

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 February 97 11:46
FROM Burrell, Christina L.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Package 0905 [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Armstrong, Fulton T.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

danvers concurs.

From: Armstrong, Fulton T.
To: @LEGISLAT-Legislative Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: Package 0905 [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, February 18, 1997 11:12 AM

<<Attached File: 0905A.DOC>>
<<Attached File: 0905B.DOC>>
<<Attached File: 0905C.DOC>>

Estimados colegas: Attached for your comment/clearance and enjoyment is package 0905, Reply to Letter from Sen. Helms on CNN and Others' Requests for Licenses to Establish Bureaus in Cuba. --Fulton

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 18 February 97 13:47
FROM LeBaron, Richard B.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT NESA GUIDANCE [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Johnson, David T.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Gibney, James S.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Gray, Wendy
Grummon, Stephen R.
LeBaron, Richard B.
Moffett, Julia
Naplan, Steven J.
Parris, Mark R.
Rajan, Nahla B.
Showalter, Victoria A.

TEXT_BODY [[FEB18GUI.DOC : 3350 in FEB18GUI.DOC]]

We have cut way back on guidance for use in the daily package, maintaining only the issues of the day.

The Qs and As for Sandy's use at NJCRAC are a good supplement for use as needed.

[[BERGQ&A.DOC : 3351 in BERGQ&A.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 18 February 97 13:41

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** FEB18GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

February 14, 1997

WTO: Telecom and Cuba

Vatican

Netanyahu Visit

Middle East

France

China/Golden Venture

Korea

F-16/727 Incident

Northern Ireland

START/ABM

Russia/Computers

Russia

CWC

Bosnia

Serbia

Trips and Visitors

Greece

Greece/Turkey

Peru

Saudi Arabia

Gulf War Illnesses

WTO

WTO Telecom Negotiations

Q: What is the status of WTO telecommunications talks?

A. February 15 is the deadline for WTO negotiations to liberalize world trade in

telecommunications services, currently an almost \$600 billion market. U.S. firms are the most competitive in the world, and the United States would benefit greatly from a strong market opening agreement.

There is some positive momentum, but we are still working hard in Geneva, in Washington and in capitals throughout the world to get the commitments we expect of our trading partners. The agreement has to be balanced. We refused to accept a deal last April because it was not.

Q: There appears to be a dispute on the Hill about whether you will need legislation to implement the US offer. How are you going to handle this?

A: We are aware of the concerns expressed by some Members of Congress that implementing legislation may be necessary if we reach agreement. USTR and FCC have worked to ensure that the U.S. offer is consistent with U.S. law. We will continue to consult with Congress to address any concerns.

Helms-Burton WTO Case

Q: The New York Times today (2/13) said that the EU had delayed its WTO case on Helms-Burton, based on U.S. threats that it would invoke the national security exception. Is that true?

A: We are gratified the EU has postponed a decision on proceeding with their WTO case.

We recognize we have differences of opinion over the best way to bring about a transition to democracy in Cuba. But we do not think foreign policy differences of that kind can be resolved in a trade forum like the WTO.

Both we and the Europeans worked hard to put the WTO in place and it serves us all greatly. We are encouraged that our European allies are working with us to find a way to discuss our differences without jeopardizing what we worked so hard to build.

Q: Are you willing to jeopardize the WTO for a weak claim that our Cuba trade policy is necessary to our national security?

A: Naturally, if the Europeans go forward with their case the U.S. would defend its position with the greatest possible vigor, and I think our European friends understand that. This is not the place to get into the specifics of how we would do so.

I should point out that whatever the outcome, the WTO has no power to change U.S. laws. Only Congress can do that.

[If pressed]:

We have not ruled out any rights we have under the WTO. In the past, we have invoked the national security provisions of the GATT to justify our trade embargo against Cuba.

VATICAN

Q: What is your reaction to Senator Helms's request that Ambassador Flynn be recalled?

A: Ambassador Flynn has served as Ambassador to the Vatican for over three years.

We understand he plans to leave his post and return to the U.S. this summer.

[Only if asked]:

The Department has received the report of the Office of the Inspector General and has taken appropriate action.

MIDDLE EAST

VISITS BY LEADERS TO CONSULT ON PEACE PROCESS

-- The schedule of visits:

-Prime Minister Netanyahu - February 13

-Chairman Arafat - March 3

-President Mubarak - March 10

-King Hussein - March 18

-- Background Only: Visit by Prince Sultan (Saudi Arabia) should not be referred to in same category as these visits; he's being invited by Cohen (DOD). Will meet President on the 25th.

POSSIBLE ISRAELI LAUNCHES IN U.S.

(for use on background)

☐ Israel Aircraft Industries has informed us it is considering bidding on launches of U.S.

commercial payloads from U.S. launch sites.

☐ In that connection, Administration currently reviewing request for a site survey at a U.S. facility by IAI.

☐ It's a complex issue involving a number of considerations, among them non-proliferation, commercial space policy, and foreign policy.

☐ Not going to comment further while it is under review.

ISRAELI DECISION ON ROADS AROUND JERUSALEM

Q: Any comment on the Israeli decision to proceed with roads around Jerusalem?

A: We understand that the road which will be built was approved by Prime Minister Rabin's government to relieve congestion.

We would have preferred it not be done at this time.

Q: Why?

A: We have said to both parties since the Hebron agreement that they should act in ways which build confidence and enhance prospects for future progress.

We would prefer to see steps taken now which continue to build positive momentum.

Q: So there might be a time when you'd acquiesce?

A: We'd have preferred it not be done at this time.

Q: Was this step agreed to during Netanyahu's visit?

A: No.

Q: Was it discussed?

A: We don't get into the details in public of our diplomatic exchanges.

Q: You've said in the past that both sides should avoid steps which prejudice the outcome of permanent status talks? Is that still your view?

A: Yes, that remains our view.

Q: Is this such a step?

A: We've said we would have preferred it not be done at this time.

FRANCE -- PRESIDENT'S MEETING WITH PHILIPPE SEGUIN

□ President saw Philippe Seguin, President of the National Assembly of France, Thursday afternoon. Seguin was President Chirac's personal representative to the funeral of Ambassador Pamela Harriman, held Thursday morning at the National Cathedral.

□ President grateful for the presence of Mr. Seguin; looks forward to seeing him privately. They discussed importance of U.S.-French relations and contribution made by Ambassador Harriman.

□ Also grateful for other honors bestowed by France on Ambassador Harriman, especially France' highest decoration, the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor.

CHINA -- GOLDEN VENTURE DETAINEES

Background: In 1993, some 282 Chinese nationals tried to enter the United States illegally aboard the Golden Venture. Most were caught and placed in exclusion or deportation proceedings. Fifty-three currently remain in detention pending the outcome of their asylum cases which involve claims of fear of return to China's coercive family planning practices. The Administration has been criticized in the press and by some Members of Congress for its decision to maintain the aliens in detention for over 3 and a half years. The Administration defended its position by pointing out that the length of detention resulted from the detainees' many court challenges to the exclusion decision and, more importantly, that this detention policy served as an effective deterrent to alien smuggling.

The Administration has now decided to release the migrants. The decision reflects humanitarian concerns given the exceptional length of detention and the fact that the new immigration law (which takes effect on April 1, 1997) will strengthen our deterrence of alien smuggling by making it possible to exclude aliens within a matter of weeks. Releasing the migrants therefore will not undermine our deterrence strategy. The releases will occur over the next week or so, after the INS has gone through each case to review possible criminal background and to set reasonable conditions of supervision. The released aliens will remain in exclusion proceedings.

Points

- ☐ Administration has decided to release the remaining Golden Venture detainees.
- ☐ Decision reflects humanitarian concern for people who have been in detention for over 3 and a half years.
- ☐ To date, detention policy has been successful in deterring alien smuggling.
- ☐ However, new immigration bill strengthens our deterrence policy by making possible in the future expedited exclusion of smuggled aliens -- within a matter of weeks of their arrival in U.S.

☐ As a result, release of remaining Golden Venture detainees will not undermine our policy, and Administration has decided that it is now appropriate.

☐ The releases will take place over a period of several days, to allow INS to review each case. Persons with criminal backgrounds will not be released. INS also will determine reasonable conditions of supervised release. The process should be completed by March 1, 1997.

☐ The aliens will remain in exclusion proceedings and those found not to be entitled to asylum will be deported.

KOREA

DPRK DEFECTOR IN BEIJING

Background: FYI not to be discussed with the Press: The issue now is two-fold: How will the North react to such a senior level official defecting; how much pressure will they put on China not to allow the defector to travel to Seoul and what kind of pressure, if any, will the South try to put on us to intervene with the Chinese to allow the defector to leave Beijing.

Q: What is the significance of such a senior member of the north Korean government defecting? Does this indicate that conditions in North Korea are even more severe than we believe?

A: A senior member of the North Korean government has reportedly sought asylum in the South Korean Embassy in Beijing. We are in close contact with the South Koreans. We have a single interest in this case: that it be handled in accordance with normal international asylum practices.

If asked:

Q: Have the South Koreans asked for our help in getting the Chinese to allow the defector to leave China?

A: The Republic of Korea has relations with China and is discussing the issue directly with Chinese officials.

VISIT OF SOUTH KOREAN NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR

□ Ban Ki Moon, Senior Secretary for Foreign and National Security Affairs (National Security Advisor), met with National Security Advisor Berger on Tuesday. The two consulted on a number of issues, including North Korea.

□ This was the first opportunity Ban has had to visit Washington since assuming his duties last October.

