

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/7/99 4:47:22 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT SBTP re Peace Agreement Signed to End Sierra Leone Conflict
[UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)
Sanborn, Daniel W. (Press)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)
Gray, Wendy E. (SPCHW/CNSLR)
Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)
Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)
Battenfield, Pat A. (AF)
Frazer, Jendayi E. (AF)
Sanders, Robin R. (AF)
Smith, Gayle E. (AF)
Gray, Wendy E. (SPCHW/CNSLR)
Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Statement by the President
SBTP re Peace Agreement Signed to End
Sierra Leone Conflict

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Sierra Leone 07-07-99.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota)

For Immediate Release July 7, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Peace Agreement Signed to End Sierra Leone Conflict

On behalf of all Americans, I congratulate President Ahmed Tejan Kabbah and Revolutionary United Front leader Foday Sankoh on the signing of a peace agreement today in Lome, Togo. The agreement offers the hope of ending nearly eight years of terrible conflict in Sierra Leone and bringing peace and a brighter future for its people.

I thank President Eyedema and the Government of Togo for hosting the peace talks and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the UN, and my Special Envoy Reverend Jesse Jackson for providing critical support to the peace process. Neighboring countries also provided refuge to hundreds of thousands of Sierra Leoneans who fled the conflict and atrocities in their country. Their willingness to open their arms to those in need is an example that inspires us all.

We are committed to working with ECOWAS, the UN and the OAU to ensure appropriate support for implementing the agreement and beginning reconciliation efforts. We will work with the people of Sierra Leone and the international community to support the safe return of more than one million refugees and internally displaced people and the reconstruction of the country.

###

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/7/99 5:59:42 PM

FROM Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Pkg 3869 -- Ltr to McKinney re Sierra Leone [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)
Battenfield, Pat A. (AF)
Frazer, Jendayi E. (AF)
Sanders, Robin R. (AF)
Smith, Gayle E. (AF)

CARBON_COPY Bartlett, L. June (EXSEC)
Davies, Glyn T. (EXSEC)
Dejban, Donna D. (NSA)
Gire, Cynthia L. (EXSEC)
Hilliard, Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Jacobson, Tracey A. (ADMIN)
Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)
Kerrick, Donald L. (NSA)
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)
Powell, Elliott (WHSR/EXSEC)
Sargeant, Stephen T. (EXSEC)
Snip, Sarah E. (EXSEC/INTERN)
Wasserman, Elaine P. (DEFENSE)

TEXT_BODY The Staff Secretary has returned the subject package for updating.
Please use track change function and return via e-mail. We will
reprint here. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 3869ltr (mckinney sl).doc

Dear Cynthia:

Thank you for writing and for your continued interest in and concern about the conflict in Sierra Leone. As you rightly point out, the conflict in Sierra Leone resulted in unspeakable brutalities. Thousands were killed and scores more have suffered amputations, rape and mutilations, not to mention the hundreds of thousands who have lost their homes and are now refugees.

The United States has been working with other countries in the region to end this horrific conflict. We have supported the Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS) in its decision to proceed along two tracks simultaneously: pursuing negotiations for a durable peace agreement and simultaneously continuing to press the rebel military to provide an incentive for negotiations while protecting the people of Sierra Leone.

Our Special Envoy for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa, Reverend Jesse Jackson, accompanied by Sierra Leone's President Kabbah, went to Lome, Togo on May 19 to facilitate discussions between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF for a cease-fire. That agreement was successfully concluded. It has led to a decrease in fighting in Sierra Leone and to the creation of an atmosphere conducive to negotiations for a peace agreement, which began on May 24. Our Ambassador to Sierra Leone, Joseph Melrose, has been in Lome since April, and remains an active observer and facilitator for all parties to the talks.

In addition, we continue to support the humanitarian and security needs of the people of Sierra Leone. Already this year we have allocated more than \$41 million to support humanitarian relief efforts -- providing medical care, food and shelter for victims of the conflict. We have also worked with the ECOWAS, supplying more than \$5 million in logistics, communication and medical relief

support.

That said, I agree that we need to make a sustained financial commitment to support ECOMOG's efforts and, eventually, a peace agreement. However, to date, my requests for increased support to ECOMOG have met with congressional obstacles that have forced us temporarily to suspend logistical support to ECOMOG's peacekeepers. The latest example of this is the holds that were released on June 11 on a \$5.8 million reallocation within the Department of State's budget to assist ECOMOG. I hope that I can count on you to help ensure that an anticipated request for a reallocation of \$3 million within the budget of the Department of Defense does not encounter similar obstacles.

You also noted in your letter that you would support the placement of the RUF on the State Department's list of foreign terrorist organizations. We agree that the RUF has been responsible for outrageous acts of violence which have contributed to the instability in Sierra Leone. Designation as a foreign terrorist organization, however, requires that the Secretary of State determine that certain statutory criteria are satisfied. The Secretary of State continues to review this case, but has determined that Sierra Leone has not yet met the criteria.

Again, thank you for writing and for your continued interest and involvement in our Africa policy. I hope you will support our efforts in Congress to increase assistance to Africa and to support greater trade and investment in the continent through rapid passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Cynthia McKinney
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515-1004

2

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/7/99 7:16:00 PM
FROM Vaccaro, Jonathan M. (Matt) (MULTI)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Sierra Leone Peace Agreement press guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Vaccaro, Jonathan M. (Matt) (MULTI)

CARBON_COPY
TEXT_BODY

-----Original Message-----

From: Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 1999 4:36 PM

To: @ALLNSC - NSC Staff

Cc: @VP

- VP Natl Security Affairs

Subject: DAILY GUIDANCE UPDATE [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Please
review and forward your updates to @PRESS by 10:00 a.m.
Thursday,
July 8. Thank you.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT jul07gui.doc
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

July 7, 1999

EUROPE / RUSSIA

Kosovo

Bosnia /Kosovo / PFWIC Arrest

Kosovo / Dissent

Kosovo / Incidents

Kosovo / KLA Activities

Kosovo / Status of Russian Deployment

Russia / Hoffman Matter

NEAR EAST / SOUTH ASIA

India-Pakistan

ASIA

Lamb Decision

INTERAMERICAN

Colombia / Supporting Peace and Counter-Drug Efforts

AFRICA

Sierra Leone Peace Agreement

TRANSNATIONAL THREATS

Taliban Executive Order

KOSOVO

July 7, 1999

How is KFOR deployment going?

* KFOR deployment increased by about 3000 troops over the weekend.

* The total is about 29000, including

8000 British
5250 American
4860 French
4400 Italians
3200 Germans
625 Dutch

720 Spanish
720 Polish
555 Canadians (in U.K. zone)
525 Greek (in U.S. zone)
and others.

* There are an additional 10000 other troops in FYROM under General Jackson's command.

BOSNIA/KOSOVO: PFWIC ARREST July 7, 1999

CONTEXT: Yesterday SFOR arrested Radislav Brdanin, a lawmaker in the Bosnian Serb assembly who was indicted for war crimes. He is being taken to the Yugoslav war crimes tribunal in the Hague. Solana said in a statement that the detention of Radislav Brdanin ``will contribute to the continued consolidation of the peace in Bosnia."

Where is Brdanin now?

* He is being processed for transfer to the Hague.

* Brdanin had been under sealed indictment.

* This action brings to 37 the number of ICTY indictees who have been brought to justice.

* This arrest underscores our commitment to see those responsible for crimes not only in Bosnia but in Kosovo as well brought to justice.

What support is the U.S. providing to the ICTY?

* We are providing a supplemental voluntary contribution of \$9 million.

* We have sent more than 60 FBI personnel to Kosovo to temporarily assist the Tribunal with specific investigations relating to the Milosevic indictment.

* We recently announced rewards of up to 5 million dollars for information leading to the arrest or conviction of persons indicted by the Tribunal.

* We are providing the Tribunal with all the information we can.

KOSOVO: DISSENT

July 7, 1999

CONTEXT: About 10,000 gathered at a protest in Uzice yesterday, even though the police had declared the rally illegal. Also yesterday, the Town Assembly in Novi Sad (northern FRY) voted to request resignation of Milosevic and lifting of state control over media reporting. 1st municipality to come up with such a request.

The day before, a crowd of up to 20,000 people demonstrated in southern Serbian city of Leskovac (120 miles SE of Belgrade). Crowd chanted "Thieves, Thieves" and "Change, Change." The rally was inspired by local television employee, who broadcasting during a break in a basketball match last week, urged people to demand resignation of Milosevic's rep Stefanovic. TV employee has become local hero in Leskovac, which previously was Socialist Party stronghold.

There is mounting criticism of Milosevic within Serbia as demonstrations increase and opposition leaders speak out. Are you encouraged by this? Do you think Milosevic will be forced to step down? What are you doing to promote this movement?

* We are heartened that the Serb people are coming to grips with what happened in Kosovo.

* As the full extent of Milosevic's self-destructive policies come to light, the Serb people are beginning to express their wish for an end to nationalist agitation. As a result, Milosevic has promised the integration into the

European mainstream. Unfortunately this can only happen with Milosevic out of office.

* We have always opposed the cynical manipulation of nationalist sentiment and stated many times my support for Serbia's democratization.

* It is too early to predict how long Milosevic can maintain his control.

* We are taking many steps to encourage democratization in Serbia but no one has provided more incentives for political change in Serbia than President Milosevic himself. Serbia will receive no reconstruction aid from the United States with Milosevic in power.

* NATO's airstrikes implied no quarrel with the Serbian people.

* The goal of our policy is a Europe that is undivided, democratic, and at peace.

KOSOVO: INCIDENTS

July 7, 1999

What incidents have taken place? Do they signal an absence of security?

* Yesterday, a civilian was shot, possibly by a sniper; KFOR arrested 6 KLA members with handguns near Pec and two civilians with AK-47s in northern Kosovo. In addition, a child was killed when a landmine detonated near the border.

* Over the weekend KFOR took action against a number of individuals disturbing the peace, including looters yesterday and rogue KLA elements. In addition, another soldier -- this time a German -- was injured in a weapons accident.

* These incidents are exceptional. As KFOR deployments have risen their coverage

is more complete and their response is more comprehensive.

* On June 28, the UN Acting SRSG de Mello took significant steps towards establishing interim police and justice systems, appointing legal experts to select judges and deploying first international police.

* As KFOR coverage becomes more comprehensive, we are not seeing violence and reprisals of the kind we saw in the first days after the air strikes ended.

* KFOR continues to provide security to everyone in Kosovo, whether Albanian or Serb. It is robust and even-handed.

* KFOR commanders and forces are determined that no one should live in fear.

KOSOVO: KLA ACTIVITIES July 7, 1999

What is the status on KLA demilitarization?

* The KLA committed that as of the midnight deadline Monday its members would not carry automatic small arms outside authorized assembly areas and would establish verifiable and secure weapons storage sites.

* Leadership and the great bulk of the KLA is showing broad compliance with the terms of the undertaking.

* The wearing of military uniforms and insignia (due to end in September) has already generally ceased.

* There have been no reports in the last 24 hours of KLA personnel either armed or in uniform outside their assembly areas. Tensions are much reduced.

* We see no signs of intentional non-compliance among leadership.

* We recognize that the KLA may have problems transmitting

instructions to all
its members dispersed throughout Kosovo.

* Even so, many KLA personnel have vacated fighting positions, and have moved to assembly areas, dropped weapons and uniforms, and left.

* The KLA is also assisting KFOR with mine clearance.

* KFOR will be as rigorous in its enforcement of the KLA undertaking as it was in enforcing Serb forces' withdrawal from Kosovo.

