over the events this morning in Guatemala. It is a clear interruption of the democratic process that demands the immediate attention of the inter-American community. There is no justification for resorting to non-democratic means to resolve Guatemala's problems.

We understand Guatemalan President Serrano announced he was acting under transitional article 21 of the Guatemalan constitution to suspend the Guatemalan Congress, Supreme Court and Constitutional Court and to ask the Electoral Tribunal to call elections within two months for a constituent assembly. Some military elements have deployed in Guatemala City and have surrounded the houses of the president of Congress and the human rights ombudsman.

Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs Bernard Aronson telephoned President Serrano this morning to make our strong opposition clear and urged him to reverse these steps. We are in touch with the Organization of American States, the United Nations and the governments in the region to urge them to help persuade President Serrano not to proceed along the lines he announced.

If these steps are not reversed immediately the United States will press for an emergency meeting of foreign ministers of the OAS under the Santiago Declaration. OAS Secretary-General Baena Soares informed Assistant Secretary Aronson he would call for a meeting of the Permanent Council of the OAS immediately, the first step in the Santiago process.

South-North Korea Dialogue

Q: What can you tell us about reports that South and North Korea will have direct talks about the nuclear issue? Where does this fit in with U.S.-North Korea talks?

A: -- South Korea's prime minister on May 20 proposed to his North Korean counterpart direct contacts to discuss issues of concern to both sides.

-- North Korea responded on May 25 by proposing that both sides meet at the vice-ministerial level to discuss preparations for an exchange of special envoys at the deputy-prime ministerial level.

-- We view the fact that North Korea has responded to the South's proposal as a positive step toward a full resumption of North-South dialogue, which we would welcome.

-- Our consistent policy is that all differences between North and South Korea should be settled through North-South dialogue. We coordinate very closely with the Republic of Korea on our approach to North Korea and see these talks as mutually reinforcing our objectives.

Haiti

Q: What is your reaction to the rejection by the de facto government and military of the plan to send an international police force to Haiti?

A: -- The international community put together a plan for a multilateral police contingent because the Haitian parties said such a plan would be useful as part of a broader political settlement of the Haiti crisis.

-- It is regrettable that the parties chose not to take the political responsibility for accepting this plan.

-- We are now reviewing our policies in close consultations with the UN and OAS.

-- We remain deeply committed to our objectives of restoring democracy to Haiti and Aristide to his presidency.

Q: Do you plan to implement sanctions now?

A: -- We are considering a whole range of additional measures, including sanctions.

Funds for Humanitarian Aid to Bosnia and Croatia

[Background: The State Department announced Monday that the President has directed the State Department to provide an additional \$30 million to Bosnia and Croatia to meet urgent and unexpected humanitarian needs of refugees and victims of conflict in those countries.]

Q. What will the funds be used for?

A. -- These funds will support the invaluable work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross and other international agencies. Funds are needed for food, gasoline for transport of assistance, medical supplies, use and maintenance of vehicles and support of UN humanitarian operations. The U.S. assistance could be used for any or all of these purposes.

Q. What is the total amount of U.S. support for the humanitarian aid effort in the former Yugoslavia?

A. -- For 1993, it is just over \$200 million.

Q. Why don't others come forward and help?

A. -- They do. In fact, the European Community has provided about 70 percent of humanitarian aid to the former Yugoslavia over the past year. Moreover, we have urged other governments to come forward with assistance.

Q. How can we be spending \$30 million for Bosnia and Croatia when there is so much suffering at home?

A. -- We can meet our humanitarian obligations at home without neglecting such commitments overseas.

-- Moreover, the \$30 million comes from an account dedicated to refugee assistance overseas. The contribution is therefore not at the expense of any domestic program.