UN FOOD APPEAL

Q: Will the UN WFP food Aid appeal cause the U.S. a dilemma in its relationship with South Korea?

A: We anticipate the UN will issue an appeal similar to the one that was made last year. When the appeal is issued we will consider it as we do all humanitarian appeals. You may recall that the United States participated in last year's appeal by providing a total of \$8.2 million. We have had no indication that South Korea is opposed to humanitarian assistance to the North.

Q: Is it true that the South Korean government opposes U.S. participation in UN WFP appeals and that participation is linked to North Korean attendance at the joint briefing?

A: The U.S. has not linked possible humanitarian food aid in response to an international appeal to the North's attendance at the joint briefing. Contrary to what has recently been reported, the USG did not promise, privately or otherwise, North Korea food aid in return for attendance at the joint briefing. U.S. policy is to review requests for humanitarian assistance independent of political considerations. That holds true in the case of North Korea.

If there is any interest regarding what South Korea is doing to provide humanitarian assistance in comparison to the U.S.:

☐ South Korea's Red Cross said on Wednesday it had shipped 700 tons of flour to famine-stricken North Korea, the second such shipment in a week. The aid shipment is the second since Pyongyang apologized last December for a submarine incursion that plunged ties to anew low. On Friday, the relief organization shipped 300 tons of flour and 15,000 pairs of socks, worth a total of about \$153,000, from Incheon.

☐ South Korea is allowing its relief organizations to restart their programs in a modest way. The current shipments are based on an on-going need and not on the latest appeal for food aid.

If asked:

☐ The United States supports the efforts of the ICRC and other NGOs to respond to the humanitarian needs of North Korea and takes note of the recent shipment of flour and socks by the South Korean Red Cross. The United States will review official requests from international organizations for humanitarian aid on a case by case basis.

TAIWAN-NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR WASTE DEAL

☐ The U.S. believes that any international shipment and storage of nuclear waste must meet the relevant international standards, as defined by the IAEA.

☐ We encourage Taiwan and North Korea to work with the IAEA to satisfy the international community (especially concerned countries in the region) that this proposed deal meets international standards.

☐ We note that strong concerns have been expressed within the region about this shipment, and believe these should be considered in reaching a final decision.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD F-16 INCIDENTS

The following actions were taken in response to two recent incidents involving Air National Guard F-16 fighters along the East Coast:

- ☐ The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) is investigating both incidents;

- ☐ General Ronald Fogleman, the Air Force Chief of Staff, suspended all operations of active duty, Reserve and Air National Guard aircraft in designated warning areas along the East Coast and the Gulf region until units have reviewed the applicable memoranda of agreement and operating procedures with the controlling agencies and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA);

- ☐ The FAA undertook a thorough review of internal procedures and applicable memoranda of agreement between the FAA and the various air control centers involved.

NORTHERN IRELAND

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 13, 1997

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Killing of British Soldier in Northern Ireland

I am grieved and outraged by the callous killing of a British soldier in Northern Ireland yesterday. The First Lady and I extend our deepest sympathy to the soldier's family and to the British government and people on the loss of this young man. We wish the authorities success in bringing the murderers swiftly to justice.

All those who care about the future of Northern Ireland must join

me in condemning this cowardly crime. I remain convinced that the people of both of Northern Ireland's traditions want to take the path of peace and reconciliation, not hatred and violence.

The Belfast talks chaired by Senator Mitchell continue to have my full support. I urge all those taking part, who share a commitment to democratic values, to move as rapidly as possible into substantive negotiation about the future of Northern Ireland.

The loyalists and their leaders have shown great courage and restraint in not allowing themselves to be drawn into an escalating spiral of violence. I urge them to remain steadfast.

#

NORTHERN IRELAND

Ambassador Smith to be Recalled?

(Background: The Washington Times picked up a story out of London that the WH is going to "recall" Ambassador Jean Kennedy Smith because we intend to change our policy toward Northern Ireland and she is regarded as too pro-Sinn Fein.)

☐ No truth to report that Ambassador Smith is going to be "recalled" because of change of White House policy toward Northern Ireland or dissatisfaction with Ambassador Smith's performance. She has played invaluable role in Administration support for Northern Ireland peace process.

☐ Our policy has not changed. We support efforts of British and Irish governments to bring about just and lasting settlement; see Belfast talks as historic opportunity. Continue to believe those talks have best chance of success with participation of all elected parties, including Sinn Fein, but that can only happen after cease-fire.

Parades Commission Report

Background: Last summer after the civil unrest over marches in Drumcree, the British set up a panel headed by Oxford don Peter North to recommend how to handle parades in the future.

The North report, just released, recommends that a commission be set up with, inter alia, the authority to make decisions on controversial parades. In its January 30 reaction to the report, the British Government neither accepted nor rejected the recommendation for a commission with decision-making powers but initiated an 8-week consultation period on this aspect of the report.

□ North Review offers valuable insights and recommendations to deal with the very controversial and divisive question of parades and marches in Northern Ireland, particularly during summer "marching season."

□ Report recommends establishment of independent parades commission. Pleased that British Government moving to set one up. Very much hope it can be up and running in time to make a difference and help avoid a repeat of last summer's bitter confrontations.

□ Last summer's events cost the people of Northern Ireland dearly, both economically and politically. Vital for future political progress in Northern Ireland that new ways be found to meet needs of both communities and avoid annual confrontations.

Adams Refused Visa?

Background: Two London newspapers reported over the weekend that the White House has advised Gerry Adams he will not get a visa until the IRA reinstates its cease-fire. One paper sourced "officials of the NSC"; the other diplomats in London.

□ Mr. Adams has not/not applied for a visa. Since there is no application, the Administration has made no decision.

□ If pressed: As in the past, an application for a visa waiver by Mr. Adams would be decided on basis of whether it could contribute to search for lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

Loyalist Cease-fire Intact?

- ☐ Up to British and Irish governments and participating parties to decide who participates in talks.
- ☐ As President said in statement yesterday, we urge loyalists to maintain their cease-fire. There has been no claim of responsibility for car bomb attacks and there is no doubt loyalists have shown restraint in response to escalating IRA violence.

Belfast Talks

- ☐ Belfast talks, chaired by Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, represent historic opportunity and best hope in decades for achieving lasting settlement.
- ☐ Must not squander progress of last months. Urge all political leaders to take responsibility for making these talks work. Need to move quickly into substantive negotiations on future of Northern Ireland.
- ☐ Continue to believe that participation of all elected parties, including Sinn Fein, would give talks best chance of success; that can only happen with cease-fire.
- ☐ Impressed with commitment and determination both governments have shown in search for peace. They and we share goal of inclusive negotiations on future of Northern Ireland, which can only happen if there is an IRA cease-fire.

Deportation Proceedings Against Matt Morrison

- ☐ Have been assured by Justice that these proceedings being handled fairly. Judicial matter - don't want to comment further.

START/ABM

Q: The Vice President mentioned Friday that he and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin discussed "guidelines" for a possible START III agreement. Does this signal the

Administration has given up on START II ratification in Russia and is now prepared to move on to START III?

A: As the Vice President said, we have begun discussions on possible guidelines for START III that our two Presidents might consider in March.

Such guidelines would underscore the value of START II ratification and point the way toward further reductions that would increase our mutual security and decrease costs.

We have no intention, however, of setting aside START II and moving ahead instead with the conclusion of a "START III."

The ratification of START II by Russia remains an essential prerequisite to further reductions in nuclear forces, and we are currently working with the Russian government to achieve Russian ratification of START II.

[If asked: Did the Vice President and Prime Minister discuss a specific "target" for further reductions under START III? What else is under discussion in the context of START III guidelines? Have any agreements been reached?]

A: We are not going to comment on specifics. As the Vice President said, while some progress was made, we have only started these discussions and there are complex issues involved for both our two countries.

[If asked: Are you prepared to commit to the elimination of nuclear weapons, as called for by the former head of the U.S. Strategic Command, General Lee Butler?]

A: The President said at the United Nations this fall that the United States looks forward to a new century "in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced, and ultimately eliminated."

[If asked: Were issues related to the ABM Treaty and ABM/TMD demarcation discussed by the President and Prime Minister?]

A: Both the ABM Treaty and ABM/TMD demarcation were discussed. Both sides remain committed to the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability, and to resolving the issue of ABM/TMD demarcation.

U.S. HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTERS AT RUSSIAN NUCLEAR SITES

Q: In response to recent press inquiries, the Administration has stated that it has not approved high performance computers to Russian facilities that have been associated in the past with the Russian nuclear weapons program. Yet Russian Minister of Atomic Energy, Viktor Mikhaylov, has been quoted as saying that Russia bought two supercomputers which are installed at the Arzamas-16 and Chelyabinsk-70 nuclear centers. What's the story?

A: The Administration has not approved the export of any high performance computers to the two Russian nuclear centers, nor do we have any requests pending for such exports. However, we are aware of statements made by Minister Mikhaylov on January 13.

The Commerce Department is investigating this matter, and we are pleased to say that the Russian Government has offered its full cooperation in the investigation. Because there is an active investigation, however, further comment at this time would be inappropriate.

Q: In early 1996, the Administration liberalized its controls on computer exports. What level of computers were liberalized to Russia?

A: In January 1996, the Administration implemented the following computer export policy to Russia:

□ Computers at any level require an export license when the exporter knows, or has reason to know, that the shipment is being made to a facility engaged in, among other activities, the design, development, production or stockpiling of

nuclear weapons.

☐ Computers up to 2000 MTOPS may be sold to all other end users in Russia, including military end-users, without a license.