* The KLA's next deadline is July 20.

The military has said very clearly that they need to accelerate the KFOR deployment. Have you pushed the deployment timetable forward so that more resources get to Kosovo to avoid a vacuum on the ground?

* US deployment is on track.

* KFOR numbers continue to rise everyday and are approaching 25000 in Kosovo.

* As KFOR coverage becomes more comprehensive, we are not seeing violence and reprisals of the kind we saw in the first days after the air strikes ended.

* Additional American forces from Germany are currently arriving.

* NATO is looking at ways to accelerate allied deployments.

It appears that the refugees refused to wait for UN help and went home anyway.
Has this caused any problems on the ground and is this a sign that, like Bosnia, those responsible for civilian implementation will fail to act quickly enough, causing civilian implementation to lag behind what is needed?

* Albanians have returned rapidly and against the advice of UNHCR and NATO. As a result, there have been some injuries due to landmines and booby-traps because areas were not secured in advance.

* There were some traffic jams and road congestion in the first days of return but these problems have dissipated.

* Daily returns are proceeding now at a manageable level.

* Civil implementation for Kosovo is a large task; there is a big job ahead.

However, we are encouraged at the speedy response that we have seen thus far from the UN, the EU, and the OSCE.

* We expect steady progress to be made over the next several months as these organizations expand their capacity within Kosovo.

* US is doing its part. Yesterday Secretary Albright announced commitment of 450 police to the UN civil police force.

* Even with the rapid returns into Kosovo, there are no people starving and we are doing everything we can to ensure that the returnees will have adequate shelter this winter.

Any reaction to L.A. Times story that NATO negatively impacted the environment?

* Once the bombing began, NATO's aim was to degrade Milosevic's military capability. That included attacking the country's industrial capacity as the conflict continued. NATO targeted very carefully, however, and tried hard to avoid collateral damage.

* The international community pursued a diplomatic solution for well over a year. Milosevic clearly understood the consequences of not permitting a negotiated settlement. He could have ended the conflict at any time. Responsibility for attendant environmental damage rests with him.

* I refer you to the Pentagon for any questions about specific targets hit or industrial targets destroyed.

KOSOVO: STATUS OF RUSSIAN DEPLOYMENT

July 6, 1999

CONTEXT: Additional Russian troops began arriving in Kosovo July 6, after agreement was reached in Moscow July 4 between SHAPE and the Russian government on the terms of the Russian deployment.

Comment on agreement in Moscow on Russian presence in Kosovo?

- * Welcome the agreement reached this weekend. Russian forces will operate in accordance with the terms agreed in Helsinki.

- * KFOR will continue to operate freely in all sectors in accordance with its mandate. Arrangements with Russians preserve KFOR's military effectiveness and the principle of unity of command.

How many Russian troops? To where?

- * First flights arrived today (Tuesday) via Ukraine and Romania. Total of four flights today -- troops and equipment. Do not have precise numbers.

- * Troops will begin to deploy to German, U.S. and French sectors as they arrive and receive their equipment.

- * In addition, the Russians are preparing to move troops and equipment by rail and sea.

(If raised, Will Russians operate under different rules?)

- * Russian troops will operate under the same rules of engagement as the rest of KFOR.

- * As is customary within NATO deployments, the Russian forces can decline to execute an order that contravenes Russian law, in which case the KFOR force in that sector would execute the order (e.g., an order to arrest someone which would

go beyond what Russian troops are permitted to do normally).

RUSSIA/HOFFMAN MATTER

July 6, 1999

CONTEXT: There have been several press reports about the Hoffman matter, including a detailed piece in the Washington Times today alluding to "Russia's increasingly aggressive intelligence activities in the United States". Our position remains not to comment on the issue.

Any comment on the Hoffman expulsion? Are the Russians stepping up their intelligence activities in the U.S.?

* We do not comment on intelligence matters.

INDIA-PAKISTAN

July 7, 1999

Since fighting continues in Kashmir, was the July 4 Summit a failure?

* We are watching very closely the situation along the line of control in Kashmir.

* We note that Prime Minister Sharif met PM Blair in London yesterday and will be returning to Islamabad on Thursday. We note too that Blair reportedly endorsed the joint statement issued in Washington Sunday.

* In accordance with the joint statement with President Clinton, we expect that there will be concrete steps taken soon to restore the line of control in the Kargil region of Kashmir.

* We leave to the Pakistani government exactly what those concrete steps will be,

but our views are well known on what is needed to restore respect for the line of control.

(IF pressed: we have said before that forces supported by Pakistan are on the Indian side of the line of control.)

What has been the Indian reaction to the Sunday meeting?

* National Security Adviser Berger called his counterpart in India, Brajesh Mishra, on Sunday afternoon to brief him on the results of the talks.

* The government of India should describe its reaction.

Have you threatened Nawaz Sharif's hold on power by getting him to agree to withdraw the militants? There are reports of anti-Sharif and anti-U.S. demonstrations in Pakistan.

* Prime Minister Sharif has a solid majority in Parliament. Political demonstrations are a part of Pakistan's democracy, and should not deter the leadership from taking steps for the long-term benefit of Pakistan.

**PRESIDENTIAL DECISION ON SECTION 201 SAFEGUARDS
FOR U.S. LAMB INDUSTRY AND
IMPORTS FROM AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND
July 7, 1999**

CONTEXT: The President has reviewed and concurs in a ruling by the International Trade Commission (ITC) that lamb imports from Australia and New Zealand pose a threat to the U.S. industry. The President has prescribed relief measures for the U.S. industry in the form of a combination of import caps and tariffs that would be phased out over a three year period. The Presidential decision will be strongly criticized in Australia and New Zealand.

Any comment on the Presidential decision on lamb imports from Australia and New

Zealand?

* The President has reviewed and concurs in a ruling by the International Trade Commission (ITC) that imports of lamb from Australia and New Zealand pose a threat to the U.S. domestic industry. The President has prescribed relief measures for the U.S. industry in the form of a combination of import caps and tariffs that would be phased out over a three year period. For details, I refer you to the U.S. Trade Representative.

* I would add that the President made this determination after careful deliberation, and after taking into account the needs of the U.S. industry as well as our foreign policy interests.

Will this decision sour the atmosphere for Australian Prime Minister Howard's visit to Washington on July 12?

* The President and the Prime Minister will have a full agenda of items for their working lunch, including security and economic cooperation. I expect the President's decision will be one topic of discussion, but no, I don't expect it will sour the atmosphere.

Isn't the President planning a State Visit to New Zealand in September? Won't this spoil the warm welcome he would otherwise expect to receive?

* No, I don't believe it will.

Has the President spoken with Prime Minister Howard or Prime Minister Shipley about his decision?

* He spoke with both of them about a month ago to discuss lamb imports. They expressed their views to the President at that time, and he said he would do his best to take their concerns into account when making his decision, which he has

done.

COLOMBIA: SUPPORTING PEACE AND COUNTER-DRUG EFFORTS

July 7, 1999

CONTEXT: Colombian President Pastrana took office last year amid hopes that he could bring an end to years of violence, drug trafficking, and government red ink. An article in today's Washington Post claims that "by most measurements, things have only gotten worse" since then. Pastrana kept his pledge to begin negotiations to end a 40-year war with Marxist guerrillas, but progress at the bargaining table has been slow. Meanwhile, drug cultivation has increased. The article says that "for the Clinton administration, Pastrana's leading foreign backer, the belief that peace was achievable and would provide a victory in Washington's drug war has descended into gloomy uncertainty."

Any reaction to the article in this yesterday's Washington Post about the Colombian peace process?

* We support President Pastrana's efforts to broker a negotiated settlement to end Colombia's civil conflict. He was elected on a peace platform and won by the widest margin of victory in recent Colombian history. We are impressed by Pastrana's personal commitment to the peace process and wish him success in the talks now scheduled to start July 20th.

* Starting a peace process in a country that has suffered 40 years of civil conflict and over 35,000 dead in the past decade alone is not easy. We never expected that a peace settlement with the guerrilla groups could be achieved quickly. Lessons from similar disputes elsewhere suggest that the start-up phase of talks is particularly prone to violence as groups position themselves

for the
negotiations.

* Despite the challenges, we believe the peace process is integral to efforts to fight narcotics trafficking, reduce kidnappings, restore respect for human rights and put the Colombian economy back on a sustainable, high-growth trajectory. We are also mindful of the fact that peace in Colombia can only be attained through the strengthening of state institutional capacity, including the strengthening of police and security forces.

* The GAO report on counter-drug efforts in Colombia is a reasonably accurate portrayal of a complex situation. Success in attacking coca cultivation elsewhere in the Andes has lead to increased planting within Colombia. We will continue to work with the Government of Colombia to fight coca production and narcotics trafficking.

SIERRA LEONE PEACE AGREEMENT July 7, 1999

CONTEXT: A peace agreement was signed today in Lome, Togo by the President of Sierra Leone and the leader of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), ending a nearly eight-year long conflict which began in 1991. Its main elements include a cessation of violence, RUF participation in an expanded Cabinet, a mechanism to control strategic natural resources (diamonds), and a full pardon for RUF leader Foday Sankoh coupled with amnesty for the RUF. The agreement also provides for extensive demobilization, disarmament, and reintegration of combatants. Several commissions, including a truth and reconciliation commission, will be established to help in national reconciliation and reconstruction. Two previous peace agreements - the latest in 1996 - have failed.

The U.S., UK and Netherlands have provided logistical support for the regional peacekeepers (ECOMOG) that defended (and in March 1998 restored to power after an attempted coup) the democratically elected government of President Kabbah. In April of this year, the Sierra Leone Government allowed Foday Sankoh, imprisoned and sentenced to death on eight counts of treason, to travel to Lome, Togo to consult with senior RUF commanders for the first time in more than two years. This internal RUF dialogue developed an agenda for negotiations with the government and helped to clarify the RUF lines of authority. On May 18th, Rev. Jackson and President Eyadema of Togo brokered a meeting between Sankoh and President Kabbah that reached agreement on a cease-fire and the beginning of peace talks.

POLICY:

* Our objectives in Sierra Leone are to promote a regional peace that will end the conflict, relieve the suffering of the people of Sierra Leone, and foster peace and national reconciliation. We are hopeful that this agreement will succeed, and we are prepared to provide appropriate support for its implementation.

Can you comment on the amnesty provision for the rebels in the peace agreement reached in Lome?

* We are eager to help regional efforts to establish peace and security and address the humanitarian needs of the Sierra Leonean people. This is a peace agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF. It provides for amnesty only within the borders of Sierra Leone, it does not preclude potential prosecution of war crimes by an international body. However, no such tribunal exists at present. The United States is not a signatory and is not bound

by the agreement, although we do support the conclusion of the peace agreement.

What recourse will be available for victims of atrocities?

* The peace agreement provides for a truth and reconciliation commission, as well as a human rights commission that will deal with these issues on a case-by-case basis. The peace agreement also provides for humanitarian assistance to reach populations in rural areas and for the demobilization and reintegration into society of child combatants.

Does the agreement call for a peacekeeping operation in Sierra Leone and does the U.S. support such an operation?

* We do not yet have the text of the final agreement. However, UNOMSIL is in Sierra Leone, at this time with 40 military observers and is authorized to deploy up to 70 military observers. The United States will work with the UN and the international community to provide appropriate support for the implementation of the agreement.

What are the costs for the U.S. of this agreement?

* Although the U.S. is not a signatory of the agreement and we are not committed to any specific actions, we will work with the parties and the United Nations to support the implementation of the agreement. I do not have a cost estimate for you at this point.

