

FOIA MARKER

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

Folder Title: Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]				
Staff Office-Individual: Defense Policy-Bell, Robert				
Original OA/ID Number: 48				
Row: 31	Section: 3	Shelf: 3	Position: 1	Stack: V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. letter	Duplicate of vz4514_004. (2 pages)	11/29/1993	b(6)
002a. memo	For Anthony Lake from Keith Hahn. Subject: Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff Brief to the President. Record ID: 9309596. (1 page)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
002b. briefing paper	Meeting with the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Friday, December 10, 1993. Record ID: 9309596. (2 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
002c. paper	Background Paper; Recent Media Reports on Military Balance in Korea. (3 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
003a. memo	Duplicate of 002a. (1 page)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
003b. briefing paper	Duplicate of 002b. (3 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
003c. paper	Duplicate of 002c. (3 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
004. draft	Draft SCC [Standing Consultative Commission] Cable. Draft #5. (6 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
005. cable	re: Official-Informal. (4 pages)	12/07/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F

vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

UNCLASSIFIED
NSC/RMO PROFILE

RECORD ID: 9309159
RECEIVED: 22 NOV 93 14

TO: DICKS, NORMAN D

FROM: PRESIDENT

DOC DATE: 06 DEC 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY

CO

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: REPLY TO REP DICKS RE AQUISITION OF COMMERCIALY DERIVED AIRCRAFT

ACTION: PRESIDENT SGD LTR

DUE DATE: 25 NOV 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: HAHN

LOGREF:

FILES: WH

NSCP:

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

BELE
HAHN
NSC CHRON
ROSNER

COMMENTS:

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSMEM

CLOSED BY: NSASK

DOC 4 OF 4

UNCLASSIFIED

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 6, 1993

Dear Norm:

I certainly enjoyed our trip to Seattle together. Our discussion about the feasibility of using commercially derived aircraft to meet some of our strategic airlift requirements was particularly enlightening. I hope that my subsequent remarks to the outstanding workers at the Boeing plant conveyed my belief that this remains a very viable option.

Thank you for your support on a number of very important issues that have come before Congress the past several months. I look forward to working with you when you return from recess to find the most cost-effective and capable way of providing strategic airlift for our Armed Forces.

Sincerely,



The Honorable Norman D. Dicks
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 4, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKI ^R
HOWARD PASTER ^{HP}

SUBJECT: Letter from Representative Dicks RE Acquisition of
Commercially Derived Aircraft

Purpose

To respond to a letter from Representative Norman Dicks of Washington in which he urges you to consider purchasing Boeing 747 and 767 aircraft as part of program to upgrade and expand our strategic airlift capability.

Background

Representative Dicks wrote the letter at Tab B before he accompanied you on your flight to Seattle to attend APEC. After your discussion with him on that flight, you acknowledged the feasibility of using commercially derived aircraft to meet U.S. strategic airlift requirements in your remarks to workers at the Boeing plant. The Department of Defense continues to view this as a viable option in light of continuing problems with the C-17 aircraft program.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter to Representative Dicks at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab A Letter to Representative Norman Dicks
Tab B Incoming Correspondence

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

November 30, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *RB*FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*SUBJECT: Letter to the President from Representative Dicks
RE Acquisition of Commercially Derived Aircraft

At Tab B Representative Norman Dicks of Washington has written the President urging him to purchase Boeing 747 and 767 aircraft as part of the U.S. strategic airlift fleet. This letter was mailed November 17, before the President's visit to Seattle. The President and Representative Dicks talked about this subject on the flight to Seattle and the President subsequently inserted language into his speech to Boeing workers.

The response to Representative Dicks assures him that we will continue to consider the option of purchasing commercial aircraft to meet part of our airlift requirements. The letter also thanks him for his recent support on several important congressional votes.

Concurrence by: Jeremy Rosner *JR*RECOMMENDATION

That you forward Tab I to the President.

Attachments

Tab I	Memorandum for the President
Tab A	Letter to Representative Dicks
Tab B	Incoming Correspondence



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20515

NORMAN D. DICKS
WASHINGTON, SIXTH DISTRICT

93 NOV 19 PM 12:10

November 17, 1993

Dear Mr. President:

I thoroughly enjoyed the chance to visit with you while watching Sidwell Friends complete their undefeated football season.

In preparation to your trip to Seattle for the APEC Conference I want to bring to your attention an issue of tremendous importance for the Puget Sound region.

The Department of Defense is currently giving serious review to acquisition of commercially derived aircraft to meet our critical airlift requirements. Undersecretary of Defense John Deutch last week visited Boeing facilities in Seattle with me to review the potential to utilize 747 and 767s for this mission. We are optimistic that a decision on this issue from the Department will be coming shortly, and the Congress has provided funding to initiate such a program.

I sincerely believe this is an opportunity to provide the nation with cost effective military assets while at the same time providing important work that can help avoid further employment reductions in the Puget Sound area.

9151

I have provided background information on the issue to your staff and hope that you will be able to give this matter your personal attention.

Sincerely,

Norm

NORM DICKS
Member of Congress

NDD:tlf

The President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

PS: This is very important
to me.

TO: ITOH

FROM: CONNELL, M

DOC DATE: 06 DEC 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY
USIA

STRATEGIC FORCES
PRD

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: USIA COMMENTS ON DRAFT NATL SECURITY STRATEGY

ACTION: FOR RECORD PURPOSES

DUE DATE: 09 DEC 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: HAHN

LOGREF: 9320511 9320551

FILES: IFR

NSCP: PRD0035

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

ANDREASEN
BELL
GOTTEMOELLER
HAHN
JONES
MERCHANT
SCHIFTER
SCHWARTZ
SODERBERG
STEINBERG
WALKER

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSWEA

CLOSED BY: NSWEA

DOC 1 OF 1



LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

December 6, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. William H. Itoh
Executive Secretary
National Security Council

FROM: Mary Ellen Conneley *McC*
Executive Secretary

SUBJECT: Draft National Security Strategy

The first National Security Strategy issued by President Clinton is certain to be the subject of considerable scrutiny both in the United States and abroad. It offers the opportunity to broaden the traditional concept of national security and to define our national interests in a world transformed by the changes that have brought to an end four decades of Cold War. Through the National Security Strategy, the Administration can build the case for the interrelationship of international affairs and our domestic well being. At a time when communications technology sends into the living room, the kind of information that would have been beamed back only to the White House Situation Room in another era, the public needs an explanatory framework for understanding the Clinton Administration's policy and approaches.

Unfortunately, it is our opinion that the November 18 draft of the National Security Strategy is not a wholly satisfactory public affairs document. Even at the risk of further delaying publication, we urge that a new version be prepared. That text should place additional emphasis on the importance of the strategies of "soft power," in a period where ideas and values have come to the forefront of human concern. There is everywhere a new interest in the civic culture of the United States and the day-to-day practice of democracy and free enterprise. Long term investments in educational and cultural exchange also contribute to national security through the promotion of international understanding.

We look forward to working with you in revising the National Security Strategy.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

06-Dec-1993 09:05 EDT

UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Natalie S. Wozniak (WOZNIAK)
Donald K. Steinberg (STEINBERG)

FROM: Robert G. Bell
(BELL)

SUBJECT: Detargeting Press Guidance

QUESTION: Is the United States talking to Russia about detargeting our nuclear missiles, as reported today in the New York Times?

ANSWER: In a statement on April 23 on advancing US relations with Russia and the other new independent states, the President noted: "We are beginning a comprehensive review of measures that could enhance strategic stability, including the possibility of each side reprogramming its nuclear missiles so they are not routinely aimed at each other." Since April, we have had on-going, productive talks with Russia on this issue, and we hope to conclude them at an early date.

QUESTION: Are you planning an announcement at the Summit?

ANSWER: It would be premature to talk about whether an agreement will be announced in this area at the Summit since we are still discussing this initiative with Russia.

CC: Records (RECORDS)
CC: Steven P. Andreasen (ANDREASEN)
CC: Rose E. Gottemoeller (GOTTEMOELLER)

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~
NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

21355
Redo

December 7, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

FROM: ROBERT BELL *RbB*

SUBJECT: Proposed PDD on U.S. Policy on Ballistic Missile
Defenses and the Future of the ABM Treaty

Per your request, revisions to the proposed PDD on the above
subject have been made and coordinated with OMB.