☐ Computers up to 7000 MTOPS may be sold to strictly civilian end users for civilian uses, without a license.

☐ Computers above 7000 MTOPS, for all end users/end-uses, require a license.

Q: Isn't it difficult for a company to know in every case whether an end-user is civilian, or military, or engaged in proliferation activities?

A: It can be. That is why U.S. exporters have been clearly instructed to contact the government (i.e., the Commerce Department) when they are uncertain about an end-user.

Q: Would you expect U.S. exporters to know that the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy (MINATOM) was engaged in nuclear weapons work? Did the government let exporters know that these two sites were end users of concern?

A: Minatom and the sites at Arzamas and Chelyabinsk have been long associated with the Russian nuclear weapons program. In fact, there have been several recent press reports about these facilities.

We expect U.S. exporters to know their customers. In fact, U.S. companies have contacted the Commerce Department to ask if shipments to these two entities would be approved. This indicates that U.S. exporters doing business with Minatom have understood their obligations to seek export licenses before making any shipments.

If an exporter had any doubts about the activities of Minatom, however, that company had an obligation to resolve those doubts or to contact the government for assistance.

Q: What has the Administration done to ensure that more U.S. supercomputers don't go to

these sites without an export license?

A: The relevant companies have been contacted, and we are satisfied that they are aware that computer shipments to these end users require an export license.

Q: If shipments to Arzamas and Chelyabinsk did occur, doesn't this show that the Administration's computer policy was a mistake, and has allowed a serious breach to our national security - namely that U.S. supercomputers are now helping the Russians refine their nuclear weapons?

A: The Administration's computer policy recognized the growing worldwide availability of high performance computers. It also recognized that U.S.-origin computers should not be shipped to certain end users without explicit U.S. authorization.

This was, and is, a reasonable balance to our security and economic interests that was carefully considered and supported by all of the national security agencies involved in the export policy development process, including Defense, Energy, State and Commerce.

If a U.S. company has violated that policy by shipping computers to the Russian nuclear weapons program without proper authorization, then that is a matter for our enforcement officials. In order to determine if any U.S. export regulations have been violated, an investigation has been initiated.

RUSSIA/NIS

Current Items

Yeltsin Radio Address -- if Asked

Have not seen text, aware Yeltsin spoke today to Russian people.

(If asked about possible killing of UN observer in Tajikistan)

☐ Saw report, but have no confirmation of any death; press reports have, in fact, been conflicting.

(FYI: Reports so far NOT conclusive -- we will keep tracking.)

Waiver of Immunity for Georgian Diplomat

☐ State Department confirmed U.S. Attorney has formally requested Georgia to waive diplomatic immunity for Embassy counselor Makharadze.

☐ Refer you to State Department for further information.

Clinton-Yeltsin Meeting

☐ President and Yeltsin to meet in Helsinki March 20-21.

☐ We look ahead to progress with Russia on wide range of issues -- American investment, arms control, European security structures. Our agenda very comprehensive.

GCC

☐ Vice President Gore and PM Chernomyrdin Vice President Gore had excellent meetings last week during eighth session of Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission. Full agenda of ongoing commission business, including business development issues, energy and agriculture reform, protection of the environment and defense conversion.

☐ VP and Chernomyrdin also prepared for upcoming meeting of two Presidents. They discussed arms control issues, development of a NATO-Russia relationship, and economic reforms that will stimulate investment and growth in Russia.

☐ Friday VP and Chernomyrdin reported on discussions to President Clinton. Saturday they traveled to Chicago for meeting with U.S. business community

If asked about Russian Criticism of Solana Travels to Caucasus, Moldova

☐ See no basis for Russian reaction; since break-up of former Soviet Union, NATO Secretary

Generals have traveled widely in New Independent States, as well as throughout Central Europe -- nothing novel about Solana's trip.

General Issues

Russia-Iran Missile Technology

- ☐ The United States regularly exchanges information with the intelligence services of friendly governments. We find these exchanges to be valuable. Beyond that, it would be inappropriate to comment on the substance or origins of intelligence reports and assessments.
- ☐ We know that Iran is pursuing weapons of mass destruction. Clearly the international community needs to be concerned about that and try to prevent it.
- ☐ The United States believes any such cooperation or assistance is very dangerous and has conveyed its views to Russia on these issues regularly, in a variety of forums and communications. We will continue to investigate and follow-up on all reports as warranted.
- ☐ If asked: The Vice President and the Prime Minister routinely discuss a wide range of security issues, including non-proliferation concerns; we cannot comment on any specifics of their private discussions.

NATO-Russia

- ☐ Exploring several ideas to develop strong NATO-Russia relationship,
- ☐ NATO Secretary General Solana and Foreign Minister Primakov had good discussion last month on future NATO-Russia relations; to meet again week of February 20 in Brussels.
- ☐ VP and Chernomyrdin had extensive discussions on European security, bilateral issues in preparation for the Clinton-Yeltsin meeting. Good exchange of views, positive tone; as Vice President said Friday, believe we've "narrowed range of differences on NATO-Russia".

- ☐ Understand enlargement difficult issue for Russia, but U.S., NATO and Russia have interests in developing NATO-Russia relationship and broadening cooperation.
- ☐ U.S. determined to proceed with NATO enlargement. Believe that is in interests of European security and stability. Equally determined to manage enlargement process in manner that does not threaten Russia and to do all that we can to build strong NATO-Russia relationship.

Prospects for Russian Ratification of START II Treaty

- ☐ Treaty faces ratification vote in Duma; parliamentary prerogative to debate its merits. While some may oppose Treaty, Russian government committed to ratification.
- ☐ START II in best interests of both countries, should be ratified by Russia.

If asked: is Administration planning to leap ahead" to START III:

- ☐ As Vice President stated, U.S. prepared to begin negotiations on further reductions in nuclear forces once START II has entered into force; VP said we're ready to consider what under "guidelines" to enter into negotiations. (FYI: VP carefully avoided saying "negotiations.")
- ☐ No intention of setting aside START II.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Chemical Weapons Convention

- ☐ The President is committed to working with the Senate to secure the ratification of the CWC.
- ☐ We have been working with the Senate on a bipartisan basis to take up the CWC on its merits.
- ☐ We will continue to work with the Senate to achieve this goal at the earliest possible time.

BOSNIA

Brcko Decision

- ☐ The decision mandates that the office of the High Representative assume interim international supervision of the Brcko area.
- ☐ The Arbitrator will retain jurisdiction and will review the issue in approximately one year.
- ☐ The Parties should remember that they are committed to implement the decision in full and must show restraint.
- ☐ The international community stands behind the decision and will support its full implementation.
- ☐ Implementation of the decision will require an integrated approach, including increased reconstruction assistance, international oversight under the auspices of the OHR, and an expanded security presence to ensure the reduction of tensions.
- ☐ The decision is a result of lengthy and careful deliberation, due to the complexities of the situation, it does not make a black and white judgment but rather makes a good-faith effort to balance the conflicting concerns of the parties, and render a decision that will allow for the peaceful reintegration of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- ☐ Implementation will be a gradual and long-term effort requiring sustained commitment by the parties and international community. The implementation conference in early March will be the first step in this process.

Brcko Q's and A's

Q: What did the Brcko Arbitration Panel adjudicate?

- ☐ Both the Bosnian Federation and Republika Srpska lay claim to the town of Brcko, located at

a crossroads in Northern Bosnia which is politically strategic and economically important.

☐ Under the terms of the Dayton Agreement, the Panel was charged with deciding whether the boundary line near Brcko separating the Federation and the Republika Srpska should be moved in accordance with the wishes of one or the other side. The Panel also was to determine which entity will control the town of Brcko itself.

Q: Who made the decision?

☐ The presiding arbitrator is Roberts Owen, an American citizen and former State Department Legal Advisor. He was appointed by the President of the International Court of Justice in the Hague.

☐ Two other arbitrators--one Muslim and one Serb--make up the rest of the panel. According to the Dayton Agreement, if the three arbitrators cannot agree, the presiding arbitrator then has the authority to make the decision.

☐ Following final consultations with the other two arbitrators, Owen announced his decision in Rome on February 14th.

Q: What are the outlines of the decision?

☐ The decision mandates that the office of the High Representative assume interim international supervision of the Brcko area.

☐ There will be no change in the boundary line between the Federation and Republika Srpska.

☐ Because of the lack of progress in implementing the Dayton Agreement in the Brcko area, Owen determined that increased international supervision is required.

☐ A Deputy High Representative for Brcko will work with local authorities to set up the necessary procedures to implement the agreement.

☐ The Arbitrator will retain jurisdiction over the question and will review the issue in

approximately one year, at the end of the interim international implementation period.

☐ The decision also calls for accelerated reconstruction efforts in the Brcko area; an expanded international Police presence, which would help ensure free transit in the Brcko area; and a managed process for the return of refugees and displaced persons.

Q: Who will implement the decision? Who will enforce it and who will pay?

☐ The Gradual implementation of the decision will begin after the adoption of an implementation strategy by the international community at a Brcko implementation conference in early March.

☐ The Deputy High Representative for Brcko will determine when the necessary conditions exist to begin implementation and will oversee the process.

☐ The office of the High Representative, in consultation with the parties and the international community, will monitor the compliance by the parties and determine whether other measures or procedures to fulfill the decision are needed.

☐ The parties are ultimately responsible for ensuring that the decision is implemented in full.

☐ The U.S. and Contact Group are committed to effective and full implementation of the decision as part of the overall peace process.

☐ While SFOR has taken a number of steps to ensure a secure environment in the Brcko area, its mission will not expand beyond the current responsibility to provide such a secure environment.