Did the U.S. pressure President Kabbah to make undue concessions to the RUF?

* No. The United States, along with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the UN, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the UK and others, acted as a facilitator for the peace talks. This agreement is strictly between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF.

What kind of role has the United States played in "facilitating" the agreement?

* From the start, the United States worked with the government, RUF representatives, ECOWAS and the UN to initiate talks and reach a lasting settlement.

* On May 18th, Reverend Jesse Jackson, the President and Secretary of State's Special Envoy for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa, working in close collaboration with ECOWAS Chairman President Eyadema of Togo and the UN, was able to secure the agreement of President Kabbah and RUF leader Sankoh to a cease fire that commenced on May 24th. This led to the negotiation of the agreement that was signed today.

* This was part of a team effort that extended over months to encourage dialogue between the parties. Reverend Jackson's efforts built on the work of our Special Envoy for Liberia, Ambassador Howard Jeter, and our Ambassador to Sierra Leone, Joseph Melrose.

What is the humanitarian situation in Sierra Leone?

* It is dire. This January, the RUF/AFRC rebels invaded the capital, Freetown. In a period of several weeks, 6,000 people were killed and large portions of the city were destroyed, leaving about 150,000 people homeless. More than 3,000 children (two-thirds of them girls) are registered as missing since January.

* Sierra Leone is a small country with a population of only 4.6

million.

Violence and terror have forced more than one-third of the population to flee

their homes. More than 400,000 are refugees - primarily in neighboring Guinea

and Liberia - and another 700,000-1,000,000 are believed to be internally

displaced. The agreement to allow unhindered access by humanitarian

organizations to many areas of the country that have been isolated for more than

a year will allow the international community to start meeting the needs of an

estimate 2.6 million people in need of assistance.

What is the United States doing to alleviate the suffering in Sierra Leone?

* We have provided more than \$55 million in emergency humanitarian relief to

Sierra Leone in FY98, and so far in FY99, we have provided an additional \$41

million in humanitarian assistance.

* We are also providing non-lethal logistical support to ECOMOG in its role

implementing the peace agreement. This support has amounted to \$10 million since

May 1998, and we are providing an additional \$5.8 million now. In addition, we

hope to provide a further \$3 million in draw down of non-lethal defense articles.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

(Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota)

For Immediate Release July 7, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Peace Agreement Signed to End Sierra Leone Conflict

On behalf of all Americans, I congratulate President Ahmed Tejan

Kabbah and
Revolutionary United Front leader Foday Sankoh on the signing of a
peace
agreement today in Lome, Togo. The agreement offers the hope of
ending nearly
eight years of terrible conflict in Sierra Leone and bringing peace and
a
brighter future for its people.

I thank President Eyedema and the Government of Togo for hosting
the peace talks
and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS),
the Organization of
African Unity (OAU), the UN, and my Special Envoy Reverend Jesse
Jackson for
providing critical support to the peace process. Neighboring countries
also
provided refuge to hundreds of thousands of Sierra Leoneans who fled
the conflict
and atrocities in their country. Their willingness to open their arms to
those
in need is an example that inspires us all.

We are committed to working with ECOWAS, the UN and the OAU
to ensure
appropriate support for implementing the agreement and beginning
reconciliation
efforts. We will work with the people of Sierra Leone and the
international
community to support the safe return of more than one million
refugees and
internally displaced people and the reconstruction of the country.

#

TALIBAN EXECUTIVE ORDER

July 6, 1999

What does the Executive Order do, and what is its impact?

* The Executive Order was issued pursuant to the International
Emergency Economic
Powers Act (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act and other
authorities which
provide wide authority for the President to impose economic sanctions
to protect

the United States against threats to its national security and foreign policy interests. The President has formally determined that actions and policies of the Taliban pose such a threat.

* The Order blocks all property and interests in property of the Taliban, including the Taliban leaders listed in the annex to the order, that are in the United States or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons.

* The Order prohibits any transaction or dealing by United States persons or within the United States in property or interests in property blocked pursuant to the order, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of the Taliban;

* This Order does not prohibit postal, telephonic, or other personal communication which does not involve the transfer of anything of value. It also does not apply to information related items such as books, films and tapes, which are exempted under U.S. law.

* Neither does this order prohibit, under appropriate safeguards, commercial sales of agricultural commodities and products, medicine and medical equipment, for civilian use in the territory of Afghanistan controlled by the Taliban. This is in keeping with the Administration's recent decision regarding how these classes of items are affected by U.S. sanctions in other regions.

* State and Treasury will use their best efforts to help businesses understand the areas, the persons, and the products that are off-limits under the Executive order.

* Want to be clear: This order is not aimed at the people of Afghanistan, but at the Taliban. It will be implemented in a manner which permits the continued

provision of humanitarian assistance.

Why are you doing this now?

* As the President's statement points out, we have tried repeatedly - both directly and through other governments - to persuade the Taliban to expel Usama Bin Ladin to the United States for trial, or, if that is not possible, to a third country where he would face justice for his crimes. We have also sought to convince the Taliban that it must stop giving safe haven it gives to Bin Ladin's operatives who live and train in Taliban-controlled Afghanistan. These efforts have failed. This Executive Order will turn up the pressure on the Taliban and on those who support it.

Is the E.O. related to the closure of the U.S. embassies in Africa last week? Is there any connection to an ongoing plot?

* This is not a direct response to any particular threat information that we have received but rather to the overall situation. However, we are still receiving information that Bin Ladin and his network are continuing planning for terrorist attacks against American interests.

* We don't comment on the details of intelligence matters, so I'm not going into the specifics of why we had to close temporarily half a dozen embassies in Africa. Suffice it to say that we take all threat information seriously, and we took the steps that we deemed to be prudent.

Why is the President imposing an Executive Order instead of using more specific laws, such as those allowing for designation of a country as a state sponsor of terrorism or a group as a foreign terrorist organization?

* The use of the Presidential Executive Order reflects the seriousness

with which
the President views continued provision of safe haven to Bin Ladin by
the
Taliban. It also provides for a broad range of sanctions that the
President
believes meet US foreign policy objectives in this case.

* In addition, the Executive Order properly focuses the responsibility
on the
Taliban rather than the country of Afghanistan. As you know, we do
not recognize
the Taliban as the legitimate government of Afghanistan, hence, it
would be
inappropriate to designate Afghanistan itself as a state sponsor.

* [NOTE: State Guidance muddies the waters. It says: In May of this
year, the
Acting Secretary of State certified that Afghanistan was a country that
was not
fully cooperating with the U.S. on antiterrorism issues. This order is a
logical
step.]

What is the extent of Taliban assets in the United States expected to
be seized
under the Executive Order? What will the impact of this move be?

* The amount of assets blocked by the order is likely to be modest.
Treasury will
be able to provide more details.

* Whatever the amount, the order sends an unambiguous message of
our commitment
to take action against those who shelter international terrorists like Bin
Ladin.

* We believe this will help to further isolate the Taliban
internationally.

* Also will make Taliban supporters think hard whether they want to
risk running
afoul of these sanctions by maintaining that support.

How many assets have been blocked thus far? What are they?

* At this early stage, we don't know; but we do not expect to find
large amounts

of assets.

* [If asked about assets of government of Afghanistan in the U.S.:
Substantial
assets over which the Taliban could assert control have also been
blocked and,
thus, protected under this order.]

How can the E.O. affect Taliban supporters? Isn't specific to the Taliban?

* The Treasury Department, in consultation with the State and Justice Departments, may block the property and prohibit transactions involving individuals who act for or on behalf of the Taliban, or who provide financial, material, or technological support for the Taliban or any of the other parties designated under the Executive order.

Who are these supporters? Have you identified anyone in particular?

* We know that the Taliban receives support from outside Afghanistan. We're working to improve our knowledge of these supporters, and, if we can, we will take appropriate action.

What do we expect to accomplish by the E.O? What must the Taliban do to have it rescinded?

* Taliban must expel Bin Ladin to the United States for trial, or if that is not possible, to a third country where he will face justice for his crimes. This E.O. is designed to make that message clearer and more powerful to the Taliban. The Taliban must cease allowing Bin Ladin and his supporters to use its territory to train for, plan and promote terrorism.

Does the E.O affect travel to and from Afghanistan?

* No. By law, the Order does not regulate or prohibit any transactions ordinarily

incident to travel to or from Afghanistan or any other country.

Does the order prevent humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan?

* The order will be implemented so as not to affect such assistance, underscoring that the order is directed at the Taliban, not the Afghan people.

* We are the largest single provider of humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan and Afghan refugees. Our assistance is provided through UN specialized agencies and international NGOs. None goes to the Taliban or other Afghan factions.

What assistance does the U.S. provide to Afghanistan?

* In the last fiscal year -- fy98 -- the State Department provided some \$8.3 million in earmarked contributions through international and non-governmental organizations. Of that amount, over \$3.3 million was for projects that specifically targeted programs for afghan women and girls, including \$1.5 million for education and health in Pakistan. An additional \$14.8 million was contributed to the general regional appeals for UNHCR and ICRC -a significant proportion of the latter was for programs for Afghans in Afghanistan.

* Also in fy98, USAID's office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance provided nearly \$7 million for earthquake relief and for internally displaced and other vulnerable persons inside Afghanistan. Assistance was also provided for demining (\$2 million), counter-narcotics (\$1.54 million) and UN coordination (\$500,000) from state department accounts.

* For this current fiscal year, we anticipate that funding will be at least at the level of last year, though implementation of assistance inside Afghanistan has been complicated by security conditions inside Afghanistan.

As a practical matter, how will the USG differentiate between trade from Taliban and non-Taliban territory?

* The USG will make its best effort to verify the origin and destination of products.

Is this an embargo against Afghanistan?

* No. The Executive Order is directed against the Taliban and, thus, the geographical areas within Afghanistan that it controls as well as other entities owned or controlled by it. It is not an embargo.

But isn't this action against the Taliban an action against the Government of Afghanistan?

* No. Let me repeat: The sanctions are imposed against the Taliban, which the United States does not recognize as the government of Afghanistan. Although specific assets of the Government of Afghanistan are blocked where the Taliban is in a position to exercise control over them, this is not a general blocking of Government of Afghanistan assets.

Who will enforce these sanctions?

* OFAC - which is part of Treasury -- in consultation with the State and Justice Departments, will enforce these sanctions as it does in more than a dozen other sanctions programs.

What is the level of two way trade between the United States and Afghanistan?

* In 1998, about \$24 million: \$7 million in exports and \$17 million in imports.

What items do we trade with Afghanistan?

* The U.S. exported primarily machinery and transportation equipment. Most of our imports were raw materials and light manufactures, including gems and carpets.

Why use sanctions when trade is already so small?

* Sanctions will help ensure that us trade with Taliban-controlled areas dries up until the Taliban take steps necessary to halt Bin Ladin's activities.

* The executive order will also prevent U.S investment in Taliban-controlled areas.

* The Taliban can have the possibility of U.S. trade and investment or they can continue to harbor terrorists. It is their choice.

* A key effect impact of these sanctions on the Taliban and its leaders is their further isolation from normal international commerce by denying the Taliban access to the U.S. financial system and prohibiting the Taliban from trade and transactions with U.S. firms and individuals.

* Our intent is to send a strong message to the Taliban and their supporters inside and outside Afghanistan. The message is that the Taliban face a very bleak future and increasing international isolation so long as they shelter terrorists like Usama bin Ladin.