Concurrence: Gordon Adams *GA*

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum to the President at Tab I.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President
Tab A Proposed PDD

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By *V2* NARA, Date *10/3/2016*
7016-052-1

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~
NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

21355

November 29, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: ROBERT G. BELL *RGB*
FROM: STEVEN P. ANDREASEN *SPA*
SUBJECT: Proposed PDD on U.S. Policy on Ballistic Missile
Defenses and the Future of the ABM Treaty

The attached PDD reflects the decisions taken by the President on U.S. policy on ballistic missile defenses and the future of the ABM Treaty.

Concurrences: *Done as corrected*
Nancy Menan Alan Kreczko *AK*

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum to the President at Tab I.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President
Tab A Proposed PDD

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By *VZ* NARA, Date *11/3/2016*
2016-0152-E

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

21355

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE

SUBJECT: Proposed PDD on U.S. Policy on Ballistic Missile
Defenses and the Future of the ABM Treaty

Purpose

To submit for your approval a proposed Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) on U.S. policy on ballistic missile defenses and the future of the ABM Treaty.

Background

The proposed PDD reflects the decisions you have taken on Presidential Review Directive (PRD)-31, "U.S. Policy on Ballistic Missile Defenses and the Future of the ABM Treaty."

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the proposed PDD at Tab A.

Attachment

Tab A Proposed PDD

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VL NARA, Date 10/3/2006
2016 052 -f

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

~~SECRET~~

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTONPRESIDENTIAL DECISION DIRECTIVE/NSC-

MEMORANDUM FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

THE SECRETARY OF STATE
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY
DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO
THE UNITED NATIONS
CHIEF OF STAFF TO THE PRESIDENT
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL
SECURITY AFFAIRS
DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
DIRECTOR OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND
DISARMAMENT AGENCY
DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
POLICY

SUBJECT: U.S. Policy on Ballistic Missile Defenses and the
Future of the ABM Treaty (S)

This Presidential Decision Directive establishes and directs the implementation of U.S. Policy on Ballistic Missile Defenses (BMD) and the Future of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. (S)

Background

On April 26, 1993, Presidential Review Directive (PRD)-31 tasked a comprehensive examination of U.S. BMD policy, focusing on the following three areas:

- The objectives the Administration should pursue as a priority in BMD. (S)
- An assessment of what, if any, changes in the ABM Treaty should be sought in light of these objectives and the modalities for achieving any changes. (S)
- A strategy for pursuing our BMD objectives with Russia and with friends and allies. (S)

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

KJS 8/1/2008

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

The Review was completed by the Interagency Working Group (IWG) on Arms Control and forwarded to the Deputies Committee on November 13, 1993. It was considered by the Principals Committee on November 22, 1993. (C)

U.S. BMD Objectives and Program

Consistent with the assessment of the ballistic missile threat contained in PRD-31, on August 30, 1993, I approved the recommendations from the Bottom-Up Review (BUR), including the Secretary of Defense's recommendations for a fundamental restructuring of BMD programs. (C)

Specifically, the U.S. will pursue a BMD program between FY95 and FY99 that will provide for:

- Enhanced theater missile defense (TMD) capability later this decade. (U)
- Maintaining national missile defense (NMD) as a technology research and development (R&D) program. (U)
- A modest follow-on technologies (FOT) and research and support (R&S) program. (U)

The TMD programs identified in the BUR will play a key role in minimizing two critical dangers to U.S. security: regional threats to U.S. interests and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In general, our TMD forces should:

- Provide highly effective protection against limited tactical ballistic missile attacks for forward deployed and concentrated or dispersed expeditionary elements of the armed forces of the United States and for the facilities and forces of friends and allies of the United States. (U)
- Effectively protect allied population centers. This protection could provide the opportunity for U.S./allies to execute military options in support of national objectives with minimum interference from enemy missile forces. (U)

ABM Treaty

Consistent with U.S. BMD programmatic objectives, the following will be the policy of the United States with regard to the ABM Treaty. (S)

- ABM Treaty interpretation. The Administration has already informed the Congress that it will adhere to the traditional, or "narrow," interpretation of the ABM Treaty. (U)
- NMD ABM Treaty issues: The United States will not seek amendments to the ABM Treaty to permit (1) expansion of the number of ABM sites and ground-based interceptors beyond

those currently permitted (1 and 100, respectively), (2) development, testing or deployment of space-based sensors for direct battle management (i.e., satellites capable of substituting for ABM radars) or (3) development, testing or deployment of space-based interceptors. The United States will, however, reexamine these options if a decision is taken at some future date to elevate NMD to an acquisition and deployment program. (C)

- Brilliant Eyes (BE) ABM Treaty issues: The objective BE space-based sensor system is not sufficiently defined to determine its ABM Treaty implications. If, at some future date, the USG concludes that the ABM Treaty would prohibit the objective BE system, the USG will determine at that time whether to seek changes or redesign the system to make it consistent with the USG interpretation of the ABM Treaty. However, the United States will not negotiate at this time ABM Treaty amendments or otherwise seek formal agreement to the objective BE system. (C)
- Succession: The United States will agree to negotiate a protocol that will multilateralize the ABM Treaty, i.e., to give each of the Bishkek signatories, as well as Georgia and Azerbaijan the option of becoming parties to the ABM Treaty. (C)
- TMD/ABM clarification: The requirement for robust TMD programs has been validated as a top priority in our defense planning; thus, ensuring that the ABM Treaty is updated to reflect changes in TMD technologies is more important than ever. (U)

The U.S. will propose to our ABM Treaty partners that for purposes of determining treaty compliance a TMD system would not be deemed to have been "given the capability to counter" a strategic ballistic missile (SBM) unless it had actually been tested against an SBM. An SBM would, in turn, be defined as having a maximum velocity greater than 5.0 km/second. (S)

- Linkage: The U.S. will implicitly link our positions on succession and TMD/ABM clarification. The U.S. will not conclude one without the other. (S)

BMD Cooperation

The U.S. will be prepared to discuss (1) sharing of ballistic missile early warning information, (2) planning for use of ATBM forces and (3) employing technology cooperation to assist in forging a positive security relationship between the United States and Russia and to serve as part of a general strategy to address the proliferation of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction. The United States will adopt a regional/bilateral approach to BMD cooperation in each of the above three areas. (C)

In general, the degree to which we are willing to share technology will depend on the country with which we propose to cooperate. In the specific case of Russia, the extent to which we would pursue missile defense technology cooperation would depend on their continued progress in political and economic reform; adherence to arms control agreements and the Missile Technology Control Regime; and a willingness to enter into and abide by a bilateral agreement on cooperative activities. ~~(C)~~

The United States will, however, limit these cooperative programs with Russia in two important ways:

- First, the technology development should be generic and not involve direct cooperation in any current U.S. system development (i.e., joint space sensor technology programs should include experiments not tied to BE or other operational system development). ~~(C)~~
- Second, the United States should focus on jointly developing new technology products rather than transferring existing technology. Thus, only the carefully controlled U.S. technology necessary for specific projects would be incorporated into them. ~~(C)~~

Our program with Russia will proceed on its own merits, although the pace of cooperation will be implicitly linked to our ability to move forward with our own TMD programs. That, in turn, will require a forthcoming response from Russia (and the other New Independent States that would be made Party to the ABM Treaty) on our TMD/ABM demarcation proposals. ~~(C)~~

Encouraging other countries to acquire ATBMs, and (as appropriate) sharing U.S. technologies permitted by the MTCR, can further U.S. security interests in some regions of the world, reduce escalatory tendencies that unchecked offensive military capabilities can create and contribute to U.S. counter-proliferation efforts. ~~(C)~~

However, potential tensions and tradeoffs exist between pursuing missile defenses and limiting or preventing proliferation. A tension between our BMD efforts and our nonproliferation goals may arise if and when we need to cooperate with a non-MTCR country in the development or sale of missile interceptors. Entering into such cooperation could easily put the U.S. in the position of engaging in behavior that we would object to -- and might have to impose sanctions on -- if it were carried out by other countries. Thus, the U.S. will strictly limit the number of non-MTCR states with which such cooperation occurs. ~~(C)~~