☐ SFOR is prepared to handle any eventuality.

☐ Additional international police are likely to be necessary and some IPTF monitors will be redeployed to Brcko this week from elsewhere in Bosnia to augment the international police presence.

Q: Is this an American decision?

☐ Absolutely not. Although the presiding arbitrator is an American citizen, the Tribunal is an independent body. The decision is solidly backed by the international community.

Q: What role will the United States play in Implementation?

☐ We will pursue an active diplomacy in the weeks ahead to lower tensions and reduce the risk of confrontations between the parties.

☐ The United States will strongly support implementation of this decision using existing resources already dedicated to Bosnia, which will be reallocated to address new economic assistance and security needs. There will be no need for any additional funding.

☐ Although the Europeans are taking the lead on over-all civilian implementation in Bosnia, the Deputy High Representative for Brcko will be an American, signaling our determination to see that the decision is implemented in full.

Q: Does this decision permanently award Brcko to the Bosnian Serbs?

☐ No. The Decision mandates that the Office of the High Representative assume interim international supervision of the Brcko area.

☐ The arbitrator will retain jurisdiction and will review the issue in approximately one year.

Mostar

☐ We condemn the acts of violence that took place in Mostar. We have called for restraint by all parties and urged them to redouble their efforts to work together.

☐ We have protested the incident to the Bosnian Croat Leadership. We have also raised our concerns with the government of Croatia.

☐ We have called upon the Bosnian Croat authorities to condemn publicly this brutal act and to see that those responsible are brought to justice.

☐ We are also working with the High Representative, IPTF, SFOR and

other international
agencies to maintain the peace.

War Criminals

☐ We remain deeply concerned with lack of progress on war crimes front in Bosnia. Achieving justice is part of achieving an enduring peace.

☐ We're examining variety of ways we can help the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals to justice. We have made no decisions on how to assist the Tribunal. We are reviewing many different options.

☐ We also continue to press the parties to live up to their responsibilities to detain war criminals. We have been consulting with our allies for some time on ways to press the countries involved to turn indicted war criminals over to the tribunal.

☐ While international military forces in Bosnia will detain war criminals if, in the course of normal duties, they encounter those under indictment, it is not the role of SFOR to hunt down war criminals.

If pressed about sending teams of special police or commandos to arrest war criminals:

☐ One possible option is to set up a special police force to assist the Tribunal in apprehending indicted war criminals. Such a force would not include SFOR personnel. This is only one of a number of options under consideration. No decisions have been made.

Return of Refugees

☐ The recent explosion in Gajevi and the arson attack in Stolac underscore our continuing concerns about the potential for violence or intimidation against returning refugees and displaced persons and the possibility of further confrontations in the Zone of Separation. SFOR and the IPTF are investigating these attacks and taking additional security measures to avoid the potential for additional violence.

☐ The situation in Gajevi remains calm and preparations continue

for the return of displaced Bosniaks in accordance with agreed procedures. We are continuing to monitor the situation and will continue to insist that refugees and displaced persons that follow the agreed procedures are allowed to return to their homes.

☐ We are encouraged that Bosniaks appear to be returning peacefully and are encouraged that the Bosnian Serb leadership recently joined us in condemning similar attacks. We expect further action in response to last week's explosion.

☐ The repatriation of refugees and displaced persons will be a long term process and we will continue to encourage the parties and assist international agencies to ensure the expeditious return of these persons to their former homes. We have seen encouraging signs including the return of 225,000-250,000 internally displaced persons and refugees to their homes in Bosnia.

Iranian Influence in Bosnia

☐ Iranian influence in Bosnia has been an ongoing concern, but we have taken effective measures to cut Iranian links.

☐ We have enforced the Dayton agreement ban on foreign forces and insisted that Bosnian government sever all military and intelligence links with Iran as a condition of the train and equip program. As the President certified in June, those conditions have been met. There have been no indications since June that military or intelligence cooperation has resumed.

☐ We remain concerned about Iranian influence and continue to watch the situation closely. Overall, we and the intelligence community assess that Iranian influence has substantially diminished since the implementation of Dayton and since we tied the issue to the train and equip program.

Train and Equip Program

☐ The international Train and Equip program is ongoing and is a key success and a major step

toward establishing a stable military balance in Bosnia, which is one of the keys to establishing a lasting peace in the region.

☐ The program's extensive training effort involves 170 U.S. contracted trainers, funded by international donations, and additional offers of training assistance from our allies in Europe and moderate Islamic states. The Federation has taken delivery of U.S. equipment from our \$100 million drawdown for Bosnia under the program and is receiving security assistance and equipment donations from moderate Islamic states.

☐ The T&E program continues to facilitate concrete progress in the formation of joint Federation defense structures that will be critical to strengthening the Bosniak-Croat Federation.

New Bosnia Mission/SFOR -- General

☐ The NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR) mission started December 20. SFOR's limited and focused mission will allow time to consolidate the peace built by the success of IFOR.

☐ The Stabilization Force is about half IFOR's size. U.S. share is less than half last year's commitment -- about 8500 troops inside Bosnia.

☐ The NATO plan for SFOR includes more limited set of military and supporting tasks than IFOR, reflecting the more narrow mission of this smaller force. With fewer troops, SFOR will focus more on security, including force protection, and will be less involved in civilian tasks.

SFOR Mission Duration

☐ 18 months will give sufficient extra time needed for civilian implementation efforts on economic reconstruction, refugee return, and related issues needed to ensure a self-sustaining peace.

☐ We will review every 6 months to see if we can accomplish mission with fewer forces. SFOR will gradually shift responsibilities to civilian agencies

and the parties themselves while moving from stabilization to deterrence to disengagement.

If pressed on whether this means that the U.S. has ruled out participation of U.S. forces after completion of SFOR mission:

☐ We believe that SFOR's mission can be completed in 18 months, and that the conditions will have been established in which stability and security can be maintained without an outside military presence.

If pressed whether the U.S. will insist that any force after 18 months will be European only:

☐ I'm not going to speculate about such scenarios. We believe the mission will be completed in 18 months.

SERBIA/KOSOVO

Serbian Elections/Milosevic's Announcement

☐ We are encouraged by the passage of a law in the Serbian assembly implementing the Gonzalez recommendations and recognizing opposition victories. We urge rapid implementation of its provisions and steps so that the opposition can take its duly-elected seats.

☐ We remain cautious until Serbian authorities fully implement the OSCE Gonzalez report recommendations and recognize all opposition victories in the November 17 elections.

☐ We are continuing to move forward with a plan of action to support democratization in Serbia. We are considering a number of actions ranging from economic and political measures to democracy building initiatives as well as continuing to support the important roles of international organizations such as the OSCE.

If asked whether the opposition should give up their demonstrations

☐ It is up to the opposition and the will of the Serbian people to determine how to express their political rights. It is our hope that implementation of the Gonzalez recommendations will put Serbia on the path to democracy.

☐ We continue to condemn any use of force by Serbian police against demonstrators.

Kosovo

☐ We remain concerned about the tense situation in Kosovo and have urged all parties to exercise maximum restraint in order to avoid violence.

☐ We deplore the continuing Serbian government repression and are calling for the restoration of full human and political rights for the people of Kosovo. We have actively worked to help the people of Kosovo, by providing direct humanitarian assistance and by pressuring the Serbian government to reverse its repressive policies.

☐ We have maintained the outer wall of sanctions, which is directly linked to the restoration of full human and political rights in Kosovo.

☐ At the same time, we do not support the independence of Kosovo and do not recognize the unofficial parallel institutions that have been created.

TRIPS AND VISITORS

☐ VP and PM Chernomyrdin announced that POTUS and Yeltsin will meet in Helsinki March 20-21.

☐ Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada will make an official visit to Washington on April 8.

☐ Chilean President Frei arrives February 26 for a state visit.

☐ President will travel to Mexico April 11-12, Latin America and

the Caribbean May 6-13.

☐ President will travel to Netherlands May 28 for US-EU Summit and Marshall Plan commemoration event. No details yet.

☐ Announced that Portuguese Prime Minister Guterres will be here for meeting and working lunch April 3. Do not yet know what other events will be included in his visit.

☐ Also announced that Spanish President Aznar will be here April 30 for meeting and working lunch. Again, no details available.

If asked about Bruton visit:

☐ Yes, we expect Irish Prime Minister here for annual St. Patrick's Day celebration.

If asked about Hashimoto Visit

Background: The Japanese Embassy received guidance this morning in reaction to a leaked story in Tokyo about a possible Hashimoto visit to Washington in April. The Japanese are saying, "The Prime Minister intends to visit Washington in late April and the two governments have begun consultations."

☐ We have seen reports indicating that PM Hashimoto wishes to visit Washington this spring.

☐ Nothing on the President's schedule yet.

GREECE/TURKEY

GREECE-U.S. SECURITY GUARANTEES

☐ We would be deeply concerned about any instability in the south Balkans that triggered refugee flows into Greece and would consult closely with the Greek government about the situation.

GREECE/TURKEY

NDU's Institute of Strategic Studies Map

Background: NDU's Institute for National Strategic Studies issued its 1997 Strategic Assessment this week, which contains a map that does not show Greek/Turkish borders and notes Turkey's claim to the continental shelf without noting Greece's 6-mile claim to territorial waters.

Q: Does the NDU map reflect an official U.S. government position?

A: The NDU map does not reflect an official U.S. government position on the issue of the Greek/Turkish border in the Aegean.

We have said repeatedly that the dispute between Greece and Turkey over ownership of Imia/Kardak islet should be submitted to the ICJ for adjudication.