Talking Points on Bosnia Joint Action Program

- The Joint Action Program on Bosnia adopted on Saturday by the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, and Spain is an important step forward.
 - It reinforces our determination to **end the violence and ethnic cleansing**, prevent the spread of the conflict to other areas in the region, and ensure a **coordinated plan of action** among the United States, our European allies, and Russia.
- The 13-point program includes a wide-range of measures achieve these goals, including humanitarian assistance, enhanced enforcement of existing sanctions and the threat of additional sanctions, new security measures for neighboring areas of Kosovo and Macedonia, protection for "safe havens" and a U.N. War Crimes Tribunal.
- The creation of safe havens **does not "legitimate genocide."**
 - In fact, the Joint Action Program firmly reasserts the **refusal of the Western allies to accept territorial gains in Bosnia through aggression.**
 - For example, it clearly states that economic sanctions will remain in place until the withdrawal of Bosnian Serb troops from territories occupied by force.
 - It **leaves open options for new and tougher measures** proposed by the United States, including the lifting of the arms embargo on the Bosnians and the threat of air strikes to allow the rearming to take place.
- The joint program adopted Saturday in Washington is a direct result of **American leadership** on the Bosnian issue.
 - It is an outgrowth of Secretary Christopher's determined efforts to move the Western allies into a more active policy towards the Bosnian crisis.
 - The important role played by the Russian Foreign Minister stems in part from President Clinton's leadership in Vancouver in supporting President Yeltsin at a crucial moment.
- The United States will continue to play its **appropriate role** in a coordinated effort to resolve the Bosnian situation.
 - This role includes enforcing the "No Fly" zone, provision of humanitarian assistance, assisting UNPROFOR troops if they come under attack, and possibly providing troops in Macedonia.
 - We will **not put U.S. groundtroops into Bosnia** except to support a comprehensive political settlement.

Bosnia

Q: Doesn't President Izetbegovic's rejection of the new plan make the safe havens untenable? Hasn't the President himself said the plan rewards genocide?

A: -- The safe havens will be a way of stopping the fighting in and around the six enclaves and a way of protecting the innocent civilians inside the enclaves.

-- We and our allies will continue to work with the Bosnian parties to reach a negotiated settlement which will address the long-term future of the Bosnian people.

-- As President Clinton has said, the new action program for Bosnia strengthens the possibility of ending ethnic cleansing and limiting the conflict.

Q: How do we stand on resolutions before the UN Security Council?

A: -- The UNSC voted Tuesday to establish a war crimes tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

-- Later this week, we expect the Council to consider a resolution implementing Safe Areas in Bosnia.

-- We also expect a resolution preparing the way for placing international monitors along the border of Serbia and Bosnia. [The six safe areas under consideration are Sarajevo, Srebrenica, Tuzla, Bihac, Gorazde, and Zepa. We have no indication as to whether additional areas might be added later.]

May 26, 1993

Token, Kent, Ed, CIA

Vietnam Defector

D+A approved by Calce. pls
review background + call with
any? rxs.
WS

[Background: As part of the ongoing effort to declassify all possible POW/MIA related documents (as outlined in EO 12812), the government continues to review documents in its files. Hundreds of thousands of documents have been turned over. Last February, 7 CIA documents were declassified relating to a North Vietnamese army medic, Dang Tan, who left North Vietnam in 1967 and was placed in a unit in the South. He surrendered to the US in 1969. He gave a press conference in 1971. The CIA lost track of him in 1974 and is currently reviewing where he is. Last week, additional documents relating to the same individual were reviewed by State and declassified on May 25th. The documents were made public today and Senator Kerry mentioned them today in a background session with the press.

In the documents released, Tan claims that the North Vietnamese were holding over 800 American pilots prisoner at the time he left North Vietnam in 1967. He also relates a system of classification of Vietnamese prisoners similar to that put forward in the Russian document -- progressives (who cooperated and opposed the war), hard-core POW's (who refused to cooperate), and special or important POW's (who had important information).

At the time of his press conference, American officials instructed Tan not to use the figure of 800 in his press conference (or his claim that POW's were drugged) out of concern that the information was inaccurate. In 1967, there were only a total of 353 POW and 479 MIA's -- only 579 aircrews for all of Indochina. While Tan could have been mistaken in assuming all 800 POW's were pilots, it is a bit of a stretch to assume that all MIA's were captured and alive in Vietnamese prisons. US officials, however, believed other information Tan had was useful and urged him to go public with the information.

The documents are currently being evaluated by various agencies, including those currently reviewing the Russian document.

One of the documents released was a May 10, 1971 memo from CIA Director Helms to National Security Advisor Kissinger. The memo states that Tan "has demonstrated himself knowledgeable of North Vietnamese policies with respect to the handling of US prisoners of war." A 1970 CIA memo questions the accuracy of his claims and but states that "he is believed to be reporting accurately what he has seen and heard and his information is considered generally valid." The CIA noted, however, that Tan's knowledge of POW's was second and third hand, however.

Senator Kerry will be inquiring about the document during his trip over the Memorial Day weekend to Vietnam.

CC TL, SB, G. S. Dece Dee.