The Department of Defense and Department of State will formulate a specific proposal for (a) early warning, (b) TMD and (c) technology cooperation with Russia (and, as appropriate, other countries and/or regions) and submit it to the IWG on Arms Control no later than January 7, 1994. ~~(C)~~

Negotiating Forum

The United States will use the SCC as the forum for negotiating clarifications, modifications, state succession and procedural applications of the ABM Treaty. Meeting in the SCC will serve to reaffirm the Administration's commitment to the ABM Treaty and will constitute a good faith effort to cooperate with the Russians on issues over which they have serious concerns. (S)

Higher-level political discussions should be used to reach broad agreement on our basic implementation strategy and to set parameters for the SCC sessions to follow. These discussions will also be the main forum for articulating to the Russians our revised BMD cooperation objectives, supplemented by technical discussions in sub-level working groups. (S)

Implementation

The NSC staff will coordinate the taskings identified in this PDD. (U)

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 12/02/93

ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 12/7

SUBJECT: MILITARY NOMINATION: 31 OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO REAR ADMIRAL

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☐	PASTER	☐	☐
McLARTY	☐	☐	QUINN	☐	☐
NEEL	☐	☐	RASCO	☐	☐
PANETTA	☐	☐	RUBIN	☐	☐
BAGGETT	☐	☐	SEGAL	☐	☐
EMANUEL	☐	☐	SEIDMAN	☐	☐
GEARAN	☐	☐	STEPHANOPOULOS	☐	☐
GERGEN	☐	☐	TYSON	☐	☐
GIBBONS	☐	☐	VARNEY	☐	☐
HALE	☐	☐	WATKINS	☐	☐
HERMAN	☐	☐	WILLIAMS	☐	☐
LAKE	☐	☐	CLERK _____	☐	☒
LINDSEY	☐	☐	BELL _____	☐	☐
McGINTY	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
MYERS	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
NUSSBAUM	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐

REMARKS:

Do you have any objection?

RESPONSE:

The National Security Council staff concurs in the attached military nominations.

Anthony Lake

JOHN D. PODESTA
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
Ext. 2702



THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-1000



24 NOV 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Flag Officer Nomination

On behalf of the Secretary of Defense, I recommend you nominate the 31 officers whose names are on the attached list for appointment to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the United States Navy. These nominations are a result of selection boards I approved on behalf of the Secretary of Defense.

This action will not cause the Navy to exceed the number of officers authorized to be serving in the grade of rear admiral (lower half).

William J. Perry

Attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE


WASHINGTON

November 29, 1993

11:12

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

JOHN A. GAUGHAN

DIRECTOR, WHITE HOUSE MILITARY OFFICE

SUBJECT:

Navy Flag Officer Nomination

Forwarded for your approval and signature is a nomination containing the names of 31 officers for appointment to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the United States Navy.

This recommendation is based on a selection board that was approved by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, for the Secretary.

Recommendation

That you approve and sign the attached.

Attachment

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. letter	Duplicate of vz4514_004. (2 pages)	11/29/1993	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F

vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

The White House

Washington

To the Senate of the United States:

I NOMINATE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAPTAINS IN THE LINE OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF), PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF)

CAPTAIN TIMOTHY ROBERT BEARD, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN DAVID LAWREN BREWER III, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN STANLEY WALTER BRYANT, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN TONEY MICHAEL BUCCHI, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN ROBERT STANLEY COLE, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN WILLIAM WINSTON COPELAND, JR., (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN JOHN WILBUR CRAINE, JR., (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN JAMES BEATY FERGUSON III, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN EDMUND PETER GIAMBASTIANI, JR., (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN JOHN JOSEPH GROSSENBACHER, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN JAMES BRUCE HINKLE, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN GORDON STALLINGS HOLDER, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN RICHARD GEORGE KIRKLAND, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN PETER AVARD CHIPMAN LONG, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN MARTIN JULES MAYER, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN BARBARA ELIZABETH MCGANN, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN PATRICK DAVID MONEYMAKER, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN CHARLES WILLIAM MOORE, JR., (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN JOHN BERNARD NATHMAN, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN JOHN BRAMWELL PADGETT III, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN WILLIAM LUND PUTNAM, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN THOMAS RUSSELL RICHARDS, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN DAVID PUTNAM SARGENT, JR., (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN WILLIAM ROBERT SCHMIDT, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN DONALD ALAN WEISS, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY

[001]

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF)

CAPTAIN JOHN ANTHONY GAUSS, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY
CAPTAIN THOMAS JOHN PORTER, (b)(6), U.S. NAVY

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF)

CAPTAIN ROBERT WAYNE SMITH, [REDACTED], U.S. NAVY

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (CRYPTOLOGY)

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF)

CAPTAIN HARRY WINSOR WHITON, [REDACTED], U.S. NAVY

[001]

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (INTELLIGENCE)

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF)

CAPTAIN LOWELL EDWIN JACOBY, [REDACTED], U.S. NAVY

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (OCEANOGRAPHY)

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF)

CAPTAIN PAUL GOLDEN GAFFNEY II, [REDACTED], U.S. NAVY

X

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002a. memo	For Anthony Lake from Keith Hahn. Subject: Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff Brief to the President. Record ID: 9309596. (1 page)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F

vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002b. briefing paper	Meeting with the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Friday, December 10, 1993. Record ID: 9309596. (2 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F
vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002c. paper	Background Paper; Recent Media Reports on Military Balance in Korea. (3 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F
vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

003a. memo	Duplicate of 002a. (1 page)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)
------------	-----------------------------	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F
vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003b. briefing paper	Duplicate of 002b. (3 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F

vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003c. paper	Duplicate of 002c. (3 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F
vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

UNCLASSIFIED
NSC/RMO PROFILE

RECORD ID: 9321394
RECEIVED: 06 DEC 93 13

TO: GROSSMAN, M

FROM: ITOH

DOC DATE: 08 DEC 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: NETHERLANDS
FOREIGN TRAVEL

ADMINISTRATIVE
CBW

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: NSC STAFF FORN TRAVEL NOTIFICATION

ACTION: KENNEY SGD MEMO

DUE DATE: 09 DEC 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: PONEMAN

LOGREF:

FILES: ADMIN

NSCP:

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

BELL
MANZANARES
NSC CHRON
PONEMAN

COMMENTS:

DISPATCHED BY

DATE

BY HAND

W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSWEA

CLOSED BY: NSJDA

DOC 2 OF 2

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED
ACTION DATA SUMMARY REPORT

RECORD ID: 9321394

DOC ACTION OFFICER

001 SODERBERG
001
002

CAO ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED

Z 93120720 FOR DECISION
X 93120809 SODERBERG APPROVED RECOM
X 93120809 KENNEY SGD MEMO

DISPATCH DATA SUMMARY REPORT

DOC DATE DISPATCH FOR ACTION

DISPATCH FOR INFO

002 931208 GROSSMAN, M

UNCLASSIFIED

National Security Council
The White House

PROOFED BY: _____ LOG # 21394
URGENT NOT PROOFED: _____ SYSTEM PBS NSC INT
BYPASSED WW DESK: _____ DOCLOG ASK A/O _____

	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	DISPOSITION
DepExecSec	<u>1</u>	<u>Wau</u>	
ExecSec			
Staff Director	<u>2</u>	<u>W</u>	
<u>Kenney</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>W</u>	<u>Tals I+II</u>
D/AFNSA			
APNSA			
Situation Room			
West Wing Desk	<u>4</u>	<u>FOA 12/3</u>	<u>N</u>
NSC Secretariat	<u>5</u>		

A = Action I = Information D = Dispatch R = Retain N = No Further Action

cc: VP McLarty Other _____

Should be seen by: _____
(Date/Time)

COMMENTS:

Travel for Elisa Davis
12/11-19

DISPATCH INSTRUCTIONS:

Nancy
initialed
Chris

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

December 8, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR MARC GROSSMAN
Executive Secretary
Department of State

SUBJECT: NSC Staff Foreign Travel Notification

NSC Staff Elisa Harris
Member: Director for Nonproliferation and
 Export Controls

Purpose of Travel

To participate in the Chemical Weapons Convention Preparatory
Commission plenary.