We have similarly called for Greece and Turkey to settle their territorial differences without force or the threat of force, with respect for the territorial integrity of the other, and in accordance with all relevant international agreements.

PERU

Q: What's the situation in Peru at the Japanese Ambassador's Residence? What is the United States going to do about this situation?

A: President Clinton met with President Fujimori on February 3 to express our support for his handling of the hostage situation at the Japanese Ambassador's residence. President Clinton fully endorsed the joint statement made by President Fujimori and Prime Minister Hashimoto in Toronto on February 1 and reiterated our support for a peaceful resolution without concessions to terrorists..

This is a very serious situation and lives are obviously at risk. It simply isn't productive for me to address the other questions you have raised.

Q: Does the United States negotiate with hostages or condone those who do?

A: The United States does not condone making concessions to terrorists, but how to handle negotiations is a sovereign decision for the government involved.

Q: Were other issues discussed in the meeting with President Fujimori?

A: President Clinton told President Fujimori how much he appreciated Peru's contribution to our joint counternarcotics efforts. He also expressed support for pushing forward with finding a definitive resolution to the border dispute between Peru and Ecuador.

SAUDI ARABIA

F-16 Sales to Saudi Arabia

- ☐ No official request has been received.
- ☐ When and if we do receive a Saudi request, it will be examined in the usual manner by State and Defense, who will make recommendations to the President.
- ☐ We have a long-standing arms supply relation with Saudi Arabia and their security is vitally important to us, but no decisions have been made at this time on any major new weapons sale.

Saudi Cooperation with FBI

Q: What are you doing to get Saudi Arabia to cooperate with the FBI on the Khobar Towers bombing investigation?

A: The FBI is in charge of that investigation for the U.S.

I understand that they are in a dialogue with the Saudis about what additional specific materials and cooperation they seek.

We have assurances from the highest levels in the Kingdom

that we will get full cooperation and we expect that such assurances will be honored.

Q: What's your reaction to allegations that the al-Khobar bombing involved Iranians?

A: There is an investigation under way.

I'm not going to speculate about hypothetical outcomes to this investigation.

Nor am I going to speculate about hypothetical responses once this investigation is complete.

Q: Was there an Iranian or Syrian role?

A: We have reached no conclusions.

Q: If Iran was behind it, will we still attack Iran as Secretary Perry said last summer?

A: This is hypothetical and I'm not going to respond. But if you ask whether the U.S. responds to those who are proven to have attacked it, the record of this Administration is clear.

But I must stress that we have reached no conclusion about state sponsorship in the Khobar attack.

GULF WAR ILLNESSES

Has there been a cover-up?

- ☐ No -- There is currently no evidence nor any indication of a cover-up.
- ☐ The Presidential Advisory Committee concurs in this assessment.
- ☐ The fact that U.S. troops inadvertently destroyed Iraqi chemical weapons after the war came to light as part of our effort to learn all that we can; that effort has since been intensified.
- ☐ We're awaiting the outcomes of Army IG, DOD Intel Oversight & CIA IG investigations.

Were Chemical or Biological Warfare Agents used during the Gulf War?

- ☐ The CIA's thorough August 2, 1996 report on this issue concluded no Iraqi use of CBW.
- ☐ Moreover, based on current scientific evidence, the Presidential Advisory Committee found it unlikely that exposure to CBW explains undiagnosed Gulf War illnesses.

Is DOD the right choice to continue the investigation -- even with independent oversight?

- ☐ Yes, and that's the decision taken by the President when he extended the Presidential Advisory Committee to provide independent oversight.
- ☐ DOD has unique resources for this task and is committed to a thorough & open process.
- ☐ DOD's recent expansion of effort has included: (1) designation of a new Special Assistant for Gulf War Illnesses; (2) a ten-fold increase in investigative resources (including more than 100 additional staff); and (3) an outreach program to the more than 20,000 Gulf War veterans who may have been in the vicinity of Khamisiyah when chemical demolitions occurred.

Why are Gulf War veterans sick?

- ☐ I'll leave addressing the merits of specific theories to the many experts -- at DOD, HHS and VA, as well as outside government -- currently focused on Gulf War illnesses.
- ☐ The Presidential Advisory Committee carefully evaluated 9 leading environmental risk factors and concluded that current scientific evidence does not support a causal link -- pesticides; chemical warfare agents; biological warfare agents; vaccines; pyridostigmine bromide (PB); infectious diseases; depleted uranium; oil-well fires and smoke; and petroleum products.
- ☐ Stress is a likely contributing factor in some Gulf War illnesses.
- ☐ Bottom-line: further research on the causes of Gulf War illnesses is required and is now in progress.

What has the Administration done for Gulf War veterans who are sick?

- ☐ Through the dedicated efforts of DOD and VA personnel, veterans are receiving the care they need for Gulf War illnesses, whether diagnosed or undiagnosed.
- ☐ To date -- (1) DOD & VA toll-free help lines; (2) 80,000+ free medical exams; (3) 26,000+

compensation claims approved; (4) special legislation paying disability for Gulf veterans with undiagnosed illnesses; (5) thousands of pages declassified; and (6) 80+ federally-sponsored research projects underway.

Is there a "lessons learned" process in place for future deployments?

☐ DOD has begun to incorporate "lessons learned" in planning future deployments.

☐ Example: a new policy directive for a Medical Surveillance System for Deployments is near completion, with key elements having been tested in Bosnia and Southwest Asia.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

14 February 97 16:17

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

BERGQ&A.DOC

2/14/97 3:00 pm

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PREPARED FOR MR. BERGER'S
APPEARANCE BEFORE

THE NATIONAL JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY
16, 1997

SYRIA

Q. What will it take to get the negotiations with Syria started again?

Will the President be in touch with President Asad?

A: We attach a top priority to a comprehensive peace. Clearly can't

be comprehensive without an Israeli-Syrian and Israeli-Lebanese agreement. Had good thorough discussion with PM Netanyahu. Will be

in touch with Asad when that can help move process forward.

Q. Do you expect Israel to enter into negotiations with Syria while

Syria is supplying and supporting Hizbollah in southern Lebanon?

A: Syria, unlike others that tolerate or support terrorism, has made clear it seeks a peace with Israel and has engaged in direct negotiations with Israel.

And the Government of Israel has made clear it wants to resume Israeli-Syrian negotiations. Our policy to support Israel's objective, not impose obstacles.

But we have clear differences with Syria on its support for Hizbollah; have urged the Syrians to stop supporting these groups, stop allowing weapons shipments to them.

As the President said on Thursday, "The pursuit of peace and the practice of terror are incompatible. For negotiations to succeed, there must be a climate of stability and tranquility. For peace to endure, Arabs and Israelis must know the calm of a normal life."

Q: Will the President Send Secretary Albright to Syria?

A: Obviously Secretary Albright will be traveling to the region at some point. No dates set.

As the President said on Thursday after his meeting with the Prime Minister, we're encouraged by the discussions we've had, but we still have a lot of work to do.

Q: Did the President or Secretary Christopher gave Prime Minister Netanyahu assurances that commitments to the Syrians by the Rabin Government on withdrawing from the Golan were not binding on the current Israeli government?

A: Hasn't been our practice to get into the details of these negotiations; not going to change that practice now, since it preserves U.S. credibility as a mediator.

LEBANON

Q: If Israel were to agree to a unilateral withdrawal from southern

Lebanon, would the United States support that and would the United States participate in an international presence to guarantee a quiet border?

A: First, U.S. wants to see peace along Israel's border with Lebanon. Israel needs to be able to defend its Northern border. Have often exerted diplomatic effort to help contain hostilities there, and reduce conflict's impact on civilian populations on both sides. We support the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, free of all foreign forces.

As for question of a unilateral Israeli withdrawal, PM Netanyahu has said he is not interested in such an approach. So our efforts are focused on getting the negotiations going where the issues can be addressed.

ISRAELI SETTLEMENTS

Q: What is your position on Israeli settlements? Did the President really mean it when he agreed that settlements are an "obstacles to peace."

A: Settlement activity is unhelpful. It clearly complicates the negotiating process and creates tensions. Just as we've said before, when either side says or does things that are seen to preempt the outcome of a negotiation, it makes it that much more difficult to achieve progress.

Q: Are you saying that Jews don't have a right to live on the West Bank?

A: Look, Jews have been living in this area since the time of Abraham.

But settlements is an issue both sides agreed to deal with in their permanent status negotiations. I'm making a common sense point: if one side does things that preempt the negotiating process, it's that much more difficult to carry out successful negotiations.

ISRAELI REDEPLOYMENTS

Q: Do you agree with the view that the Israelis can decide unilaterally how much they will redeploy in the next rounds of redeployment starting the first week of March?

A: The issue of further Israeli redeployments is an Israeli responsibility under the Interim Agreement. In the Hebron talks, we provided a U.S. view on the timing of these further redeployments. The three phases should be completed within twelve months, but not later than mid-1998.

ABU MARZOOK EXTRADITION CASE

Q: Can you tell us if Hamas leader Abu Marzook will be extradited to Israel?

A: We don't comment on pending extradition cases.

JERUSALEM EMBASSY

Q: What is the U.S. position on Jerusalem and on moving the U.S. Embassy there?

A: No issue more sensitive than Jerusalem, that's why it's a final status issue. Don't believe U.S. should complicate this difficult issue by introducing itself into the equation.

PALESTINIANS COMBATING TERRORISM

Q: Are the Palestinians doing enough to combat terrorism against Israel?