Will the EO disrupt pending telephone contracts between American companies and the Taliban? What about proposed pipelines across Afghanistan.

* With the few exceptions noted in the order -- humanitarian

donations, for
example - the order prohibits transactions between U.S. companies
and the
Taliban. Any U.S. person with existing contracts or ongoing trade
with the
Taliban or the territory under their control in Afghanistan is required
to stop
any further non-exempt performance. Companies that need more
specific
information should contact the Treasury department.

How long does the EO stay in effect and what would the Taliban have
to do in
order to have it lifted?

* The Executive Order's duration is one year, and may be renewed
annually.

* The EO makes clear that the Taliban must expel Bin Ladin to the
United States
for trial, or if that is not possible, to a third country where he will face
justice for his crimes. The Taliban must cease its support for
terrorism,
especially in providing a base of operations and safe haven for al-
Qaida. Beyond
that, it would not be useful to speculate at this point about what the
president
may choose to do in the future with respect to the EO.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Clarksdale, Mississippi)

For Immediate Release July 6, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Executive Order Blocking Assets of the Taliban Movement

I have signed an Executive Order imposing financial and other
commercial
sanctions on the Afghan Taliban for its support of Usama bin Ladin
and his

terrorist network. The Taliban has allowed the territory under its control to be used as a safe haven and base of operations for Usama bin Ladin and the Al Qaida organization, who were responsible for the bombings of our embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania last year, murdering 12 Americans, nearly 300 Kenyans and Tanzanians and wounding another 5,000. To this day, bin Ladin and his network continue to plan new attacks against Americans, without regard for the innocence of their intended victims or for those non-Americans who might get in the way of his attack. The United States has tried repeatedly, directly and working with other governments, to persuade the Taliban to expel bin Ladin to the United States for trial, or if that is not possible, to a third country where he will face justice for his crimes, and to end the safe haven it gives to bin Ladin's network, which lives and trains in Taliban-controlled Afghanistan. These efforts have failed. The Executive Order I have signed will deepen the international isolation of the Taliban, limit its ability to support terrorist networks and demonstrate the need to conform to accepted norms of international behavior. The Order does not affect humanitarian aid, food and medical supplies for civilian use. It is not aimed at the people of Afghanistan, but at the Taliban. Those who nurture terrorism must understand that we will not stand by while those whom they protect target Americans.

#

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/8/99 8:40:51 AM
FROM Smith, Gayle E. (AF)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Pkg 3869 -- Ltr to McKinney re Sierra Leone [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Please note

-----Original Message-----

From: Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)

Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 1999 6:00 PM

To: @AFRICA - African Affairs

Cc: @EXECSEC

- Executive Secretary

Subject: Pkg 3869 -- Ltr to McKinney re Sierra Leone [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

The Staff Secretary has returned the subject package for updating. Please use track change function and return via e-mail. We will reprint here. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

3869ltr (mckinney sl).doc

Dear Cynthia:

Thank you for writing and for your continued interest in and concern

about the conflict in Sierra Leone. As you rightly point out, the conflict in Sierra Leone resulted in unspeakable brutalities. Thousands were killed and scores more have suffered amputations, rape and mutilations, not to mention the hundreds of thousands who have lost their homes and are now refugees.

The United States has been working with other countries in the region to end this horrific conflict. We have supported the Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS) in its decision to proceed along two tracks simultaneously: pursuing negotiations for a durable peace agreement and simultaneously continuing to press the rebel military to provide an incentive for negotiations while protecting the people of Sierra Leone.

Our Special Envoy for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa, Reverend Jesse Jackson, accompanied by Sierra Leone's President Kabbah, went to Lome, Togo on May 19 to facilitate discussions between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF for a cease-fire. That agreement was successfully concluded. It has led to a decrease in fighting in Sierra Leone and to the creation of an atmosphere conducive to negotiations for a peace agreement, which began on May 24. Our Ambassador to Sierra Leone, Joseph Melrose, has been in Lome since April, and remains an active observer and facilitator for all parties to the talks.

In addition, we continue to support the humanitarian and security needs of the people of Sierra Leone. Already this year we have allocated more than \$41 million to support humanitarian relief efforts -- providing medical care, food and shelter for victims of the conflict. We have also worked with the ECOWAS, supplying more than \$5 million in logistics, communication and medical relief support.

That said, I agree that we need to make a sustained financial

commitment to support ECOMOG's efforts and, eventually, a peace agreement. However, to date, my requests for increased support to ECOMOG have met with congressional obstacles that have forced us temporarily to suspend logistical support to ECOMOG's peacekeepers. The latest example of this is the holds that were released on June 11 on a \$5.8 million reallocation within the Department of State's budget to assist ECOMOG. I hope that I can count on you to help ensure that an anticipated request for a reallocation of \$3 million within the budget of the Department of Defense does not encounter similar obstacles.

You also noted in your letter that you would support the placement of the RUF on the State Department's list of foreign terrorist organizations. We agree that the RUF has been responsible for outrageous acts of violence which have contributed to the instability in Sierra Leone. Designation as a foreign terrorist organization, however, requires that the Secretary of State determine that certain statutory criteria are satisfied. The Secretary of State continues to review this case, but has determined that Sierra Leone has not yet met the criteria.

Again, thank you for writing and for your continued interest and involvement in our Africa policy. I hope you will support our efforts in Congress to increase assistance to Africa and to support greater trade and investment in the continent through rapid passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Cynthia McKinney
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515-1004

2

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/13/99 9:29:32 AM
FROM Battenfield, Pat A. (AF)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Pkg 3869 -- Ltr to McKinney re Sierra Leone [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Erica, did you take care of this letter? (I don't recall seeing a response from you in the e-mail.)

-----Original Message-----

From: Joshi,
M. Kay (EXSEC)
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 1999 6:00 PM
To: @AFRICA
- African Affairs
Cc: @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
Subject: Pkg
3869 -- Ltr to McKinney re Sierra Leone [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

The
Staff Secretary has returned the subject package for updating. Please
use track change function and return via e-mail. We will reprint
here. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

3869ltr (mckinney sl).doc

Dear Cynthia:

Thank you for writing and for your continued interest in and concern about the conflict in Sierra Leone. As you rightly point out, the conflict in Sierra Leone resulted in unspeakable brutalities. Thousands were killed and scores more have suffered amputations, rape and mutilations, not to mention the hundreds of thousands who have lost their homes and are now refugees.

The United States has been working with other countries in the region to end this horrific conflict. We have supported the Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS) in its decision to proceed along two tracks simultaneously: pursuing negotiations for a durable peace agreement and simultaneously continuing to press the rebel military to provide an incentive for negotiations while protecting the people of Sierra Leone.

Our Special Envoy for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa, Reverend Jesse Jackson, accompanied by Sierra Leone's President Kabbah, went to Lome, Togo on May 19 to facilitate discussions between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF for a cease-fire. That agreement was successfully concluded. It has led to a decrease in fighting in Sierra Leone and to the creation of an atmosphere conducive to negotiations for a peace agreement, which began on May 24. Our Ambassador to Sierra Leone, Joseph Melrose, has been in Lome since April, and remains an active observer and facilitator for all parties to the talks.

In addition, we continue to support the humanitarian and security needs of the people of Sierra Leone. Already this year we have allocated more than \$41 million to support humanitarian relief efforts -- providing medical care, food and shelter for victims of the conflict. We have also worked with the ECOWAS, supplying more than \$5 million in logistics, communication and medical relief support.

That said, I agree that we need to make a sustained financial commitment to support ECOMOG's efforts and, eventually, a peace agreement. However, to date, my requests for increased support to ECOMOG have met with congressional obstacles that have forced us temporarily to suspend logistical support to ECOMOG's peacekeepers. The latest example of this is the holds that were released on June 11 on a \$5.8 million reallocation within the Department of State's budget to assist ECOMOG. I hope that I can count on you to help ensure that an anticipated request for a reallocation of \$3 million within the budget of the Department of Defense does not encounter similar obstacles.

You also noted in your letter that you would support the placement of the RUF on the State Department's list of foreign terrorist organizations. We agree that the RUF has been responsible for outrageous acts of violence which have contributed to the instability in Sierra Leone. Designation as a foreign terrorist organization, however, requires that the Secretary of State determine that certain statutory criteria are satisfied. The Secretary of State continues to review this case, but has determined that Sierra Leone has not yet met the criteria.

Again, thank you for writing and for your continued interest and involvement in our Africa policy. I hope you will support our efforts in Congress to increase assistance to Africa and to support greater trade and investment in the continent through rapid passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Cynthia McKinney
House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20515-1004

2

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/13/99 3:46:58 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT July 13 NSC Press Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Sutphen, Mona K. (NSA)

CARBON_COPY Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)
Sanborn, Daniel W. (Press)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

TEXT_BODY

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT jul13gui.doc
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

July 13, 1999

EUROPE / RUSSIA

Kosovo (updated)
Dissent
Overestimation of Damage

Incidents

KLA Activities

Refugee Return Program (new)

Bosnia / Troop Reduction (new)

Russia / Missile Proliferation/Launch Quota (updated)

Russia / Food Aid

NEAR EAST / SOUTH ASIA

India-Pakistan

Iran / Internal Unrest

Israel / FLOTUS and Jerusalem

Israel / Barak Visit Announcement

ASIA

Taiwan (new)

AFRICA

Sierra Leone Peace Agreement

DROC Cease-fire Agreement

TRANSNATIONAL THREATS

WMD Commission (Deutch-Specter)

INTERAMERICAN

Cuba / Chamber of Commerce Travel

Cuban Migration (new)

KOSOVO
July 13, 1999

How is KFOR deployment going?

* KFOR deployment is around 33000.

* It includes

8110 British
5600 American
4700 French
4700 Italians
3800 Germans
1324 Dutch
900 Spanish
720 Polish
1000 Turkish (in German sector)
590 Canadians (in U.K. zone)
525 Greek (in U.S. zone)
and others (including about 690 Russians).

* There are an additional 10000 other troops in FYROM under General Jackson's command.

DISSENT (July 13, 1999)

CONTEXT: In Belgrade the Alliance for Change continued a petition drive demanding Milosevic's resignation, despite police opposition.

There is mounting criticism of Milosevic within Serbia as demonstrations increase and opposition leaders speak out. Are you encouraged by this? Do you think Milosevic will be forced to step down? What are you doing to promote this movement?

- * We are heartened that the Serb people are coming to grips with what happened in Kosovo.
- * As the full extent of Milosevic's self-destructive policies come to light, the Serb people are beginning to express their wish for an end to nationalist agitation. As a result, Milosevic has promised the integration into the European mainstream. Unfortunately this can only happen with Milosevic out of office.
- * We have always opposed the cynical manipulation of nationalist sentiment and stated many times my support for Serbia's democratization.
- * It is too early to predict how long Milosevic can maintain his control.
- * We are taking many steps to encourage democratization in Serbia but no one has provided more incentives for political change in Serbia than President Milosevic himself. Serbia will receive no reconstruction aid from the United States with Milosevic in power.
- * NATO's airstrikes implied no quarrel with the Serbian people.
- * The goal of our policy is a Europe that is undivided, democratic, and at peace.

OVERESTIMATION OF DAMAGE (July 12, 1999)

CONTEXT: According to a prominent story in the Washington Post, Kosovo is not as badly damaged as originally reported by the Allies and in Western media. This story focusing on physical damage expands on earlier stories on NATO's overestimation of the scope of atrocities and refugee displacement.