ITINERARY:

<u>Date</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Major Event/Meeting</u>
12/11-19	The Hague	Netherlands	CWC Preparatory Commission plenary

for Kristie A. Kenney
William H. Itoh
Executive Secretary

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

December 3, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR NANCY SODERBERG

THROUGH: J. ROBERT MANZANARES *JRM*
FROM: DANIEL PONEMAN/ROBERT BELL *RB*
SUBJECT: Travel Request for Elisa Harris,
The Hague -- December 11-19, 1993

We would like Elisa Harris to attend the Chemical Weapons Convention Preparatory Commission meeting in the Hague the week of December 13. Two issues of importance to the United States will be decided at this meeting: Israeli participation in the Western Group and the Prepcom budget for 1994. Ms. Harris' attendance at this meeting will strengthen the hand of the U.S. delegation as it works to achieve positive outcomes on these issues. ACDA is issuing invitational orders to cover her travel and other expenses for the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the travel authorization at Tab I and the memorandum to Marc Grossman at Tab II.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachments

Tab I Travel Authorization Form
Tab II Memorandum to State Department

DATE 12/6/93

NSC STAFF TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION

1. TRAVELER'S NAME: ELISA D. HARRIS
2. PURPOSE/EVENT (Include Dates): CWC Preparatory Commission plenary.
11 Dec to 19 Dec
3. ITINERARY (Please Attach Copy of Proposed Itinerary): Wash DC to The Hague and return to Wash DC
4. DEPARTURE DATE 12/11 RETURN DATE 12/19
DEPARTURE TIME 5:15p RETURN TIME 9:00am
5. MODE OF TRANSPORTATION:
GOVT. AIR COMMERCIAL AIR xx POV RAIL
OTHER
6. ESTIMATED EXPENSES:
TRANSPORTATION PER DIEM OTHER
TOTAL -0-
7. WHO PAYS EXPENSES: NSC OTHER xxx
IF NOT NSC, DESCRIBE SOURCE AND ARRANGEMENTS: ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY
8. WILL FAMILY MEMBER ACCOMPANY YOU: YES NO
IF SO, WHO PAYS FOR FAMILY MEMBER (If Travel Not Paid By
Traveler, Describe Source & Arrangements):
9. TRAVEL ADVANCE REQUESTED: \$
10. REMARKS (Use This Space to Indicate Any Additional Items You
Would Like to Appear on Your Travel Orders):

11. TRAVELER'S SIGNATURE: Elisa D. Harris

12. APPROVALS: Senior Director Daniel Foreman

Director of Administration J. Robert Maynard

National Security Adviser Christie A. Kenney

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

December 8, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR:

LYNN DAVIS
Department of State

ASHTON CARTER
Department of Defense

JOHN KELIHER
Department of Energy

CRAIG CHELLIS
Central Intelligence Agency

GENERAL MICHAEL RYAN
Joint Chiefs of Staff

JOHN HOLUM
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

SUBJECT: IWG Meeting on SCC Issues ~~(S)~~

There will be a meeting of the Arms Control IWG on Friday, December 10, from 9:30-11:00 a.m. in Room 208, to discuss the attached SCC draft guidance cable on succession and TMD/ABM demarcation. Agencies should also be prepared to discuss Russian SCC Commissioner Koltunov's ideas on TMD/ABM demarcation, tabled in the SCC on December 7. ~~(S)~~

Names of attendees should be telephoned to 202-395-3330 no later than COB Thursday, December 9, 1993. (U)

SP4 for

Robert G. Bell
Special Assistant to the President
and Senior Director for Defense
Policy and Arms Control

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VZ NARA, Date 10/3/2006
2016-0152-F

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. draft	Draft SCC [Standing Consultative Commission] Cable. Draft #5. (6 pages)	12/08/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F

vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

December 8, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: ROBERT G. BELL *RB*
FROM: STEVEN P. ANDREASEN *SPA*
SUBJECT: Letter from Representatives Regarding Nuclear
Testing

Representative Kopetski and 77 other Representatives have written the President urging him to continue the U.S. testing moratorium despite the recent Chinese nuclear test.

The response from the President notes that we deeply regret the recent test by China and are encouraging the Chinese to refrain from further testing. The response also notes that the President has directed DOE to take such actions as are needed to put the U.S. in a position to be able to conduct nuclear tests next year, provided the notification and review conditions of the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell Amendment are met in the Spring of 1994 and notes the relevant factors upon which the President's ultimate decision on whether to test will be made. The response tracks closely with the statement released by the White House on October 5 in response to the Chinese test.

Concurrence: Jeremy Rosner *JP*

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum to the President at Tab I.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President
Tab A Letter to Representatives
Tab B Letter from Representatives

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE
HOWARD PASTER

SUBJECT: Letter from Representatives Regarding Nuclear
Testing

Purpose

To respond to a letter from 78 Representatives on nuclear testing.

Background

Representative Kopetski and 77 other Representatives have written you urging you to continue the U.S. nuclear testing moratorium despite the recent Chinese test.

The response from you notes that we deeply regret the recent test by China and are encouraging the Chinese to refrain from further testing. The response also notes that you have directed DOE to take such actions as are needed to put the U.S. in a position to be able to conduct nuclear tests next year, provided the notification and review conditions of the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell Amendment are met in the Spring of 1994 and notes the relevant factors upon which your ultimate decision on whether to test will be made. The response tracks closely with the statement released by the White House on October 5 in response to the Chinese test.

Recommendation

That you sign the response to the Representatives at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab A Letter to Representatives
Tab B Letter from Representatives

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Mike:

Thank you for your letter of October 5 on nuclear testing. As you know, the People's Republic of China conducted an underground nuclear test on October 4, despite the urging of more than 20 nations, including the United States, not to do so.

The United States deeply regrets this action, and we have urged China to refrain from further nuclear tests and to join the other nuclear powers in a global moratorium. Such a moratorium will contribute to the achievement of the Administration's goal of completing a Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) Treaty by 1996, consistent with the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell Amendment passed by Congress last fall and signed by President Bush.

In response to the Chinese test, I have directed the Department of Energy to take such action as is needed to put the United States in a position to be able to conduct nuclear tests next year, provided the notification and review conditions of the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell Amendment are met in the Spring of 1994. My ultimate decision on whether to test will be based on fundamental U.S. national security interests, taking into account: (1) the contribution further tests would make to improving the safety and reliability of the U.S. arsenal in preparation for a CTB; (2) the extent to which China and others have responded to the U.S. appeal for a global moratorium on testing; (3) progress in the CTB negotiations; and (4) the implications of further U.S. nuclear tests on our broader nonproliferation objectives. I have also asked Administration officials to begin consultations with Congress and our allies on these issues.

Finally, I am pleased to note that, for the first time, the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly approved last month by consensus a resolution advocating a global treaty to ban all nuclear weapon tests. The United States was a principal co-sponsor of the resolution. Our bilateral consultations with the other nuclear states on the organization and conduct of CTB negotiations also have been very successful, and we have made progress in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) to confer a

negotiating mandate on the CD's Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Testing. While we still have some important procedural matters to resolve, I am confident that we will be able to begin the CTB negotiations in January 1994.

The Honorable Michael J. Kopetski
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

93 OCT 25 A9:41

84/5

October 15, 1993

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We are writing to express our support for continuation of the U.S. nuclear testing moratorium, despite the recent Chinese nuclear test.

Earlier this year, you determined that U.S. national security interests were best served by a vigorous effort to control the spread of nuclear weapons, technology, and materials. Central to this effort are negotiation of a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), indefinite extension of the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), and greater controls over the proliferation of weapons-grade material and ballistic missile technology -- all of which we strongly support.

Now that the Chinese have conducted a nuclear test, however, we know there will be individuals in and out of the government who will be calling for a tit-for-tat response: a U.S. test for a Chinese test. In our view, this makes no sense. If a Chinese test harms U.S. efforts to achieve its policy goals in this area, a U.S. test would make achievement of our objectives even more difficult. And there is still no compelling reason for tests to improve the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

We applaud your statement condemning the Chinese test. In addition, we believe the United States should announce its intention to continue the moratorium, urge other nuclear powers to desist from further testing, and finally, declare its commitment to the rapid conclusion of a CTBT.

Thank you for your attention to our request. We look forward to working with you on this vital matter.