A: Chairman Arafat and his security services are very serious about combating terrorism within the areas they control. It's essential they carry out a systematic, sustained campaign to root out, preempt terror and apprehend, detain and prosecute those responsible. The President will be discussing this with Chairman Arafat when he sees him in early March.

No absolute guarantee that all acts of terror can be stopped. Essential, however, that PLO and PA exert maximum effort to fight terror.

In conjunction with recently-concluded Hebron negotiations, PA reaffirmed commitment to combat terror systematically. Nothing short of this needed to deal with the challenges these extremists pose.

PALESTINIAN COMPLIANCE

Q: Are the Palestinians in compliance with their commitments to us and the Israelis? The State Department says they are but the Israeli government doesn't seem to think so.

A: We monitor compliance very closely. Palestinians have taken steps to carry out their commitments. As a result of the Hebron agreement, Palestinians reaffirmed commitment to fight terror and prevent violence, in part by strengthening security cooperation with the Israelis.

(If asked about incidents related to the Hasmonean Tunnel)
In September there was a serious breakdown in command and control that led to casualties on both sides. Can't allow this to happen again.

Palestinian authorities have made clear actions taken during these incidents did not reflect their policy; Chairman Arafat has taken steps to ensure this will never happen again, including strict limits

on the use of firearms by the Palestinian Police.

AMENDING THE CHARTER

Q: Have the Palestinians amended their charter to accept Israel's right to exist and disavow terrorism?

A: In April, 1996 the Palestinian National Council adopted a resolution canceling the articles inconsistent with its commitments to Israel. During the recent Hebron negotiations, Chairman Arafat reaffirmed the commitment to complete the process of revising the Palestinian National Charter.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS: NORMALIZATION

Q: Is the normalization of ties between Israel and Arab states proceeding satisfactorily?

A: Israel has taken important step in reaching an agreement on Hebron and further redeployment; we want to see the Arab states increasing their contacts, dialogue, and relations with Israel.

U.S. ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL

Q: Do you plan to increase or decrease U.S. aid to Israel or Egypt?

A: As the President's FY98 budget indicates, we're committed to maintaining present aid levels.

(OPPORTUNITY FOR THE RESOURCES PITCH)

I can't emphasize enough how important it is that groups like yours, both at the national and local levels, get behind the Administration's request to enhance the resources available for foreign affairs.

To keep search for Middle East peace and security going forward, we need to ensure that America has the tools to lead. That means maintaining the resources to preserve our defenses and strengthen our diplomacy... minimize risks that Israel and others take for peace... promote security and free markets around world... help others overcome their differences and achieve their fullest potential.

As President has said, "This is an interdependent world... we can't walk away from our obligations.... We can be a model for the rest of the world, but we also know that we have to model the behavior we advocate -- which is to give a helping hand when we can."

I know many of have always been powerful advocate for America's global leadership, especially for foreign assistance. At this moment, when President working to reverse downward spiral in international affairs spending and guarantee that we have means to achieve goals we share, I hope your commitment is as strong and determined as ever.

In Middle East and elsewhere, we stand at a crossroads of opportunity. But we cannot simply wish our vision into being. Must summon bipartisan commitment to do what it takes to advance our leadership, promote our interests, and keep America strong, secure and prosperous for next 50 years and beyond. Grateful for your efforts toward that goal.

ISRAEL: JONATHAN POLLARD

Q: Did the President and Prime Minister discuss the Pollard case?

Is there any possibility of a Presidential pardon?

A: As you know, the President reviewed that matter in July of last year. It is not currently under review.

EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI RELATIONS

Q: Are the Egyptians playing a constructive role in the peace

process?

A: President Mubarak has made very clear Egypt attaches great importance to its relationship with Israel and will continue to work with Israel to advance the peace process. Gratified to see Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Mubarak had a chance to exchange views in Europe recently, hope those exchanges continue.

Egypt plays important role in the peace process. As a leader of the Arab world and the first Arab country to make peace with Israel, what Egypt says and does makes a difference. Confident Egypt will continue to play constructive, influential role in leading the region to peace and normalization.

President will meet with President Mubarak in March; we'll be discussing with him how we can work together to move forward in the peace process and in Israeli/Egyptian relations.

F-16s FOR SAUDI ARABIA

Q: What's the status of the sale of F-16s to Saudi Arabia; how will that affect Israel's security?

A: We have a long-standing, close security relationship with Saudi Arabia. On F-16s, we have not received an official request.

When and if we do, it will be examined by the Defense and State Departments and they will make a recommendation to me. And, as the President said, we would give it serious consideration. And as he also reaffirmed -- we are committed to preserving Israel's qualitative edge. Our commitment to Israeli security is unshakable.

COMPUTER SALES TO BEN GURION UNIVERSITY

Q: Why has the Commerce Department suddenly targeted Israel's Ben

Gurion University by naming it a proliferation "end user of concern" and imposing export licensing requirements?

A: As part of our export control system, we exercise caution in exports of powerful computers to non-signatories of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Expect there will be a number of entities for which we will publish the same requirement. Part of our overall effort to clarify, strengthen our proliferation controls by making U.S. exporters aware of need to apply for individual licenses for specific entities.

Action does not prevent exports, simply requires U.S. exporters to apply for an individual license for computers above a certain level.

License applications will be reviewed on case-by-case basis, with no presumption of denial.

U.S. has approved export of high speed computers to Ben Gurion and other Israeli universities, after careful review of proposed end use, and appropriate assurances.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 26 February 97 11:35
FROM Kessinger, Jodi
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Another Q & A for TL's hearing [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Harris, Elisa D.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Thanks. This is good for background, but can you draft an answer to the question that which Tony may have to use.

From: Harris, Elisa D.
To: Bell, Robert G.; Kessinger, Jodi
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: RE: Another Q & A for TL's hearing [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 1997 09:16 PM

we answered hundreds of senate questions for the record on the treaty. last summer, we recieved a Helms letter on June 21, and responded on July 31 with letters from POTUS and Lake, the latter with a detailed classified attachment. we received another Helms letter on july 26, and responded on August 13 with letters from POTUS and Lake, the latter with another detailed classified attachment. we received a letter from Majority Leader Lott on September 6, and responded on september 10 with a letter from Lake with a detailed attachment (8 pages single spaced). hope this helps!!!

From: Bell, Robert G.
To: Harris, Elisa D.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Andreasen, Steven P.; Kessinger, Jodi
Subject: FW: Another Q & A for TL's hearing [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 1997 08:47 PM

Pls. remind me what the time lines were last summer on the "Lake letter".
Thanks. (Jodi: Steve does not "do" CWC - Elisa does).

From: Kessinger, Jodi
To: Andreasen, Steven P.; Bell, Robert G.
CC: /R, Record at A1; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy
Subject: Another Q & A for TL's hearing [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 1997 08:31 PM

Please provide an answer to the following question as soon as possible in the morning.

Q: Senator Helms has charged that you deliberately slow rolled answering the Senate's questions on CWC. Did you?

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 28 February 97 20:37

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT February 28 Press Guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Babcock, Douglas W.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Bujold, Noelle D.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Hamel, Michael A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Jordan, Donald L.
Moore, Lori A.
Norris, John J.
Orfini, Michael H.
Szasz, Nicholas J.
Wise, William M.
Woolston, Ann E.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[FEB28GUI.DOC : 5215 in FEB28GUI.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 28 February 97 13:3

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** FEB28GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

February 28, 1997

Drug Certification Zaire

Bosnia Cyprus

Russia South Africa

Northern Ireland Cuba

China National Guard

Gulf War Illnesses

Haiti

Tony Lake

Rwanda/UN

Chile

Saudi Arabia

Iraq

Kuwait

Turkey

Japan

Poland

Middle East

Korea

High Performance Computers

Kashmir

Trips and Visitors

COUNTERNARCOTICS CERTIFICATION PROCESS

☐ Fight against narcotics trafficking taken very seriously. Issue affects health, safety of our children, and our national security.

☐ By week's end, President to receive certification recommendation from Secretary Albright. Recommendation will reflect views of all agencies with role in drug effort.

☐ Recommendation will state whether major producing and transit countries have cooperated fully with the U.S., or taken adequate steps on their own, to meet commitments in the "UN

Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances" of December 2, 1988.

☐ Decision on whether to accept Secretary's recommendations up to the President.

Requirement to make this determination part of the Foreign Assistant Act (Section 490)

☐ President has three choices: "certify," "deny certification," or provide "national interest certification."

☐ If President decides on "national interest certification," he must include in message to Congress a full, complete description of the vital national interests affected by decertification.

☐ Consequences of decertification serious: no aid, except humanitarian and counternarcotics, U.S. blocks loans from multilateral development banks, and Ex-Im financing and OPIC insurance halted.

☐ For countries certified, Congress may overturn President's certification only if, within thirty days, both Houses adopt joint resolution with majority vote.

☐ President will make his certification decision only after he receives the Secretary's recommendations.

BOSNIA

Mostar

☐ We welcome the release of the UN International Police Task Force (IPTF) report on the February 10 shooting incident in Mostar. We condemn the unwarranted acts of violence that occurred, and endorse the efforts of the IPTF and the Office of the High Representative to investigate this incident and to seek a lowering of tensions between the Bosnian Muslim and Croat communities in the Mostar area.

- ☐ We remain concerned about the outbreaks of violence in Mostar, particularly the rocket and grenade attacks in recent days on SFOR vehicles. SFOR is taking extra security measures as a result. We have called for restraint by all parties and urged them to redouble their efforts to work together.
- ☐ We have expressed our concerns about the violence in Mostar with the Bosnian Croat and Croatian Leaders. We have called upon the Bosnian Croat authorities to condemn the violence and to see that those responsible are brought to justice.
- ☐ We are also working with the High Representative, IPTF, SFOR and other international agencies to maintain the peace.