- * While NATO could be confident of the precision of its strikes, it could not estimate exactly the extent of the physical damage inflicted by FRY forces. Deputy Secretary of Defense Hamre and General Ralston are undertaking a thorough review of the air campaign which will examine the extent the physical damage inflicted.
- * We are heartened by reports that homes are not as damaged as once thought,

since it means that refugees can more easily resume their lives.

* However, there remains a great deal to be done. Kosovar people face a serious humanitarian threat. The report on which the Post story is based notes: "Hopes that the humanitarian situation may not be as serious as initially feared seem to be over optimistic, based upon this preliminary first cut."

* UNHCR is reporting chronic problems with good water supply and significant damage to critical infrastructure. For example, only 12 percent of health care facilities still exist and up to 60 percent of schools have been damaged or destroyed.

* The Washington Post story also notes that investigators are discovering evidence of atrocities on a scale even greater than anticipated.

INCIDENTS (July 13, 1999)

What incidents have taken place? Do they signal an absence of security?

* Over the weekend a U.S. patrol came on a fire fight in a building in Gniljane. Large quantities of weaponry were seized together with communications equipment. One civilian was found dead; another was found wounded and five armed civilians who arrived at the scene were detained. KFOR has also continued to find a number of wounded or dead civilians during patrols.

* Since the end of the airstrikes about 25 people have died as a result of mines or ordnance exploding.

* These incidents are exceptional. As KFOR deployments have risen their coverage is more complete and their response is more comprehensive.

* On June 28, the UN Acting SRSG de Mello took significant steps towards establishing interim police and justice systems, appointing legal experts to select judges and deploying first international police.

* There are now 172 UN police in Kosovo. The plan is for 1000 to be deployed by the end of July. Almost 2500 civil police have already been pledged by nations

to the UN of a target of 3100.

* The OSCE is planning first intake of recruits to the police academy at Vucitrn in mid-August. The first five-week course will comprise 150 students. OSCE has started to select trainers.

KLA ACTIVITIES (July 12, 1999)

What is the status on KLA demilitarization?

* The KLA committed that as of the midnight deadline Monday its members would not carry automatic small arms outside authorized assembly areas and would establish verifiable and secure weapons storage sites.

* Leadership and the great bulk of the KLA is showing broad compliance with the terms of the undertaking.

* The wearing of military uniforms and insignia (due to end in September) has already generally ceased.

* There have been no reports in the last 24 hours of KLA personnel either armed or in uniform outside their assembly areas. Tensions are much reduced.

* We see no signs of intentional non-compliance among leadership.

* We recognize that the KLA may have problems transmitting instructions to all its members dispersed throughout Kosovo. Even so, many KLA personnel have vacated fighting positions, and have moved to assembly areas, dropped weapons and uniforms, and left.

* The KLA is also assisting KFOR with mine clearance.

* KFOR will be as rigorous in its enforcement of the KLA undertaking as it was in enforcing Serb forces' withdrawal from Kosovo.

- * The KLA's next deadline is July 20.

The military has said very clearly that they need to accelerate the KFOR deployment. Have you pushed the deployment timetable forward so that more resources get to Kosovo to avoid a vacuum on the ground?

- * US deployment is on track.
- * KFOR numbers continue to rise everyday and are approaching 25000 in Kosovo.
- * As KFOR coverage becomes more comprehensive, we are not seeing violence and reprisals of the kind we saw in the first days after the air strikes ended.
- * Additional American forces from Germany are currently arriving.
- * NATO is looking at ways to accelerate allied deployments.

It appears that the refugees refused to wait for UN help and went home anyway. Has this caused any problems on the ground and is this a sign that, like Bosnia, those responsible for civilian implementation will fail to act quickly enough, causing civilian implementation to lag behind what is needed?

- * Albanians have returned rapidly and against the advice of UNHCR and NATO. As a result, there have been some injuries due to landmines and booby-traps because areas were not secured in advance.

- * There were some traffic jams and road congestion in the first days of return but these problems have dissipated.

- * Daily returns are proceeding now at a manageable level.

- * Civil implementation for Kosovo is a large task; there is a big job ahead. However, we are encouraged at the speedy response that we have seen thus far from the UN, the EU, and the OSCE.

- * We expect steady progress to be made over the next several months as these organizations expand their capacity within Kosovo.

- * US is doing its part. Secretary Albright has announced commitment of 450

police to the UN civil police force.

* Even with the rapid returns into Kosovo, there are no people starving and we are doing everything we can to ensure that the returnees will have adequate shelter this winter.

REFUGEE RETURN PROGRAM (July 13, 1999)

CONTEXT: Monday, the State Department announced the establishment of a refugee return program for Kosovars who were evacuated from Macedonia beginning in early May. The program will pay for all return expenses (air fare and transit costs) and will be implemented through the International Organization for Migration (IOM).

Who is eligible?

* Those refugees brought out of Macedonia after May 1 and prior to July 31.

* Return travel must commence prior to May 1, 2000.

For more info, refugees should call 1-800-748-4521.

BOSNIA: TROOP REDUCTION

July 13, 1999

CONTEXT: An AP article, citing Pentagon spokesman Ken Bacon, reports today that NATO's Military Committee has approved a reduction of almost half the troop presence in Bosnia from 31,000 to 16,500, reducing US troop deployment from 6,200 to about 4,000. NATO is in fact considering troop reductions that could be implemented late this year or early next, depending on circumstances on the ground, though current thinking is that the force would be reduced to about 19,000, not the 16,500 cited in the article.

Is it true that NATO's SFOR will be reduced from its current 31,000 to 16,500 later this year or early next?

* Progress made toward implementing the Dayton Accords in Bosnia and the overall improvements in the security situation should allow for substantial reductions to be made in NATO's force level there later this year or early next. We expect that NATO's North Atlantic Council will review the situation this fall and decide on the specifics of any reduction.

RUSSIA: MISSILE PROLIFERATION/LAUNCH QUOTA July 13, 1999

CONTEXT: The President has approved an incremental launch in the quota that caps Russian launches of commercial satellites to geosynchronous orbit. [Quota will now be 20 launches total versus 16 under the original agreement. The launches are conducted by a Lockheed-Martin joint venture with Russian aerospace firms.] For the past year and a half, we had told the Russians that we would not increase commercial space cooperation, due to our concerns regarding Russian entities' cooperation with Iran's missile program. The President's decision was based on a series of Russian actions (detailed below) to combat proliferation and build the institutional foundation for a strong export control system. [Note: We are currently briefing the Hill, the Russians, and the Israelis on the President's decision. We will do a press backgrounder late in the day. Following is provided in case the issue leaks, and we need to answer questions.]

IF ASKED: Has the President decided to increase the Russian space launch quota?

* Administration has put nonproliferation at top of U.S.-Russian agenda. Pursuing full-court press with Russians. President discussed issue at length with President Yeltsin and PM Stepashin at G-8 summit in Cologne last month. VP, Secretary Albright, APNSA Berger, Strobe Talbott, Ambassador Gallucci all pursuing issue actively with counterparts.

* In recent weeks, the Stepashin government has put in place a tough new nonproliferation policy, created institutional foundations to implement that

policy, and passed laws to punish wrongdoers. Key steps include:

- * Pushing new export control legislation through the Duma and Federation Council.

Legislation tightens Russia's control over sensitive technologies, provides for criminal penalties against violators.

- * Directing Russian agencies to implement a work plan designed in cooperation with U.S. and aimed at a number of our most pressing concerns.

- * Working with U.S. experts to strengthen export control systems at Russian aerospace companies.

- * Challenge now is to build on foundations put in place by Stepashin government to ensure that dangerous technology transfers stop. Administration's activism on this issue will not diminish.

- * Have used two key tools: (1) Targeted penalties against specific firms; used these against 10 entities; (2) Withholding increase of commercial space launch quota until we saw progress.

- * Administration has decided, on basis of recent Russian actions, to approve incremental increase of four launches, raising quota from 16 to 20.

- * Would sustain commercial space cooperation for about 6 months -- long enough to evaluate effectiveness of renewed Russian nonproliferation effort and determine the future of US-Russian commercial space cooperation. Keeps thousands of high-tech engineers and scientists from selling talents elsewhere.

- * Also making clear that future expansion of commercial space cooperation will depend on Russia using these new tools to crack down on missile cooperation with Iran. This maintains leverage on Russians. Also stand ready to apply tough penalties against additional violators.

- * The next step will be for USTR to meet with the Russians to amend the Commercial Space Launch Trade Agreement.

IF ASKED: What about Kazakh-Russian dispute on use of launch facility:

- * See problem as bilateral dispute between Russia and Kazakhstan. Important that cause of recent accident at Baikonur (BUY-kuh-nor) is identified quickly. Dispute shouldn't have significant bearing on our long-term approach to commercial space launch issue.

IF ASKED: Aren't Russian entities still helping the Iranians? Why are you rewarding bad behavior?

- * Aware that Russian entities continue to provide sensitive missile technology to Iran, which poses a threat to our friends in the region, ultimately to the U.S.

New Russian government has demonstrated significant activism in recent weeks to combat problem, strengthen institutional and legal foundations necessary for strong export control system.

- * Will continue to use the next few months to press Russia hard to take steps to end to missile technology transfers to Iran.

- * Making clear that future expansion of commercial space cooperation will depend on Russia using these new tools to crack down on missile cooperation with Iran. Also stand ready to apply tough penalties against additional violators.

RUSSIA/FOOD AID

July 12, 1999

CONTEXT. The Washington Post this morning reports that U.S. food assistance to Russia has been ineffective. The article raises questions about whether Russia really needs the assistance, whether the U.S. was able to provide food when Russia needed it, whether the food was distributed to the neediest regions, and whether we are doing enough to monitor the delivery of our food assistance. As of early July, the US has exported almost 1.4 million metric tons to Russia under the Food Aid program. An additional 1.2 million tons have already been purchased and are currently being scheduled for shipment. This is out of a total 3.1 million tons of food aid.

The Washington Post article argues that our food assistance for Russia was not addressing a critical need. Is that true?

- * The overall economic and financial stability of Russia is fundamentally in all our interests.

- * The Russian government formally requested US assistance with food procurement last Fall, and our own assessment of Russian food needs concluded that the combined effects of Russia's financial crisis last August and the worst harvest since the early 1950s created a serious strain on Russia's food supply, including shortages of many basic commodities.

- * The EU also initiated a significant program to respond to this unprecedented

situation.

* Our analysis also concluded that Russian grain stocks, normally about 15 million metric tons would have been dangerously low by July 1999, without external assistance. Even with US and EU assistance, stocks are now just 2.8 million metric tons.

* Our experts have continued to track Russian food stocks over the past several months and it is clear that the US and EU food aid programs helped prevent a critical situation from developing this summer

The Post article indicates that our assistance actually undermined Russian producers who were struggling to succeed in the market.

* We were very conscious not to hurt Russia's market. In total, we will supply some 3.1 metric tons of different food products, a level our experts determined would not reduce incentives for Russian farmers or disrupt international agricultural markets.

* A bilateral team of Russian and American experts confirms that regional prices for the sale of each commodity are based on the prevailing price in the relevant region of Russia.

Is the food aid program behind schedule?

* US food assistance to Russia is proceeding largely as planned, with the bulk of the assistance being delivered during the summer months. This is the time of greatest need, leading up to the 1999 harvest.

* Sending food earlier when Russian products were at their peak would only have depressed prices and prospects for the next harvest.

The Post article argues that our food went to Moscow and St. Petersburg-the best supplied cities in Russia. Why?

* This is a coordinated effort with the EU. US food assistance is being provided to 79 regions in Russia. The division of labor between the EU and the US meant that a significant portion of our assistance went to Moscow and St. Petersburg-where the EU is not.