Sincerely,

Martin Olav Sabo

Barney Frank

Michael J. Kopetski


Martin T. Meehan




Bernard Sanders



Howard L. Berman



Major R. Owens



Fortney Pete Stark




Eni F.H. Faleomavaega



Carolyn B. Maloney



Peter A. Piazio



Timothy J. Penny



Constance A. Morella



Anna G. Eshoo



Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky



Richard J. Durbin



Bruce F. Vento




Anthony C. Beilenson



Hamilton Fish, Jr.



Mike Kreidler




Edolphus Towns



Nancy Pelosi




Eleanor Holmes Norton



Lane Evans



David Minge



Henry A. Waxman




Thomas H. Andrews




Ed Pastor



Don Edwards



James L. Oberstar



Julian C. Dixon



Edward J. Markey




George Miller



Vic Fazio



Ron Klink



Bobby L. Rush



Neil Abercrombie



Patricia Schroeder



Joseph P. Kennedy II



Alan Wheat



William D. Ford



Patsy T. Mink




Larry LaRocco



Carrie Meek



Lynn C. Woolsey



Jerrold Nadler



Albert R. Wynn



George E. Brown, Jr.




John Joseph Moakley



Louise Slaughter




Benjamin L. Cardin



Jolene Unsoeld



John W. Olver




Robert A. Underwood




Eliot L. Engel




Elizabeth Furse


Dale Kildee


James Walsh



Christopher Shays


Maurice D. Hinchey



Dave Gray

Bart Gordon


Dan Glickman



Thomas M. Foglietta


Peter J. Viscloskey



Ron Wyden



Pat Williams



Ronald D. Coleman



Earl Pomeroy



Leslie L. Byrne


Collin C. Peterson


Charles E. Schumer


Melvin L. Watt


Jim Slattery


James P. Moran


Glenn Poshard


Jim Leach


Richard A. Gephardt

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 25, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM ITOH
NSC Executive Secretariat

FROM: HOWARD PASTER |✓

SUBJECT: Presidential Correspondence

Attached are copies of letters sent to the President from various members of Congress.

Since these letters address national security issues, we would appreciate your assistance in having drafts written.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you have any questions, please feel free to call LeeAnn Inadomi at x7500.

The following is a brief description of the letters:

- 1) John Conyers (D-MI), concerning Haiti;
- ✓ 2) Martin Olav Sabo (D-MN) and others, concerning nuclear testing moratorium;
- 3) Louise Slaughter (D-NY), concerning medical aid for Bosnia;
- 4) Charlie Rangel (D-NY), concerning Haiti;
- 5) Conrad Burns (R-MT), concerning Russian exports of aluminum;
- 6) Tom Foglietta (D-PA), concerning death of Alicia Yvette Nunez and negligent medical treatment in Dominican Republic.

Attachments

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

10-Dec-1993 01:49 EDT

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR:

VAX_MAIL@OEOB
PONEMAN@A1@OEOB
KRISTOFF@A1@OEOB
ANDREASEN@A1@OEOB

FROM: White House Situation Room
(WHSR@A1@WHSR)

SUBJECT: AUSTRALIAN CONCERN ABOUT DOE REVELATIONS

<DIST>
SIT: ANDREASEN KRISTOFF PONEMAN VAX

<PREC>
PRIORITY
<CLAS>

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

<OSRI>
RUEHBY
<DTG>
100627Z DEC 93
<ORIG>
AMEMBASSY CANBERRA
<TO>

RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2118
INFO RUEADOE/DOE WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEHIA/USIA WASHDC//EA// PRIORITY 0028
RUEHWL/AMEMBASSY WELLINGTON 3592
RUEHKO/AMEMBASSY TOKYO 1574
RUEHUL/AMEMBASSY SEOUL 4749
RUEHVA/AMEMBASSY SUVA 2924
RUEHPM/AMEMBASSY PORT MORESBY 5044
RUCNTXD/AMEMBASSY MAJURO 0074
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA 7402
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK 0458
RUEHVEN/USMISSION USVIENNA 0256
RUEHBN/AMCONSUL MELBOURNE 6207
RUEHDN/AMCONSUL SYDNEY 6867
RUHQHQB/USCINCPAC HONOLULU HI//FPA/J5//
ZEN/AMCONSUL BRISBANE
ZEN/AMCONSUL PERTH

<SUBJ>

AUSTRALIAN CONCERN ABOUT DOE REVELATIONS

<TEXT>

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ SECTION 01 OF 02 CANBERRA 08445

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 13526

White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006

By ✓2 NARA, Date 10/3/2016

2016-0152 F



Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs

URGENT

~~SECRET~~

TO: Ed Newrocki
FAX #: 697-0030
TEL #: 695-0931

FROM: ADP mson SPN
(Name) (Office)
FAX #: (202) 647-5145
TEL #: 7-6864

SUBJECT: Report on trilats; U/S Davis
has approved this and plans to sign it out
tonight. Comments by 5 welcome

Number of Pages Transmitted in this Fax

4 + cover

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED UPON REMOVAL
OF CLASSIFIED ATTACHMENTS
Initials: VL Date: 10/3/2006

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
005. cable	re: Official-Informal. (4 pages)	12/07/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 48

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - December 1993 #2 [3]

2016-0152-F

vz4515

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

TO: SPECTER, ARLEN

FROM: PRESIDENT

DOC DATE: 10 DEC 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: MILITARY BASES
CO

DEFENSE POLICY

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: REPLY TO SENATOR SPECTER RE PHILADELPHIA NAVAL YARD

ACTION: FOR DISPATCH

DUE DATE: 11 NOV 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: JONES

LOGREF:

FILES: WH

NSCP:

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

WH STRIPPING DESK

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

BELL
JONES
NSC CHRON

COMMENTS:

DISPATCHED BY

DATE

BY HAND

W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSMEM

CLOSED BY: NSJEB

DOC 3 OF 3

UNCLASSIFIED
ACTION DATA SUMMARY REPORT

RECORD ID: 9308734

DOC ACTION OFFICER

CAO ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED

001 JONES
002 LAKE
003
003 WH STRIPPING DESK

Z 93110811 PREPARE MEMO FOR LAKE
Z 93120219 FWD TO PRESIDENT FOR SIG
X 93121308 PRESIDENT SGD LTR
X 93121308 FOR DISPATCH

DISPATCH DATA SUMMARY REPORT

DOC DATE DISPATCH FOR ACTION

DISPATCH FOR INFO

003 931210 SPECTER, ARLEN

WH STRIPPING DESK

UNCLASSIFIED

REFERRAL

DATE: 13 DEC 93

MEMORANDUM FOR: WH STRIPPING DESK

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION:

TO: SPECTER, ARLEN

SOURCE: PRESIDENT

DATE: 10 DEC 93


SUBJ: REPLY TO SENATOR SPECTER RE PHILADELPHIA NAVAL YARD

REQUIRED ACTION: FOR DISPATCH

DUE DATE: 13 DEC 93

COMMENT:

FOR



WILLIAM H. LEARY

NSC RECORDS MANAGEMENT OFFICE

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 10, 1993


Dear Senator Specter:

Thank you for your kind note about the Pittsburgh health care speech and for your ideas for the redevelopment of the Philadelphia Navy Yard. I appreciate your comments and I share your concern about the future of the Yard.

I understand the City of Philadelphia has made substantial progress in developing a re-use plan for the facilities at the Shipyard. I am hopeful that a viable plan that enjoys the support of Mayor Rendell and the congressional delegation will be presented to the Pentagon soon so that last year's \$50 million appropriation can be disbursed. I know Secretary Aspin, Deputy Secretary Perry and Secretary of the Navy Dalton all are eager to see the quick and successful conversion of the Philadelphia Navy Yard and are ready to work with you and your colleagues.

I am aware of Deputy Secretary Perry's recent letter to you, and I fully endorse his commitment to support Philadelphia in its redevelopment plan. I am very much encouraged by your recent statement with Mayor Rendell reporting a unified approach to the city's re-use plan. Thank you again for sharing your views with me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Clinton", written in a cursive style.

The Honorable Arlen Specter
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

12.10.93

December 9, 1993

93 DEC 9 P4:58

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE
ROBERT RUBIN
HOWARD PASTER

SUBJECT: Letter from Senator Specter RE: Philadelphia
Naval Shipyard

Purpose

To respond to Senator Specter's letter regarding the future use of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. His letter followed his November 3 trip with you to Pittsburgh.