Q and A's

Q: Doesn't this document confirm that Vietnamese lied about the number of MIA/POW's? Doesn't it confirm the facts in the Russian document?

A: We are continuing to review the facts in both the Russian and Tan document.

We cannot make a final determination until the reviews are complete.

Q: How long have you known about these documents? Have they been taken into account in reviewing the Russian document?

A: As part of the Government' ongoing efforts under the July 1992 Executive Order to declassify all possible POW/MIA related documents, the CIA and the State Department have unclassified documents relating to Dang Tan.

7 CIA documents were declassified in February 1993, and ten State Department documents on May 25th. All of these documents are being provided to the Congress and made available to the public.

The State Department located its documents on May 18th and worked to declassify them on an expedited basis given the questions surrounding the Russian document.

We are reviewing the information on an expedited basis and Senator Kerry will inquire about the documents during his visit to Vietnam this weekend.

Q: Who is Dang Tan? Where is he now?

A: Dang Tan held various medical positions in the railroads department in North Vietnam until his 1967 insertion into South Vietnam as Chief of a provincial dispensary. His highest party position was as a member of the current affairs committee of the Party executive committee of Gia Lai Province.

He surrendered to US forces on September 26, 1969 and provided information to the US until 1974.

Since 1974, the US government has had no contact with him and we do not know his current whereabouts.

We are attempting to find him.

Q: Is his information accurate? Were there 800 MIA/POW's in 1967?

A: Tan claimed there were 800 American pilots being held in 1967. However, the total number of aircrews in all of Indochina missing or held as prisoners at that time was 579.

However, we are reviewing the documents and cannot make a final determination until all the facts are in.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I am very disappointed that you won't be a guest of Congressman Cal Dooley this weekend. I was looking forward to meeting you again.

IF YOU REALLY CAN'T SEE YOUR WAY to come to this end of the valley, I will meet with you the second week in June when American Agri-Women, Women in Farm Economics and the Farm Woman's Forum convenes.

Ruth McKenry, 13609 S. Amber, Kingsburg, CA 93631 (209)896-3585

The Fresno Bee • Wednesday, May 26, 1993 A15

BUSINESS

AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURE

Politics scuttles Espy's Valley visit

■ Agriculture secretary's planned appearances in limbo, purportedly because Valley lawmakers don't support Clinton's budget.

By Michael Doyle
and Laura M. Nelson
The Fresno Bee

WASHINGTON — Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy's scheduled trip to the southern San Joaquin Valley has been canceled, a victim of White House political hardball gone awry.

Instead of being filled with visits to farms and packinghouses throughout the Valley next week, Espy's schedule is in limbo. Valley congressmen say it was called off because they don't support President Clinton's budget.

As a result, the farmers Espy was going to visit are unhappy, the congressional hosts are unimpressed — and the White House is no closer to getting the votes it needs for approval of the budget package.

"It's really an unfortunate situation," said Rep. Calvin Dooley, D-Visalia.

Espy, a former House member, had planned next Monday and Tuesday to tour the San Joaquin Valley and visit Dooley and Reps. Richard Lehman, D-North Fork, and Gary Condit, D-Ceres.

All three are inclined to vote against Clinton's \$343.9 billion pack-

age of taxes and spending cuts. Lehman and Dooley don't like how the package's energy tax provisions could affect farmers, and they want caps on spending for entitlement programs.

So last week, White House lobbyists called Dooley's office and threatened to cancel Espy's visit unless Dooley's vote could be counted on.

Dooley dismissed the threat and started canceling events scheduled for Espy. Lehman told the White House that he was not going to be played off against Dooley and indicated he would also not be a host for the trip.

The cancellations included tours of raisin packer Victor Pecking in Madera and a reception at Borba Farms in Madera County. Espy also was expected to visit the Dooley family's Tulare County farm.

Local growers wonder who is in

charge of farm policy, the White House or Department of Agriculture.

"We had a president who ran on the platform of change and this looks like politics as usual," said Joel Nelson, president of the Visalia-based California Citrus Mutual.

Steve Kinsella, Espy's press secretary, would not confirm or deny that meetings tentatively planned for Espy had been canceled.

Espy's scheduled visit to Condit's congressional district in the northern San Joaquin Valley apparently still is on even though Condit himself has not wavered in his views of the Clinton budget package. Espy is still expected to have breakfast with Stanislaus County farmers and tour a Crow's Landing-area farm Tuesday morning, according to Condit's chief of staff Mike Lynch.



Mike
Espy