* Moscow and St. Petersburg were largely dependent on food imports which collapsed after the ruble crash last August.

* We also send a significant portion of our food assistance to the Russian Far East and Siberia, where the EU does not send assistance.

What measures are you taking to ensure that the food assistance is delivered properly?

* We have created an extensive monitoring system involving dozens of USG employees from a variety of agencies in addition to approximately 14 people working full time on this task.

* Our Embassy team meets weekly with Russian counterparts to review progress and address any problems that might arise.

* We also coordinate our monitoring with the EU to ensure that our programs are effective and complementary.

Understand that this year's harvest will also be low. Will you be sending more food to Russia next year?

* The US government is aware of reports that drought conditions have caused projections for another poor crop. We are watching the situation closely and an in depth assessment is planned as we approach the upcoming harvest. We are prepared to consider real Russian needs.

* Right now, however, we are focusing on completing delivery of the 3.1 million metric ton food aid package agreed with Russia last December.

INDIA-PAKISTAN

July 12, 1999

CONTEXT: Over the weekend, the two countries' Director Generals of Military Operations met at the border. The Pakistani Foreign Minister has announced that the "freedom fighters" have agreed to return to the Pakistani side of the Line of Control in Kashmir. He said, and the Indians denied, that India had agreed to a "cease-fire".

Has Prime Minister Sharif fulfilled his commitment to President Clinton to restore the Line of Control in Kashmir?

* We are encouraged by the reports we have seen so far that "militants" are beginning to withdraw. This is the kind of "concrete step" the President was looking for from Prime Minister Sharif.

* It is also very good news that Indian and Pakistani military commanders have met to discuss the modalities of restored respect for the Line of Control.

Has the President been in communication with the leaders of Pakistan or India in recent days?

* No

The Indian Government appears to be claiming that their military pressure rather than U.S. diplomatic efforts is responsible for the withdrawal of the Pakistani fighters. Do you dispute this?

* We are not interested in arguing over responsibility for the end of the fighting. We do believe however that Prime Minister Sharif should be given credit for his efforts in fulfilling the commitment expressed in his joint statement with the President on July 4.

Is the U.S. now prepared to mediate the Kashmir dispute?

* The United States is not mediating this issue. The President committed to Prime Minister Sharif to take a personal interest in encouraging a resumption and intensification of the Indo-Pakistani bilateral dialogue. In that context, we would hope for an earlier return to the Lahore process in which both countries would discuss all issues dividing them, including Kashmir.

Have you threatened Nawaz Sharif's hold on power by getting him to agree to withdraw the militants? There are reports of anti-Sharif and anti-U.S. demonstrations in Pakistan.

* Prime Minister Sharif has a solid majority in Parliament. Political demonstrations are a part of Pakistan's democracy, and should not deter the leadership from taking steps for the long-term benefit of Pakistan.

IRAN: INTERNAL UNREST

July 12, 1999

What is your reaction to the recent unrest in Iran and the crackdown by security forces in response to the student protests?

* We support those in Iran working for a more democratic society, one that respects the rule of law. We have watched with great interest the important strides Iran has taken over the last two years.

* We oppose the use of violence by those seeking to prevent the free expression of the voices of the Iranian people.

ISRAEL: FLOTUS AND JERUSALEM

July 8, 1999

CONTEXT: FLOTUS has written a letter in which she expresses the view that Jerusalem is "the eternal and indivisible capital of Israel" and supports moving the US Embassy to Jerusalem (though saying that the timing of the move needs to take into account its impact on the peace process). This clearly is at odds with

the Administration's position. The Forward published a copy of the letter on Thursday, July 8.

The First Lady has written that she believes Jerusalem should be the eternal, undivided capital of Israel. What is your view?

- * The views expressed in the letter are the First Lady's personal views which she has an obligation to share with the people of New York.

- * The Administration's views on Jerusalem have not changed. Israel and the Palestinians have agreed that Jerusalem would be one of the issues covered in the permanent status negotiations. These issues need to be dealt with and resolved by the parties themselves in those negotiations, without prejudgment by the US or any other third party.

The First Lady has said she would work on moving the embassy to Jerusalem. What is your view?

- * We have made clear that Jerusalem is one of the most sensitive of the permanent status issues.

- * The parties have agreed to address Jerusalem in permanent status negotiations and we do not want to prejudge those negotiations.

What does the U.S. consider to be Jerusalem's capital?

- * Israel regards Jerusalem as its capital.

- * The question of Jerusalem is to be covered in permanent status negotiations.

ISRAEL: BARAK VISIT ANNOUNCEMENT
July 8, 1999

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Rapid City, South Dakota)

For Immediate Release July 7, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

President Clinton will meet with Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak on July 15, 1999. The President and the Prime Minister will review the full range of regional issues and discuss ways to further strengthen the close bilateral relationship between Israel and the United States. President Clinton and Prime Minister Barak will focus on prospects for reaching a comprehensive, just and lasting peace between Israel and all its Arab neighbors.

#

TAIWAN
July 13, 1999

Has Taiwan abandoned the "one China" policy?

* Taiwan authorities apparently seeking to redefine some of the terms of cross-Strait dialogue.

* Taiwan has emphasized that it continues to actively push for dialogue and negotiation with the PRC.

* Beijing also enunciated its continuing desire for cross-Strait talks to place in the fall.

* We remain committed to "one China" policy and promote cross-strait dialogue and face-to-face meetings as best way to clarify misperceptions between Taipei and Beijing.

Has the USG communicated with the Taiwan and PRC authorities?

* Frequent communication with both sides.

* Have heard in recent days from Taipei that it does not seek to alter fundamental framework for cross-Strait ties.

* Stress need for direct communication between Chinese on both sides of the Strait.

SIERRA LEONE PEACE AGREEMENT

July 7, 1999

CONTEXT: A peace agreement was signed today in Lome, Togo by the President of Sierra Leone and the leader of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), ending a nearly eight-year long conflict which began in 1991. Its main elements include a cessation of violence, RUF participation in an expanded Cabinet, a mechanism to control strategic natural resources (diamonds), and a full pardon for RUF leader Foday Sankoh coupled with amnesty for the RUF. The agreement also provides for extensive demobilization, disarmament, and reintegration of combatants. Several commissions, including a truth and reconciliation commission, will be established to help in national reconciliation and reconstruction. Two previous peace agreements - the latest in 1996 - have failed.

The U.S., UK and Netherlands have provided logistical support for the regional peacekeepers (ECOMOG) that defended (and in March 1998 restored to power after an attempted coup) the democratically elected government of President Kabbah. In April of this year, the Sierra Leone Government allowed Foday Sankoh, imprisoned and sentenced to death on eight counts of treason, to travel to Lome, Togo to consult with senior RUF commanders for the first time in more than two years.

This internal RUF dialogue developed an agenda for negotiations with the government and helped to clarify the RUF lines of authority. On May 18th, Rev. Jackson and President Eyadema of Togo brokered a meeting between Sankoh and President Kabbah that reached agreement on a cease-fire and the beginning of peace talks.

POLICY:

* Our objectives in Sierra Leone are to promote a regional peace that will end the conflict, relieve the suffering of the people of Sierra Leone, and foster peace and national reconciliation. We are hopeful that this agreement will succeed, and we are prepared to provide appropriate support for its implementation.

Can you comment on the amnesty provision for the rebels in the peace agreement reached in Lome?

* We are eager to help regional efforts to establish peace and security and address the humanitarian needs of the Sierra Leonean people. This is a peace agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF. It provides for amnesty only within the borders of Sierra Leone, it does not preclude potential prosecution of war crimes by an international body. However, no such tribunal exists at present. The United States is not a signatory and is not bound by the agreement, although we do support the conclusion of the peace agreement.

What recourse will be available for victims of atrocities?

* The peace agreement provides for a truth and reconciliation commission, as well as a human rights commission that will deal with these issues on a case-by-case basis. The peace agreement also provides for humanitarian assistance to reach populations in rural areas and for the demobilization and reintegration into society of child combatants.

Does the agreement call for a peacekeeping operation in Sierra Leone and does the U.S. support such an operation?

* We do not yet have the text of the final agreement. However, UNOMSIL is in Sierra Leone, at this time with 40 military observers and is authorized to deploy up to 70 military observers. The United States will work with the UN and the international community to provide appropriate support for the implementation of the agreement.

What are the costs for the U.S. of this agreement?

* Although the U.S. is not a signatory of the agreement and we are not committed to any specific actions, we will work with the parties and the United Nations to support the implementation of the agreement. I do not have a cost estimate for you at this point.

Did the U.S. pressure President Kabbah to make undue concessions to the RUF?

* No. The United States, along with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the UN, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the UK and others, acted as a facilitator for the peace talks. This agreement is strictly between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF.

What kind of role has the United States played in "facilitating" the agreement?

* From the start, the United States worked with the government, RUF representatives, ECOWAS and the UN to initiate talks and reach a lasting settlement.

* On May 18th, Reverend Jesse Jackson, the President and Secretary of State's Special Envoy for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa, working in close collaboration with ECOWAS Chairman President Eyadema of Togo and the UN, was able to secure the agreement of President Kabbah and RUF leader Sankoh to a cease fire

that commenced on May 24th. This led to the negotiation of the agreement that was signed today.

* This was part of a team effort that extended over months to encourage dialogue between the parties. Reverend Jackson's efforts built on the work of our Special Envoy for Liberia, Ambassador Howard Jeter, and our Ambassador to Sierra Leone, Joseph Melrose.

What is the humanitarian situation in Sierra Leone?

* It is dire. This January, the RUF/AFRC rebels invaded the capital, Freetown. In a period of several weeks, 6,000 people were killed and large portions of the city were destroyed, leaving about 150,000 people homeless. More than 3,000 children (two-thirds of them girls) are registered as missing since January.

* Sierra Leone is a small country with a population of only 4.6 million. Violence and terror have forced more than one-third of the population to flee their homes. More than 400,000 are refugees - primarily in neighboring Guinea and Liberia - and another 700,000-1,000,000 are believed to be internally displaced. The agreement to allow unhindered access by humanitarian organizations to many areas of the country that have been isolated for more than a year will allow the international community to start meeting the needs of an estimate 2.6 million people in need of assistance.

What is the United States doing to alleviate the suffering in Sierra Leone?

* We have provided more than \$55 million in emergency humanitarian relief to Sierra Leone in FY98, and so far in FY99, we have provided an additional \$41 million in humanitarian assistance.

* We are also providing non-lethal logistical support to ECOMOG in its role implementing the peace agreement. This support has amounted to \$10 million since May 1998, and we are providing an additional \$5.8 million now. In addition, we hope to provide a further \$3 million in draw down of non-lethal defense articles.

DROC CEASE-FIRE AGREEMENT

July 12, 1999

CONTEXT: On July 10h, the Presidents of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, Zimbabwe and the Angola's Defense Minister signed an agreement for a cease-fire in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DROC). The Congolese rebel groups, the two Congolese Rally for Democracy (RCD) factions and the Congo Liberation Movement (MLC) refused to sign because of a dispute over who should sign the agreement rather than objection to the substance of the cease-fire agreement. The main elements of the agreement include: a cessation of hostilities to take affect in 24 hours; holding of a Congolese "national dialogue" on political reconciliation; forming a unified national army from Congolese government and rebel forces; establishing a Joint Military Commission comprising senior political and military officials from all belligerent states to oversee the cease-fire implementation, and disarm non-state military actors including those involved in the 1994 Rwandan genocide. The agreement also asks the UN Security Council to deploy a peacekeeping force to ensure implementation of the agreement and to track and disarm all armed groups in the Congo. The signing in the Zambian capital Lusaka was witnessed by the host nation Zambia, and representatives from the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and the United Nations, and the 14-nation Southern African Development Community (SADC).