Background

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, employing about 12,000, was ordered closed in the 1991 round of base closings. It will complete its last major carrier overhaul in September 1995.

Federal agencies have provided about \$3.5 million to date to assist in redevelopment planning. As you know, the closing has been very controversial: a single local re-use organization and plan has not emerged; Senator Specter has led a suit against the federal government that charges the Navy conspired to close the base by providing incomplete and inaccurate information; and \$50 million appropriated last year for the Shipyard has yet to be released by DoD for lack of an acceptable re-use plan and projects.

In his letter to you (Tab F) Senator Specter proposed establishing a tri-state Regional Development Authority overseeing a federally funded National Maritime and Industrial Center. Specter publicly criticized Mayor Rendell's approach as too narrow and as "throwing in the towel" (Tab B).

The Mayor's Commission, which includes most local Members of Congress and broad regional representation, met on November 29 and is currently finalizing its draft re-use strategy and plan for submittal to DoD by the end of December. DoD's Office of Economic Adjustment has been encouraged by the Commission's recent efforts, which would use some public investment to leverage larger private investment to convert the Shipyard into a maritime and industrial center with diverse enterprises and employment opportunities. Mayor Rendell's recent letter to you (Tab C) sets forth some of his near-term objectives.

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

Government officials that have met with Philadelphia officials and Members of Congress have consistently stressed the importance of a unified local effort and redevelopment plan. On November 17 DepSecDef Perry sent Senator Specter the letter at Tab D encouraging the Senator to work with Mayor Rendell's Commission in submitting a unified re-use plan to DoD for action.

Most recently, Senator Specter and Mayor Rendell released a joint statement on November 30 (Tab E) claiming harmony in their two approaches, both on the re-use plan and in continuing the lawsuit. It is still too soon to tell if this will result in meaningful progress in the development of a unified redevelopment plan.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the proposed response at Tab A which thanks Senator Specter for his memorandum and follows-up on Bill Perry's call for a unified Philadelphia re-use plan, and which expresses your encouragement regarding his recent joint statement with Mayor Rendell. You should not comment upon the Specter lawsuit pending before the Supreme Court.

Attachments

Tab A	Letter to Senator Specter
Tab B	<u>Philadelphia Inquirer</u> article
Tab C	Mayor Rendell letter to the President
Tab D	DepSecDef Perry Letter to Specter
Tab E	Specter/Rendell Joint Statement
Tab F	Incoming Correspondence

Specter blasts report on shipyard

The senator criticized the city's "doomsday scenario." He is suing to keep the yard open.

By Amy S. Rosenberg
INQUIRY STAFF WRITER

U.S. Sen. Arlen Specter had harsh words yesterday for a city report concluding that there will be no federal bailout of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, which is scheduled to close in 1996.

He begs to differ.

"We believe there is a realistic chance to keep the Navy yard open and keep the work coming in," Specter said at a news conference in his Philadelphia office.

"We do not need to issue a report that says we're throwing in the towel. This approach is potentially disastrous."

The Rendell administration report, which will be presented tomorrow to the mayor's commission on the shipyard's future, warns that the only hope for the 5,300 shipyard workers is private investment and retraining.

Specter said such a "doomsday scenario" jeopardized his efforts to draw more government work to the shipyard and explore the possibility

See SHIPYARD on B2

Specter blasts report, says it may hurt effort to keep shipyard open

SHIPYARD from B1
of a joint public-private investment. "It undercuts our ability to negotiate with the Department of Defense," he said. "If we've given up hope, why should they fulfill expectations that are nonexistent?"

He also said that the city's report could affect the outcome of the lawsuit to overturn the Bush administration's decision to close the nation's oldest shipyard. The lawsuit is before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Specter (R., Pa.), U.S. Reps. Curt Weldon (R., Pa.) and Robert E. Andrews (D., N.J.), and union officials have sued the federal government, contending that the Navy rigged the base-closing process by suppressing evidence from its own experts that the shipyard be kept open.

Specter said that he had spoken with President Clinton about the shipyard and that the President had agreed to get involved in the issue. He has also spoken with the secretary of the Navy, who he said expressed an interest in working out an arrangement to keep the Navy yard open with some government work and some private work. Specter wrote in a letter to Mayor Rendell on behalf of himself, Weldon and Andrews.

"There is a strong possibility of future work from the Navy," Specter wrote to Rendell in the letter, released yesterday. "To state the con-

trary is to articulate a self-fulfilling prophecy."

David L. Cohen, the mayor's chief of staff, said yesterday that the city had concluded that there was "no chance" the Navy would continue to send work to the shipyard at the level it has done in the past.

Even if the Navy continued to send some work here, Cohen said, the bulk of the jobs could only be saved through private investment.

"We the city have reached the conclusion that it would now be reckless to count on the government to be the sole employer at the Navy yard," Cohen said. "We cannot put all our eggs in a government basket."

"We have to have an alternative plan where we have private employment in order to generate jobs."

Future proposed uses for the largest manufacturing site in the region include a smaller, privately owned shipyard that could employ up to 1,000 workers. Other uses discussed in the report include a national maritime research center, manufacturing plants, warehouses and offices. The Navy plans to keep 500 acres of the facility and relinquish 900 acres.

Although Specter complained to reporters that the mayor had not returned his call of yesterday morning, Cohen said Specter and his staff had known about the report for several weeks.



CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
ROOM 215 CITY HALL
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3295
(215) 686-2181
FAX (215) 686-2170

EDWARD G. RENDELL
MAYOR

November 14, 1993

The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As we discussed last night, attached is a list of projects and funding initiatives that I am requesting as part of the City of Philadelphia's Conversion Initiative for the Philadelphia Naval Base. The goals of the Conversion Initiative are: (1) to provide employment opportunities for existing Shipyard and Base workers, and (2) to preserve the level of employment and economic activity being generated at the Naval Base within the Philadelphia region. These projects will enable us to provide employment for these workers in the short run, while we develop commercial businesses and private sector enterprises at the Naval Base in the long run.

The Administration's ability to make these proposals a reality varies, depending on the proposal. For example, the final decision to relocate the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) headquarters would have to go through BRAC '95. It makes sense to consolidate these facilities at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard because: (1) it would help an economically hard hit urban center; (2) a good portion of the NSWC is already present in Philadelphia; and (3) it would fulfill the goal of helping the City, to some degree, make up for the loss of economic activity from the closing of the Shipyard. You could not absolutely guarantee to do this, but if the Department of Defense recommended that this consolidation take place at the PNSY, there is an excellent chance that it would occur.

The President
November 14, 1993
Page 2

Also in this category, the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) was put out for competition by the Defense Department, outside of the BRAC process. When he took office, Secretary Aspin called the whole competition off. Clearly, for the same reasons cited above, relocating DFAS to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard makes abundant good sense and would be part of an overall conversion strategy. The same principle would apply to the Navy committing the USS Seattle and USS Saratoga to our Shipyard without competition.

The second category of proposals involves new initiatives which we believe could be ordered by the DoD where there has been no competition already undertaken. Two excellent examples of this are: the National Maritime and Industrial Center (which would be set up only if the National Shipbuilding Initiative passes the Congress), and the proposal for asbestos removal and scrapping of the ships. These are two new initiatives which could be given to the PNSY and would have a great impact in preserving some of the jobs of the existing workforce.

The third area involves grant money. Our proposals request a significant outlay of federal monies in the area of technology grants and job training. Although these requests are fairly substantial, they are also realistic, if any real, successful conversion is to take place.

Lastly, throughout the entire conversion process, the Navy has the right to make certain decisions which would have a tremendous economic impact on our efforts. Examples of these are the decisions which have to be made as to selling excess property to the City or leasing retained property for use by the City. Clearly, a decision by the Navy to do these things quickly, and at minimal cost, would be most beneficial to us.

Obviously, this is a full shopping list. However, I do not believe it is an unrealistic one, if economic conversion is to truly have a chance at success. I think putting some or all of these things in a package would be extremely attractive to Congressman Weldon and our own delegation. You can obviously contact Congressman Weldon directly, or I would be happy to act as a catalyst to get him, our delegation, and Congresswoman Marjorie Margolies Mezvinsky together with you for a meeting on Monday or Tuesday.