Brcko Decision

- ☐ The Brcko arbitration decision mandates that the office of the High Representative assume interim international supervision of the Brcko area. The Arbitrator will retain jurisdiction and will review the issue in approximately one year.
- ☐ The arbitration process was agreed to by the parties at Dayton. The Parties should remember that they are committed to implement the decision in full. The international community stands behind the decision and will support its full implementation.
- ☐ Implementation will be a gradual and long-term effort requiring sustained commitment by the parties and international community. The implementation conference in early March will be the first step in this process.

Return of Refugees

- ☐ We remain concerned about the potential for violence or intimidation against returning refugees and displaced persons and the possibility of further confrontations in the Zone of Separation. SFOR and the IPTF are investigating recent acts against returning refugees and are taking additional security measures to avoid the potential for additional violence.

☐

The situation in the ZOS remains calm and preparations continue for the return of displaced Bosniaks in accordance with agreed procedures. We are continuing to monitor the situation and will continue to insist that refugees and displaced persons that follow the agreed procedures are allowed to return to their homes.

☐ The repatriation of refugees and displaced persons will be a long term process and we will continue to encourage the parties and assist international agencies to ensure the expeditious return of these persons to their former homes. We have seen encouraging signs including the return of 225,000-250,000 internally displaced persons and refugees to their homes in Bosnia.

War Criminals

☐ We remain deeply concerned with lack of progress on war crimes front in Bosnia. Achieving justice is part of achieving an enduring peace.

☐ We're examining variety of ways we can help the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals to justice. We have made no decisions on how to assist the Tribunal. We are reviewing many different options.

☐ We also continue to press the parties to live up to their responsibilities to detain war criminals. We have been consulting with our allies for some time on ways to press the countries involved to turn indicted war criminals over to the tribunal.

☐ While international military forces in Bosnia will detain war criminals if, in the course of normal duties, they encounter those under indictment, it is not the role of SFOR to hunt down war criminals.

If pressed about sending teams of special police or commandos to arrest war criminals:

☐ One possible option is to set up a special police force to assist the Tribunal in apprehending indicted war criminals. Such a force would not include SFOR personnel. This is only one of a number of options under consideration. No decisions have

been made.

Iranian Influence in Bosnia

- ☐ Iranian influence in Bosnia has been an ongoing concern, but we have taken effective measures to cut Iranian links.
- ☐ We have enforced the Dayton agreement ban on foreign forces and insisted that Bosnian government sever all military and intelligence links with Iran as a condition of the train and equip program. As the President certified in June, those conditions have been met. There have been no indications since June that military or intelligence cooperation has resumed.
- ☐ We remain concerned about Iranian influence and continue to watch the situation closely. Overall, we and the intelligence community assess that Iranian influence has substantially diminished since the implementation of Dayton and since we tied the issue to the train and equip program.

Train and Equip Program

- ☐ The international Train and Equip program is ongoing and is a key success and a major step toward establishing a stable military balance in Bosnia, which is one of the keys to establishing a lasting peace in the region.
- ☐ The program's extensive training effort involves 170 U.S. contracted trainers, funded by international donations, and additional offers of training assistance from our allies in Europe and moderate Islamic states. The Federation has taken delivery of U.S. equipment from our \$100 million drawdown for Bosnia under the program and is receiving security assistance and equipment donations from moderate Islamic states.
- ☐ The T&E program continues to facilitate concrete progress in the formation of joint Federation defense structures that will be critical to strengthening the Bosniak-Croat Federation.

SFOR Mission Duration

☐ 18 months will give sufficient extra time needed for civilian implementation efforts on economic reconstruction, refugee return, and related issues needed to ensure a self-sustaining peace.

☐ We will review every 6 months to see if we can accomplish mission with fewer forces. SFOR will gradually shift responsibilities to civilian agencies and the parties themselves while moving from stabilization to deterrence to disengagement.

If pressed on whether this means that the U.S. has ruled out participation of U.S. forces after completion of SFOR mission:

☐ We believe that SFOR's mission can be completed in 18 months, and that the conditions will have been established in which stability and security can be maintained without an outside military presence.

If pressed whether the U.S. will insist that any force after 18 months will be European only:

☐ I'm not going to speculate about such scenarios. We believe the mission will be completed in 18 months.

RUSSIA/NIS

Current Items

Rodionov and the Military

☐ Noted Minister Rodionov's concerns. The situation bears watching. Budgetary problems faced by the Russian government affect virtually all sectors; so there is no doubt that the military is affected.

☐ Would note that even during the most difficult stages of economic transition, Russian government has maintained tight control over weapons systems and command structure.

Expect that still to be the case.

(If asked -- views on military restructuring?)

☐ Important issue for Russia. President Yeltsin, Prime Minister Chernomyrdin have underscored need for internal adaptation. Clearly competing views on how to proceed. We continue to follow with interest.

Waiver of Immunity for Georgian Diplomat

☐ Georgian Embassy counselor Makharadze charged February 20 in D.C. Superior Court with involuntary manslaughter, four counts of assault, in connection with January 3 traffic death of woman; Georgian government had waived diplomatic immunity.

☐ Refer you to State Department, U. S. attorney's office for further information.

Clinton-Yeltsin Meeting

☐ President and Yeltsin to meet in Helsinki March 19-20. Secretary Albright in Moscow last week meeting with Yeltsin, Chernomyrdin, Primakov.

☐ We look ahead to progress with Russia on wide range of issues -- American investment, arms control, European security structures. Our agenda very comprehensive.

General Issues

NATO-Russia

☐ Encouraged by most recent talks, indications that Russia now interested in making real progress on defining new NATO-Russia relationship.

On Timetable of New Members' Accession to NATO

☐ Timelines for enlargement not changed; while invitations will be extended in Madrid in July and accession negotiations to occur in this year, with ratification by Alliance parliaments possible in 1998, first new members would not enter NATO until 1999 (at earliest).

On idea of NATO-Russia Brigade

- ☐ We're exploring in Alliance, and with Russia, variety of ways in which NATO and Russia can work together, build together new relationship, this could include some kinds of military cooperation -- but all specifics remain to be discussed, settled.
- ☐ Secretary Albright discussed European security, Russia's role, NATO-Russia, in Moscow meetings last week.
- ☐ NATO Secretary General Solana and Foreign Minister Primakov met February 23 in Brussels to discuss development of NATO-Russia relationship.
- ☐ VP and Chernomyrdin had extensive discussions on European security, bilateral issues in preparation for the Clinton-Yeltsin meeting.
- ☐ NATO enlargement will proceed. Believe that is in interests of European security and stability. But U.S. determined to manage enlargement process in manner that does not threaten Russia and to do all that we can to build strong NATO-Russia relationship.

Prospects for Russian Ratification of START II Treaty

- ☐ Treaty faces ratification vote in Duma; parliamentary prerogative to debate its merits. While some may oppose Treaty, Russian government committed to ratification.
- ☐ START II in best interests of both countries, should be ratified by Russia.

If asked: is Administration planning to leap ahead" to START III:

- ☐ As Vice President stated, U.S. prepared to begin negotiations on further reductions in nuclear forces once START II has entered into force; VP said we're ready to consider under what "guidelines" to enter into negotiations. (FYI: VP carefully avoided saying "negotiations.")
- ☐ No intention of setting aside START II.

NORTHERN IRELAND

St. Patrick's Day Reception

Background: Today's Financial Times (2/28) and the Irish press contain headlines calling our St. Patrick's Day guest list a "snub" of Sinn Fein.

☐ The White House will again include some political leaders from Northern Ireland in the annual St. Patrick's Day reception. We expect the list of invitees from Northern Ireland to be similar to last year's. Most guests, of course, will be American.

☐ [IF PRESSED on whether Adams/ Sinn Fein will be included]: Point out that Sinn Fein was not included last year, because the cease-fire had been broken.

Adams Visa?

☐ Mr. Adams has not/not applied for a visa. Since there is no application, the Administration has made no decision.

☐ U.S. officials have been misquoted in the British press about the alleged warning to Mr. Adams.

☐ If pressed: As in the past, an application for a visa waiver by Mr. Adams would be decided on basis of whether it could contribute to search for lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

O'Callaghan to Testify in Deportation Case?

Background: The Irish press reported that controversial IRA defector Sean O'Callaghan, who has been given a visa for a speaking tour here, was to testify for the INS in the deportation hearing of Brian Pearson, an Irish national with former ties to the IRA. This was briefly true, but when INS Washington found out, they recommended against calling O'Callaghan, presumably because his credibility is too widely questioned to make him a good witness.

- ☐ Understand that O'Callaghan is not going to testify in deportation case. Refer you to INS.

Change in Policy on Need for Cease-Fire?

Background: In Belfast Friday, members of Codel Gilman held a joint press conference with Gerry Adams and said Sinn Fein should be allowed into talks without an IRA cease-fire.

- ☐ U.S. position has not changed. Like British and Irish governments, our view is that Sinn Fein can only participate in Belfast peace talks after an IRA cease-fire.
- ☐ Take opportunity to commend the loyalists, who are exercising restraint in face of provocation of IRA violence.

Berger/Steinberg Phone Calls

- ☐ In last several days NSA Berger and DNSA Steinberg have been in touch with British and Irish officials and with party leaders to discuss situation in Northern Ireland, exchange views on how to move process forward.
- ☐ If asked whether one of them spoke with Adams: Remain engaged in process; not going to comment further on details of who/when.