POLICY:

- * Encourage peace and stability in the Great Lakes and Central Africa region.
- * Encourage an agreement that addressed the underlying causes of the conflict including the security of Congo's neighbors and the need for a broad-based, democratic, and open political process in the Congo.
- * Support the evolution of regional security arrangements in Central Africa to ensure a durable peace settlement.

Can you give us an update on the Congo peace accord?

* Presidents Kabila (DROC), Bizimungu (Rwanda), Museveni (Uganda), Mugabe (Zimbabwe) and Nujoma (Namibia) and the Angolan Defense Minister signed a cease-fire agreement on July 10th in Lusaka Zambia. Other witnesses to the accord were Zambia's President Frederick Chiluba, a representative of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), and observers from the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

* We are disappointed, however, that the two RCD factions and MLC did not sign the agreement, apparently due to a dispute over which RCD faction would sign the agreement , rather than substantive objections to the terms of the agreement.

What are the next steps?

* Zambia's President Chiluba plans to consult with the various rebel factions following the July 12-14 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Summit in Algiers to try to resolve the issue.

* We encourage the rebels to work constructively to resolve their internal dispute in order to support and sign the cease-fire agreement.

* We urge all parties to implement and adhere to the agreement and to act in good faith to enable the citizens of the Congo and neighboring states to pursue their lives in peace, prosperity and democracy.

What are the key aspects of the Agreement?

* It calls for the establishment of a Joint Military Commission, comprised of the parties to the agreement to implement the cease-fire agreement including locating, identifying, disarming, and assembling all non-state armed groups operating in the Congo, and to conduct peacekeeping operations until the deployment of a UN peacekeeping forces. It asks the UN Security Council to deploy a peacekeeping force to ensure implementation of the agreement and to track and disarm all armed groups in the Congo.

* The agreement also calls for a broad based national dialogue in Congo involving

the government, the armed and unarmed opposition, and civil society under the aegis of a neutral facilitator agreed upon by the Congolese parties.

What role did the U.S. play in the talks?

* We have long supported SADC efforts, led by Zambian President Chiluba, to end the conflict. We worked with all parties to encourage resolution. We will continue our active diplomatic efforts to support the peace process.

* In both public statements and private discussions U.S. officials have consistently pressed all sides to stop the fighting and participate in the SADC-sponsored negotiations. We have called for a broad-based internal dialogue, stressed the need to address the security concerns of Congo and its neighbors, and urged belligerents to respect the safety and human rights of non-combatants.

IF ASKED: Does the USG support a UN chapter VII force for DROC?

* We understand the parties requested a UN Chapter VII force to track, disarm, and contain the ex-Far/Interahamwe.

* We do not yet have all the details of the request but we will work with other UN Security Council members to identify appropriate roles for implementation. Our experience has shown that peace enforcement missions are very difficult for the UN.

* We must carefully study any proposal for UN peacekeeping operations, especially its mandate, before making any decision about U.S. support for the operation or a U.S. role in it.

* Let me reiterate, however, that the U.S. Government is committed to finding ways to help bring peace to DROC. We believe it is important that the international community find appropriate ways to support the regional agreement.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release July 12, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I salute the leaders of Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DROC), Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zimbabwe for their courage and commitment to peace in agreeing to the terms for a cease-fire in the Congo war. The signing of this agreement in Lusaka on July 10 provides hope for the many innocent civilians who have suffered through one of Africa's most dangerous and divisive wars in modern times.

Zambian President Chiluba also deserves special tribute for his role in mediating and facilitating the Lusaka Peace Talks, and for his continuing efforts to urge rebel factions to support the cease-fire agreement. I urge all rebel groups to commit to peace and sign on to this important accord.

We have worked with all parties to encourage the resolution of their differences through dialogue and negotiations. We will work closely with our partners in Africa, the international community, and the United Nations to support this agreement. We hope that its full implementation, including the disarming of those responsible for the Rwandan genocide, will end the cycle of violence in the region, pave the way for an inclusive democracy in the DROC, and help bring a better life for all the people of Central Africa.

#

WMD COMMISSION (DEUTCH-SPECTER)

July 8, 1999

CONTEXT: An article in Thursday's Baltimore Sun discussed the content of a Deutch Commission Report.

- * Regard as serious and thoughtful report by distinguished panel.
- * Administration agrees that proliferation of WMD and missiles poses grave threat.
- * Need to ensure that USG and agencies are organized in most effective manner to deal with this threat.
- * In fact, Administration has raised the organizational profile of proliferation more than any other. (e.g. created nonproliferation office in NSC for the first time)
- * We'll give the recommendations serious study.

CUBA: CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TRAVEL

July 12, 1999

CONTEXT: The Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) licensed a delegation of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to travel to Cuba this week. The Chamber's visit will focus on the promotion of private enterprise in Cuba. The delegation committed to spend at least half of its time meeting with nongovernmental entities and, as in all such cases, is barred from discussing current or prospective business opportunities with the Cuban government.

Why did the Administration license the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to visit Cuba?

- * Chamber's proposed visit is consistent with President's policy of reaching out to the Cuban people without strengthening the Cuban government.
 - * Delegation's activities will focus on Cuba's nascent private sector (small family businesses). Group has undertaken to spend at least half of its time meeting with independent, nongovernmental entities.
 - * Policy is to keep pressure on the Cuban government to change -- through the embargo and diplomatic efforts -- while reaching out to the Cuban people to encourage independent, nongovernmental activity and promote emergence of civil society.
 - * President in March 1998 and in January 1999 authorized steps to facilitate people-to-people contact, ease current humanitarian plight caused by Cuban government's failed policies, and help Cuban people prepare for democratic future.
 - * Measures deal with allowing increased remittances; food sales to private entities; broader exchanges; expanded charter flights; and efforts to establish direct mail service.
 - * We are implementing measures in a manner that maximizes benefit to the Cuban people and minimizes benefit to the government.
- Is it true - as one wire story purports - that Chamber President Tom Donahue is travelling as an "envoy" of President Clinton? Does this signal a shift in Cuba policy? Are you preparing to lift the embargo?
- * No, Mr. Donahue is not an envoy of the USG or the President. He is travelling only as President of Chamber.
 - * No, trip does not signal any change in our Cuba policy. The embargo remains in place. Delegation is not allowed to discuss any current or prospective business opportunities with Cuban government.

CUBAN MIGRATION

July 13, 1999

CONTEXT: In response to the mass migration of some 30,000 Cuban rafters in the summer of 1994, we ended our longstanding policy of automatically allowing Cubans entry into the United States and began interdicting them and taking them to Guantanamo Bay Naval Base. We negotiated two migration agreements with the Cuban government, which were aimed at discouraging unsafe boat departures and increasing possibilities for legal migration. The Cuban government provided reassurances that it would not take action against repatriated migrants, while we

committed to providing visas to 20,000 Cubans each year. In May 1995, the Attorney General announced that we would continue to interdict Cuban illegal migrants and return them directly to Cuba unless they had a credible fear of persecution upon their return.

Both sides have generally fulfilled the commitments in the accords, and our repatriation policy has been essential to deterring mass migration from Cuba. Nevertheless, a surge in alien-smuggling and violence by illegal Cuban migrants in recent weeks poses new challenges to our policy of keeping migration in safe, orderly and legal channels. Several incidents are threatening to "magnetize" U.S. shores anew and have stirred criticism of our policy in Miami:

* On June 29, after a nationally televised confrontation with the Coast Guard on a Miami beach, six Cuban migrants were allowed to enter the United States. There were large Cuban-American protests of the incident, especially the Coast Guard's use of pepper spray against the migrants. Making things worse, Border Patrol agents later allegedly subjected the migrants to verbal abuse and forced them to pose with a picture of Fidel Castro. Both Coast Guard and the Department of Justice are investigating each incident.

* This past weekend, a migrant perished after the boat she and 11 others were riding resisted Coast Guard interdiction, struck the cutter, and capsized. The survivors have been taken to Guantanamo to give us time to investigate the incident.

* Yesterday, 15 migrants in a sailboat refused to comply with a Coast Guard order, doused their boat with gasoline and threatened to light it on fire if the Coast Guard tried to stop them. The Coast Guard was able to coax the migrants off their vessel. The media again covered the incident live.

It is critical that we reaffirm our commitment to enforce our immigration laws and to comply with the terms of the U.S.-Cuban migration accords. Any perception that we have loosened our policy could cause thousands more Cubans to take to the sea.

What is your reaction to recent incidents involving Cuban migrants interdicted at

sea?

* My heart goes out to Cuban people. Lack basic human rights, and failed economy forces many to live in squalor. Growing number trying to enter U.S. illegally.

* Deaths at sea -- two in just the past two weeks -- underscore danger. Alien-smuggling -- unscrupulous exploitation of human misery -- is on the rise.

* Concerned at the increased use of violence by some of these migrants against our law enforcement personnel. Threats to harm themselves and other migrants also unacceptable.

* Have taken concrete steps over past 18 months to reach out to Cuban people on the island -- to help relieve plight caused by Castro regime's failed policies and to help prepare for democratic future.

What is U.S. policy towards Cuban migration?

* Mass, disorderly migration is harmful to all, as shown by the recent incidents.

* Our policy is to channel migration into safe, orderly, legal channels and discourage irregular departures by boat. Have programs that provide visas to 20,000. Will continue to vigorously enforce U.S. immigration laws.

Are you reviewing U.S. migration policy toward Cubans in light of recent incidents?

* No, our objective as always is to deter unsafe and disorderly departure of people by boat and to promote safe migration through existing migration programs in Cuba.

* We are committed to protecting our borders and will not tolerate the use of violence in efforts to circumvent our laws.

* I have asked all relevant agencies to do everything we can to discourage unsafe boat departures and promote legal migration from Cuba.

What about the allegations against the Coast Guard and INS regarding the June 29 interdiction of six migrants?

* Both Coast Guard and the Department of Justice have initiated investigations into the incidents of June 29. While we are committed to enforcing the law, we also intend to show full respect for the dignity and rights of any migrants we apprehend.

* We deplore inappropriate behavior by U.S. officials and all appropriate disciplinary action will be taken against those who engage in such behavior.

Do you support the Coast Guard's use of force in interdicting migrants at sea?

* The Coast Guard is entitled to use reasonable force when necessary in enforcing our immigration laws and will continue to do so.

* At the same time, in the wake of the June 29 incident, the Coast Guard has decided to limit the use of pepper spray to only those incidents in which an officer's safety is threatened.

What about the current "wet foot, dry foot" policy? Does it really make sense to permit anyone who reaches shore to stay, and to return those who don't?

* Our current agreements with the Cuban government and U.S. law permit us to return expeditiously only persons who are picked up at sea. Thus, persons picked up at sea undergo a special procedure to ensure that if they have a right to be in the United States or if they have a credible fear of persecution in Cuba, they are not returned.

* Once a Cuban reaches U.S. soil, U.S. immigration law determines the procedures by which a Cuban's case is processed.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/16/99 8:03:00 AM
FROM Smith, Gayle E. (AF)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Sanders, Robin R. (AF)
Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)

CARBON_COPY Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)
Battenfield, Pat A. (AF)
Frazer, Jendayi E. (AF)
Sanders, Robin R. (AF)
Smith, Gayle E. (AF)

TEXT_BODY

I need no more convincing and am convinced to weigh in 300% in support of this. It is a truly wonderful idea and I think would lend some dignity to an event that requires it.