The President
November 14, 1993
Page 3

Thanks again for last night. We had a fabulous time. No matter how sophisticated you think you are, there is a very special feeling about being in the Oval Office, the Cabinet Room, and sleeping in the Lincoln Bedroom.

Sincerely yours,

Edward G. Rendell

EDWARD G. RENDELL
MAYOR

EGR/se

Attachment

PHILADELPHIA NAVAL BASE CONVERSION INITIATIVE

1. Consolidate all Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) headquarters activities at the NSWC/Carderock Division - Philadelphia site:
 - a. Authorize existing DoD tenants to remain at Philadelphia Naval Base. These facilities were not covered by BRAC '93 decisions.
 - b. Authorize existing Naval commands to remain at Philadelphia Naval Base, including: NAVSEA Logistics Center Detachment, Navy Industrial Resources Support Activity, and Naval Shipbuilding Support Office. Consolidate Planning and Engineering for Alterations offices at Philadelphia Naval Base.
 - c. DoD will recommend consolidation of the NSWC headquarters in Philadelphia to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC) in 1995.
2. Navy sends all surplus ships to PNSY for removal of asbestos and dismantling and scrapping of ship parts and metal by PNSY workers. This could be developed as a spin-off business. PNSY already has extensive asbestos-removal capability.
3. Designate PNSY as the facility to overhaul the USS Seattle in early 1994. Designate PNSY as the facility to decommission the USS Saratoga in August 1994. The Seattle is scheduled to be done through a bidding process. We are requesting a no-bid designation for both ships, which would keep PNSY workers employed while we implement our conversion strategy.
4. Select Philadelphia (either PNSY or the Defense Personnel Support Center in South Philadelphia) as the site for the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) consolidation. The competition for the DFAS site selection was called off by Secretary Aspin and is being reconsidered by DoD. We request selection of Philadelphia as part of our conversion process.
5. Fund the Philadelphia region's eleven Technology Reinvestment Program (TRP) proposals - either through ARPA funding or other funding source. These proposals will enable existing DoD contractors to diversify into commercial markets and promote employment opportunities for PNSY workers in the private sector.

6. Provide adequate funding for PNSY's job-training needs, through JTPA dislocated worker funding to the City of Philadelphia. Estimated request for 6,000 workers: \$40 million.
7. Establish PNSY as the site for the National Maritime and Industrial Center, as proposed in National Shipbuilding Initiative, if funded. The National Maritime and Industrial Center would be a center for research and development, including actual prototyping, of commercial shipbuilding technologies. The National Shipbuilding Initiative is currently being considered for appropriation of funds by Congress.
8. Department of the Navy will quickly approve low-cost leases with the City of Philadelphia for Naval Base (to be excessed) and Naval Yard (to be retained) properties. This includes reasonable provisions for utilities and maintenance costs and agreement to environmental clean-up by the Navy.

TG/se
11/14/93



THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301

November 17, 1993

Honorable Arlen Specter
United States Senate
303 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510


Dear Senator Specter:

Thank you for your recent request to meet with me to discuss the re-use efforts of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. Unfortunately, I will not be able to meet with you on Thursday, as our staffs discussed, because I will be out of town.

One of the things that I have been stressing across the nation to communities that are affected by base closures is the need for the communities to speak with one voice. While we in the Administration are committed to helping communities in their re-use efforts, as evidenced with the President's five point plan, we can only make a real impact when communities are united and speak with one voice. It is my understanding that the Mayor's commission is close to finalizing a conversion initiative.

After the City submits its plan I would be happy to meet with you and other elected leaders to discuss how the Department of Defense can help in that re-use effort. Until then, however, I think that the most appropriate course of action is to allow the City time, with input from you and others, to come up with the best unified plan for the City and people of Philadelphia. After this plan is submitted you have my commitment that I will do everything I can to assist the people of Philadelphia.

Sincerely,


William J. Perry

SEN. SPECTER & MAYOR RENDELL ISSUE JOINT STATEMENT ON THE
PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD

Philadelphia, PA, November 30*****p.m. Senator Arlen Specter and Mayor Edward Rendell today issued the following joint statement regarding their positions on the future of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard:

"To dispel any notion that there is any real difference in approach between Mayor Ed Rendell and Senator Arlen Specter on the future of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, this joint statement is being issued:

1. Both agree that maximum efforts should be made to bring as much work as possible from the Department of Defense, including the Department of the Navy to the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

2. Both agree that a comprehensive community re-use plan should be developed as soon as possible for the ultimate conversion of the Navy Yard which would incorporate the strategy outlined in the "Naval Base Conversion Initiative" and such supplements as may be added by members of the Congressional delegation with the agreement of the City with federal monetary assistance and private investment to create a national maritime and industrial center which would draw on Department of Defense work as well as private shipbuilding and ship repair.

3. Both agree that the lawsuit (Senator Arlen Specter v. Secretary of the Navy John Dalton) should be prosecuted by the plaintiffs to the maximum extent to invalidate the closure order of the Navy Yard for the reasons set forth in the legal papers and/or to provide leverage in negotiations with the federal government to obtain the best possible settlement for the future of the Navy Yard.

4. Both agree that a unified approach should be presented among the City of Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware Congressional delegations, and the plaintiffs in the lawsuit, including representatives of the working men and women at the Navy Yard, and the Governors of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware, to promote the best future interests of the Philadelphia Navy Yard for the benefit of the working men and women employed there and the region generally."

ROBERT C. BYRD, WEST VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN

DANIEL K. INOUE, HAWAII
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, SOUTH CAROLINA
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, LOUISIANA
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
JIM SASSER, TENNESSEE
DENNIS DECONCINI, ARIZONA
DALE BUMPERS, ARKANSAS
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, NEW JERSEY
TOM HARKIN, IOWA
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, MARYLAND
HARRY REID, NEVADA
J. ROBERT KERREY, NEBRASKA
HERB KOHL, WISCONSIN
PATTY MURRAY, WASHINGTON
DIANNE FEINSTEIN, CALIFORNIA

MARK O. HATFIELD, OREGON
TED STEVENS, ALASKA
THAD COCHRAN, MISSISSIPPI
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, NEW YORK
ARLEN SPECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
PETE V. DOMENICI, NEW MEXICO
DON NICKLES, OKLAHOMA
PHIL GRAMM, TEXAS
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, MISSOURI
SLADE GORTON, WASHINGTON
MITCH MCCONNELL, KENTUCKY
CONNIE MACK, FLORIDA
CONRAD BURNS, MONTANA

JAMES H. ENGLISH, STAFF DIRECTOR
J. KEITH KENNEDY, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025

November 4, 1993

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C. 20500


Dear Mr. President:

Thank you very much for inviting me to join you and the First Lady on your trip to Pittsburgh yesterday.

As you requested, I am enclosing a memo on projected future use of the Philadelphia Navy Yard. These ideas have originated from many sources and doubtless others will want to supplement it before we discuss the matter further; but it is a starting point.

So that potentially interested parties may be informed, I am sending a copy of this letter and the memorandum to the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Navy, the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division, the Solicitor General, Mayor Rendell and all Members of the Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware Congressional Delegations.

Sincerely,



Arlen Specter

P.S. I am sending this by telefax so you can have it as promptly as possible.

Enclosure
AS/ml

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

MEMORANDUM

November 4, 1993

TO: The President
FROM: Arlen Specter
RE: Conversion Plan To Make The Philadelphia Navy Yard A National Maritime and Industrial Center

Following up on our discussion yesterday concerning the Philadelphia Navy Yard, I suggest the following:


1. To carry out your Administration's programs on defense conversion, DoD should assist a tri-state (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware) Regional Redevelopment Authority to establish on the site of the Philadelphia Navy Yard a National Maritime and Industrial Center which would bid on DoD and private shipbuilding and ship repair. This Authority would seek private investment and would look to future industrial initiatives such as modular ship construction, next generation ship propulsion, dual use ships, environmentally sound ships and ship yards and nonmaritime industrial activities.
2. Your Administration should modify the plan to mothball the Yard and should instead allow the dry docks and industrial assets there to be used by the Authority. It is unfair to the City to keep these valuable premises off the tax rolls and to preclude the use of the land for other productive purposes. On other base closures, the land may customarily be used to generate jobs and taxes. In addition, the dry docks and industrial assets would be better preserved by such use.
3. Your Administration should encourage awarding of Navy maintenance and repair contracts, on a competitive basis, to the Philadelphia Navy Yard where such work can be completed prior to the scheduled closing date.
4. Before the scheduled closing date, the Authority should be able to bid on private commercial shipbuilding, repair work and other commercial industrial projects.
5. After the closure date, the Authority should be able to bid on all Navy work, on a competitive basis, just like Navy ship yards.
6. Your Administration should support the Authority during the transition period with the maximum conversion grants possible under existing law and future congressional appropriations; and consideration should be given for further financial assistance to the Authority for some portion of the \$574 million now estimated to close the Yard and the billion dollar plus figure which is estimated for complete environmental clean up.

THE PENDING LAW SUIT

As we discussed yesterday, I suggested that there is at least some value to the Administration in avoiding the risk of litigation in the case of Arlen Specter v. Secretary Garrett now pending in the Supreme Court. This case arguably would not set a precedent on other base closures because it is only one where ranking DoD officials have flagrantly failed to comply with the Base Closure Act's requirements that all information must be turned over to Congress and GAO. The Navy withheld reports from Admirals Claman and Hekman that the Philadelphia Navy Yard should be kept open albeit, downsized. That concealment violates due process of law by depriving us of critical evidence necessary for a fair hearing.

A very distinguished panel of judges of the 3rd Circuit has twice held that there should be judicial review of the decision to close the Yard. This case is unlike Franklin v. Massachusetts, relied upon by government lawyers, which precluded judicial review after a Presidential decision. In our case, the Commission made the individual decision to close the Philadelphia Navy Yard as well as the individual decisions on all the other bases and the President and Congress were limited to accepting or rejecting the total package.

Lawyers will argue about the likely outcome, but I believe all will agree that it is advisable to avoid the cost of litigation and there is at least some risk to the government on a Supreme Court decision which could limit the Base Closure Act generally. In any event, a plan which looks to future jobs and productivity is vastly preferable to more litigation.



NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

December 1, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: ROBERT G. BELL *RGB*
FROM: STEVEN R. JONES *S*
SUBJECT: Letter to the President from Senator Specter
RE: Philadelphia Naval Shipyard

Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA) has written the President (Tab F) regarding the future use of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. His letter follows his November 3 trip to Pittsburgh with the President.

The Philadelphia Navy Base was ordered closed in the 1991 round of base closings. The closure and redevelopment involves disposal of the 900 acre Naval Station and leasing of the 500 acre Shipyard. The Philadelphia Shipyard currently employs 12,000 directly, including 5200 shipyard workers. The Shipyard is scheduled to complete its last major carrier overhaul (U.S.S. John F. Kennedy) in September 1995.

The Departments of Defense, Commerce and Labor have been providing grants (about \$3.5M to date) to assist in redevelopment planning. The closing, however, has been very controversial: a single local re-use organization and plan has not emerged; Senator Specter sued the federal government and charged that the Navy conspired to close the base by providing incomplete and inaccurate information (the case comes before the Supreme Court next year); and \$50 million appropriated by Congress last year for the Shipyard has yet to be released by DoD for lack of an acceptable re-use plan and projects.

In his letter to the President, Senator Specter proposed establishing at the Philadelphia Navy Yard site a tri-state Regional Development Authority overseeing a National Maritime and Industrial Center. This center would be initially capitalized with federal funds. Specter's proposal was developed separate from the plans of Mayor Rendell's Commission on Economic Development, and on Nov 28 Specter publicly criticized the Rendell approach as a "doomsday scenario" and as "throwing in the towel." (Tab B) Specter called for more expansive goals and federal presence in the new shipyard and industrial center.

The Mayor's Commission, which includes most local Members of Congress and broad regional representation from the tri-state area, met on November 29 and is currently finalizing its draft re-use strategy and plan for submittal to DoD by the end of the

year. DoD's Office of Economic Adjustment has been encouraged by the Commission's recent efforts which would use Shipyard assets via lease and convert the Shipyard into a maritime and industrial center, based on some public investment to leverage large private investment.

The City's goal is to create diverse enterprises and employment opportunities. The City has sought ARPA Technology Reinvestment Project funding along these lines. Mayor Rendell's letter to the President at Tab C sets forth near-term assistance goals that would contribute toward the City's strategy.

Various members of the Philadelphia delegation have met with Secretary Aspin earlier this year, with NSC staff and more recently with NEC staff. Our message has consistently stressed the importance of a unified local effort and redevelopment plan.

On November 17 DepSecDef Perry sent Senator Specter the letter at Tab D encouraging Senator Specter to work with Mayor Rendell's Commission in submitting a unified re-use plan to DoD for action.

Most recently, Senator Specter and Mayor Rendell released a joint statement on November 30 (Tab E) claiming harmony in their two approaches. In the statement, Specter and Rendell pledge agreement on both the re-use plan in prosecuting the pending lawsuit. It is still too soon to determine if this will result in meaningful progress on a unified redevelopment plan.

The proposed response to Senator Specter thanks him for his memorandum, follows-up on Bill Perry's call for a unified Philadelphia re-use plan, and expresses our encouragement regarding the recent joint statement by Specter and Rendell. The President should not comment upon the Specter lawsuit pending before the Supreme Court.

Concurrences by: *In draft* Jeremy Rosner, *In draft* Alan Kreczko, *In draft* David Lane,
Keith Hahn
In draft

RECOMMENDATION

That you send the joint memo with Howard Paster and Bob Rubin to the President (Tab I) recommending his signature at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab I	Memorandum for the President
Tab A	Letter to Senator Specter
Tab B	<u>Philadelphia Inquirer</u> article
Tab C	Mayor Rendell letter to President
Tab D	DepSecDef Perry Letter to Specter
Tab E	Specter/Rendell Joint Statement
Tab F	Incoming Correspondence

8734

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 5, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM ITOH

FROM: HOWARD G. PASTER
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL MAIL

Attached is a copy of the letter sent to the President from Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), concerning the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Since this letter addresses national security issues, I would appreciate your assistance in drafting a response.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you have any questions, please feel free to call LeeAnn Inadomi at x7500.

Enclosure

8734

ID# 043405

THE WHITE HOUSE
CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

INCOMING

DATE RECEIVED: NOVEMBER 09, 1993

NAME OF CORRESPONDENT: THE HONORABLE ARLEN SPECTER

SUBJECT: ENCLOSURES MEMO REGARDING PROJECTED FUTURE USE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA NAVY YARD

ROUTE TO: OFFICE/AGENCY (STAFF NAME)	ACTION		DISPOSITION		
	ACT CODE	DATE YY/MM/DD	TYPE RESP	C D	COMPLETED YY/MM/DD
HOWARD PASTER	ORG	93/11/09		C	93/11/09
REFERRAL NOTE:					
WILLIAM ITOH	RSA	93/11/09			/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:					
REFERRAL NOTE:		/ /			/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:		/ /			/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:		/ /			/ /
REFERRAL NOTE:		/ /			/ /

COMMENTS:

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENTS: MEDIA:L INDIVIDUAL CODES: 1220
MAIL USER CODES: (A) R PA (B) (C)

*ACTION CODES: *DISPOSITION *OUTGOING *
* * *CORRESPONDENCE: *
*A-APPROPRIATE ACTION *A-ANSWERED *TYPE RESP=INITIALS *
*C-COMMENT/RECOM *B-NON-SPEC-REFERRAL * OF SIGNER *
*D-DRAFT RESPONSE *C-COMPLETED * CODE = A *
*F-FURNISH FACT SHEET *S-SUSPENDED *COMPLETED = DATE OF *
I-INFO COPY/NO ACT NEC * OUTGOING *
*R-DIRECT REPLY W/COPY * * *
*S-FOR-SIGNATURE * * *
*X-INTERIM REPLY * * *

REFER QUESTIONS AND ROUTING UPDATES TO CENTRAL REFERENCE
(ROOM 75, OEOB) EXT-2590
KEEP THIS WORKSHEET ATTACHED TO THE ORIGINAL INCOMING
LETTER AT ALL TIMES AND SEND COMPLETED RECORD TO RECORDS
MANAGEMENT.

SCANNED