-----Original Message-----

From: Sanders,
Robin R. (AF)
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 1999 11:50 PM
To: Barks-Ruggles,
Erica (AF); Smith, Gayle E. (AF)
Cc: @AFRICA - African Affairs
Subject: RE:
HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

GS - If you decide to weigh in on Hydeia you will not be disappointed. I still have visions of her speaking and I heard her for the first time several months ago. She is just breathtaking. She received an Essence Image award which is not an award given lightly. She brought the house down with her speech, not a dry eye in the room. If I remember correctly JJ attended this event. She is on the radar screen with the NAACP and other key A-A organizations on this issue. her humble presence would certainly keep the Chaka Zulu egos at bay. It would certainly be a mistake not to have her there! rrs

-----Original Message-----

From: Barks-Ruggles,
Erica (AF)
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 1999 11:41 PM

To: Sanders,
Robin R. (AF); @AFRICA - African Affairs
Cc: Bernard, Kenneth W.
(HEALTH); Babbitt, James F. (VP); @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: RE:
HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thank you for getting this info.
I have passed to Sandy Thurman's office. The suggestion is growing
on her. Gayle - you may want to weigh in!

-----Original Message-----

From: Sanders,
Robin R. (AF)
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 1999 3:48 PM
To: Barks-Ruggles,
Erica (AF); @AFRICA - African Affairs
Cc: Bernard, Kenneth W.
(HEALTH); Babbitt, James F. (VP); @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: RE:
HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

on the 14 year A-A HIV/AIDS activist
that was given AIDS at birth is: Hydeia Broadbent
poc is: Hydeia
Broadbent Foundation. person to speak w/ is Dr. Delores Bullard.
323 874-0883. This young woman is an incredible speaker on this
issue - robin.

-----Original Message-----

From: Barks-Ruggles,
Erica (AF)
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 1999 2:55 PM
To: Bernard,
Kenneth W. (HEALTH); Smith, Gayle E. (AF); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Cc: @AFRICA
- African Affairs; @HEALTH - International Health Affairs; @LEGISLAT
- Legislative Affairs; Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Babbitt, James
F. (VP)
Subject: HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

As some of you
know, Sandy Thurman's office is planning a rollout of the HIV/AIDS
Africa initiative on Monday, July 19th. The VP is going to feature
at this event (here - I believe in Room 450 - time TBD).

They
are working on the program today and have worked up the following
speakers and invitees of note. We have not received a complete invitee
list, but understand that the AIDS activist community will feature

large. I have suggested to Sandy Thurman, and she agrees that we need to vet the members of Congress that are being invited to this event given that the VP is participating and other issues (like AGOA) that are out there and may have some positive and negative overlap.

Speakers:

VP

Bishop Tutu (being invited today - not confirmed)

A Ugandan

14 year-old AIDS orphan

Possible speakers:

An American 14 year-old

girl that was given AIDS at birth by her drug addicted mother.

VIPs:

Rev. Jackson - I have warned Sandy that we must invite him as our Special Envoy, but that we will have to give him a speaking role if he is invited.

Rev. Leon Sullivan - same issues as with Jackson given his activism on this issue.

Ron Dellums - similar, though smaller issues to the two above

Members of Congress:

Clyburn

Waters

Christian-Christianson

Pelosi

Kennedy

Gephardt

Leahy

Specter

Porter

Payne

Meeks

Jackson-Lee

Barbara Lee

C. Kilpatrick

Possible Members:

Jesse

Jackson Jr.

Bill Jefferson

Juanita Millender-McDonald

They
are not intending to invite other celebrities that would not speak
(e.g. Magic Johnson, despite our recommendation that they consider
him).

@legislat, @health; @ovp - can you look at the members and
make sure they are OK for this event. Are there others they should
consider?

I have a readout on budgeting and what the draft announcement/fact
sheet looks like which I will get around this afternoon. - Erica

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/16/99 8:09:29 AM
FROM Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)
Bernard, Kenneth W. (HEALTH)
Smith, Gayle E. (AF)

CARBON_COPY Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF)
Battenfield, Pat A. (AF)
Frazer, Jendayi E. (AF)
Sanders, Robin R. (AF)
Smith, Gayle E. (AF)
Bernard, Kenneth W. (HEALTH)
Hill, Roseanne M. (MULTI)
Keenan, Josefine (Chris) (HEALTH)
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)
Saunders, Richard M. (VP)
Babbitt, James F. (VP)
Babbitt, James F. (VP)
Black, Steven K. (VP)
Bolan, Christopher J. (VP)
Boulton, Darrien D. (VP)
Brody, Richard J. (VP)
Davidson, Leslie K. (VP)
Dennett, Todd H.
Fuerth, Leon S. (VP)
Hilty, Joanne M. (VP)
Orfini, Michael H. (VP)
Osius, Theodore G. (VP)
Roberts, Michael W. (VP)
Saunders, Richard M. (VP)
Woolston, Ann E. (VP)

TEXT_BODY

Dan,
When you work this with WHLA, I have only one input: I staffed several congressional trips to Africa to study this problem in the early 1990s -- all were led by Rep. Jim McDermott (who was chairman of an on-paper congressional caucus (fabricated by me) called the

Congressional Working Group on AIDS in the Developing World). Think he should be included.

Miles

-----Original Message-----

From: Barks-Ruggles,

Erica (AF)

Sent: Friday, July 16, 1999 12:03 AM

To: Barks-Ruggles,

Erica (AF); Bernard, Kenneth W. (HEALTH); Smith, Gayle E. (AF);

Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

Cc: @AFRICA - African Affairs; @HEALTH

- International Health Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;

Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Babbitt, James F. (VP)

Subject: RE:

HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

Any thoughts? @legislat - need

you all to work with White House leg to ensure that the VP won't

be embarrassed by missing someone important and/or inviting someone

he should not. Thanks - Erica

-----Original Message-----

From: Barks-Ruggles,

Erica (AF)

Sent: Thursday, July 15, 1999 2:55 PM

To: Bernard,

Kenneth W. (HEALTH); Smith, Gayle E. (AF); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

Cc: @AFRICA

- African Affairs; @HEALTH - International Health Affairs; @LEGISLAT

- Legislative Affairs; Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Babbitt, James

F. (VP)

Subject: HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

As some of you

know, Sandy Thurman's office is planning a rollout of the HIV/AIDS

Africa initiative on Monday, July 19th. The VP is going to feature

at this event (here - I believe in Room 450 - time TBD).

They

are working on the program today and have worked up the following speakers and invitees of note. We have not received a complete invitee

list, but understand that the AIDS activist community will feature

large. I have suggested to Sandy Thurman, and she agrees that we

need to vet the members of Congress that are being invited to this

event given that the VP is participating and other issues (like AGOA)

that are out there and may have some positive and negative overlap.

Speakers:

VP

Bishop Tutu (being invited today - not confirmed)

A Ugandan

14 year-old AIDS orphan

Possible speakers:

An American 14 year-old

girl that was given AIDS at birth by her drug addicted mother.

VIPs:

Rev. Jackson - I have warned Sandy that we must invite him as our Special Envoy, but that we will have to give him a speaking role if he is invited.

Rev. Leon Sullivan - same issues as with Jackson given his activism on this issue.

Ron Dellums - similar, though smaller issues to the two above

Members of Congress:

Clyburn

Waters

Christian-Christianson

Pelosi

Kennedy

Gephardt

Leahy

Specter

Porter

Payne

Meeks

Jackson-Lee

Barbara Lee

C. Kilpatrick

Possible Members:

Jesse

Jackson Jr.

Bill Jefferson

Juanita Millender-McDonald

They

are not intending to invite other celebrities that would not speak (e.g. Magic Johnson, despite our recommendation that they consider him).

@legislat, @health; @ovp - can you look at the members and make sure they are OK for this event. Are there others they should

consider?

I have a readout on budgeting and what the draft announcement/fact sheet looks like which I will get around this afternoon. - Erica

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 7/16/99 8:34:20 AM
FROM Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Miles
Sure, I'll include your whorehouse-hopping partner. You sicko.
Dan

-----Original

Message-----

From: Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

Sent: Friday, July
16, 1999 8:09 AM

To: Barks-Ruggles, Erica (AF); Bernard, Kenneth
W. (HEALTH); Smith, Gayle E. (AF)

Cc: @AFRICA - African Affairs;

@HEALTH - International Health Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Babbitt, James F. (VP); @VP - VP Natl
Security Affairs

Subject: RE: HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

Dan,

When

you work this with WHLA, I have only one input: I staffed several congressional trips to Africa to study this problem in the early 1990s -- all were led by Rep. Jim McDermott (who was chairman of an on-paper congressional caucus (fabricated by me) called the Congressional Working Group on AIDS in the Developing World). Think he should be included.

Miles

-----Original Message-----

From: Barks-Ruggles,

Erica (AF)

Sent: Friday, July 16, 1999 12:03 AM

To: Barks-Ruggles,

Erica (AF); Bernard, Kenneth W. (HEALTH); Smith, Gayle E. (AF);

Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

Cc: @AFRICA - African Affairs; @HEALTH

- International Health Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Babbitt, James F. (VP)
Subject: RE:
HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

Any thoughts? @legislat - need
you all to work with White House leg to ensure that the VP won't
be embarrassed by missing someone important and/or inviting someone
he should not. Thanks - Erica

-----Original Message-----

From: Barks-Ruggles,
Erica (AF)
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 1999 2:55 PM
To: Bernard,
Kenneth W. (HEALTH); Smith, Gayle E. (AF); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Cc: @AFRICA
- African Affairs; @HEALTH - International Health Affairs; @LEGISLAT
- Legislative Affairs; Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Babbitt, James
F. (VP)
Subject: HIV/AIDS event [UNCLASSIFIED]

As some of you
know, Sandy Thurman's office is planning a rollout of the HIV/AIDS
Africa initiative on Monday, July 19th. The VP is going to feature
at this event (here - I believe in Room 450 - time TBD).

They
are working on the program today and have worked up the following
speakers and invitees of note. We have not received a complete invitee
list, but understand that the AIDS activist community will feature
large. I have suggested to Sandy Thurman, and she agrees that we
need to vet the members of Congress that are being invited to this
event given that the VP is participating and other issues (like AGOA)
that are out there and may have some positive and negative overlap.

Speakers:

VP
Bishop Tutu (being invited today - not confirmed)
A Ugandan
14 year-old AIDS orphan

Possible speakers:
An American 14 year-old
girl that was given AIDS at birth by her drug addicted mother.

VIPs:

Rev. Jackson - I have warned Sandy that we must invite him as our

Special Envoy, but that we will have to give him a speaking role if he is invited.

Rev. Leon Sullivan - same issues as with Jackson given his activism on this issue.

Ron Dellums - similar, though smaller issues to the two above

Members of Congress:

Clyburn

Waters

Christian-Christianson

Pelosi

Kennedy

Gephardt

Leahy

Specter

Porter

Payne

Meeks

Jackson-Lee

Barbara Lee

C. Kilpatrick

Possible Members:

Jesse

Jackson Jr.

Bill Jefferson

Juanita Millender-McDonald

They

are not intending to invite other celebrities that would not speak (e.g. Magic Johnson, despite our recommendation that they consider him).

@legislat, @health; @ovp - can you look at the members and make sure they are OK for this event. Are there others they should consider?

I have a readout on budgeting and what the draft announcement/fact sheet looks like which I will get around this afternoon. - Erica