Ambassador Smith to be Recalled?

Background: The Washington Times picked up a story out of London that the WH is going to "recall" Ambassador Jean Kennedy Smith because we intend to change our policy toward Northern Ireland and she is regarded as too pro-Sinn Fein.

- ☐ No truth to report that Ambassador Smith is going to be "recalled" because of change of White House policy toward Northern Ireland or dissatisfaction with Ambassador Smith's performance. She has played invaluable role in Administration support for Northern Ireland peace process.
- ☐ Our policy has not changed. We support efforts of British and Irish governments to bring about just and lasting settlement; see Belfast talks as historic

opportunity. Continue to believe those talks have best chance of success with participation of all elected parties, including Sinn Fein, but that can only happen after cease-fire.

Parades Commission Report

Background: Last summer after the civil unrest over marches in Drumcree, the British set up a panel headed by Oxford don Peter North to recommend how to handle parades in the future.

The North report, just released, recommends that a commission be set up with, inter alia, the authority to make decisions on controversial parades. In its January 30 reaction to the report, the British Government neither accepted nor rejected the recommendation for a commission with decision-making powers but initiated an 8-week consultation period on this aspect of the report.

□ North Review offers valuable insights and recommendations to deal with the very controversial and divisive question of parades and marches in Northern Ireland, particularly during summer "marching season."

□ Report recommends establishment of independent parades commission. Pleased that British Government moving to set one up. Very much hope it can be up and running in time to make a difference and help avoid a repeat of last summer's bitter confrontations.

□ Last summer's events cost the people of Northern Ireland dearly, both economically and politically. Vital for future political progress in Northern Ireland that new ways be found to meet needs of both communities and avoid annual confrontations.

Loyalist Cease-fire Intact?

□ Up to British and Irish governments and participating parties to decide who participates in talks.

□ As President said in statement yesterday, we urge loyalists to maintain their cease-fire. There has been no claim of responsibility for car bomb attacks and there is no doubt loyalists have

shown restraint in response to escalating IRA violence.

Belfast Talks

- ☐ Belfast talks, chaired by Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, represent historic opportunity and best hope in decades for achieving lasting settlement.
- ☐ Must not squander progress of last months. Urge all political leaders to take responsibility for making these talks work. Need to move quickly into substantive negotiations on future of Northern Ireland.
- ☐ Continue to believe that participation of all elected parties, including Sinn Fein, would give talks best chance of success; that can only happen with cease-fire.
- ☐ Impressed with commitment and determination both governments have shown in search for peace. They and we share goal of inclusive negotiations on future of Northern Ireland, which can only happen if there is an IRA cease-fire.

Deportation Proceedings Against Matt Morrison

- ☐ Have been assured by Justice that these proceedings being handled fairly. Judicial matter - don't want to comment further.

CHINA

China-U.S. Human Rights Compromise

Q: Did Secretary Albright's trip fail because there was no compromise reached on human rights issues with China?

A: There was no expectation of a breakthrough on human rights as part of Albright's trip. Her visit to Beijing addressed a range of issues, including human rights about which the Secretary was clear and direct.

We have made clear to China that in the absence of human rights

progress we would
see no reason not to proceed with a resolution at the UNHRC.

We will continue to raise human rights regularly and at all
levels with Chinese officials.

Reports on Decision to Sign Human Rights Conventions

- ☐ We would view a Chinese decision to sign conventions on
international standards for respect
for human rights as a positive step.
- ☐ Much more, however, remains to be done, and it is compliance
with these standards that is
the important step.
- ☐ We are continuing our consultations with the Europeans and
others on how best to use the
UNHRC meeting to advance our common human rights objectives in
China.

GULF WAR ILLNESSES

Q: What is your reaction to DOD's just-released report on the
missing CENTCOM
chemical logs? Are you concerned that this is more evidence of a
cover-up?

A: The document in question is a draft report of the preliminary
findings of a DOD
investigation still in progress. The draft report, which was
provided to Congress in
response to their request, reflects DOD's commitment to carrying
out the President's
guidance to ensure that all the relevant facts are determined and
disclosed. In fact, the
detailed and carefully-researched nature of this draft report
testifies to DOD's
thoroughness and aggressiveness in pursuing information which may
help our Gulf War
veterans.

While I am certainly concerned about the issue of the missing
logs, it is premature to
conclude that the information is evidence of a cover-up. I am

also sure that, if any evidence of a cover-up arises, it will be appropriately handled by the Inspectors General looking into these events.

Finally, as you know, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses was extended to provide independent oversight of the ongoing investigations. I think it's important that we await the outcomes of the ongoing DOD and CIA investigations, as well as the Advisory Committee's assessment of the adequacy of those investigations.

Q: Why does the Pentagon continue to "discover" material it already has about GWI? If DOD knew about chemical exposure and didn't inform you or your committee, isn't that covering up?

A: The Presidential Advisory Committee (PAC) has been key to reinvigorated DOD efforts to find out what we knew. Last year, DOD acknowledged that its prior investigations lacked the vigor needed, and significantly increased its effort. We are now beginning to see the fruits of that effort.

We all wish that this information had come out sooner, and the documents released recently are disturbing; we should have known about them long ago. But, I have said we would do this in an open manner and we are. I want to commend those in DOD and CIA who have found these documents and released them. DOD has taken great pains to note this is NOT the end of the story, and to actively seek new information from all sources.

Our first commitment is to be sure the veterans are getting the care they need, and that's happening. We shouldn't lose sight of what's been done -- 80,000+ free medical exams, 26,000+ compensation claims approved, 80+ federally-sponsored research projects now underway, including research into low level chemical exposure.

Q: A specific issue raised by the Khamisiyah report is that the 26

Feb 91 log entry indicates the possible presence of chemical weapons at Khamisiyah (Objective Gold). Doesn't this info indicate that CIA/DOD "knew" about possible chemical weapons during the ground war? Why can't this info be declassified?

A: First, I am mindful of the ongoing Army IG, CIA IG, and DOD Intelligence Oversight investigations into many of these same questions, and the extension of the Presidential Advisory Committee (PAC) to provide independent oversight of the adequacy of these investigations. Consistent with my resolve to get out the truth, I have asked the PAC, in performing its independent oversight role, to review the information released in the DOD report and the supporting documentation. This is critical from the standpoint of whether military commanders took appropriate precautions at the time, and whether the implications of that information for Gulf War veterans' health have been appropriately accounted for in providing clinical care and conducting research.

As to the declassification issue, CIA is reexamining its previous decisions with respect to the documents, and will either declassify those documents, or, if sensitive intelligence sources and methods are still involved, brief their contents to the PAC and appropriate Congressional committees to eliminate any appearance of cover-up.

[IF ASKED]:

Q: What about the statement that the CIA briefed the NSC staff in January 1996 on the possibility of U.S. troop exposure?

A: An NSC staffer received a classified brief from CIA in January 1996 as part of its ongoing monitoring of the development of this issue. The NSC staffer recalls that the briefing focused on the CIA declassification initiative. During the briefing, the staffer was told that information had come to light about the possible presence of chemical munitions at Tall al Lahm (later identified as Khamisiyah). The staffer was also briefed that the CIA would work with DOD to try to determine the

credibility of the information, and, if credible, DOD would sort out the possible implications for U.S. forces. All of this was briefed as preliminary information.

HAITI -- TRAVEL BY BERGER/TALBOTT

□ NSA Berger and Deputy Secretary Talbott visited Haiti Thursday for meetings with President Preval and other senior Haitian officials. Their aim was to review the important progress Haiti has made in strengthening its new democracy, and encourage continued efforts to consolidate and advance reform.

□ NSA Berger and Deputy Secretary Talbott discussed the importance of strengthening democratic institutions and review programs designed to foster economic and social development in Haiti. They also discussed the need for rapid progress in creating an environment that attracts investment; U.S. Government support for Haiti's counternarcotics endeavors; efforts to improve public security through reform of the judicial system and development of the Haitian National Police; and the need to make progress in resolving a number of cases of political violence.

□ The United States remains deeply committed to supporting Haiti's democratic and economic development. NSA Berger and Deputy Secretary Talbott underscored that commitment as they work with Haiti's leaders to advance our common goal: A democratic Haiti, prosperous and at peace, working in partnership with the United States to forge a brighter future for all the people of the Americas.

LAKE NOMINATION ISSUES

- ☐ President spoke to Chair, Ranking member of Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the Lake nomination when the President went to the Hill following his State of the Union address.
- ☐ Also made clear his unwavering support for Tony at the close of his joint press conference with Prime Minister Netanyahu.
- ☐ (IF ASKED ABOUT SENATORS' SUPPORT) Several Senators have made their views known to you.
- ☐ (IF REQUEST FOR FULL FBI REPORT RAISED) As is standard practice, Senator Shelby provided with summary of FBI report and notes on the FBI's interview with the nominee. We're discussing with Senator Shelby his request for additional information.
- ☐ (IF REQUEST FOR SWORN TESTIMONY FROM NSC STAFF RAISED) As Senator Shelby's letter recognizes, this is an unusual request. We are discussing this issue with the Senator.

RWANDA TRIBUNAL

Background: The UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, fired the chief administrator and deputy prosecutor of the international criminal tribunal for Rwanda yesterday. The decision followed release of a UN investigation that found widespread mismanagement at the tribunal.

Points

- ☐ Action is important signal of the new Secretary General's commitment to seriously reform the UN.
- ☐ Welcome the decision. The recent report by the UN made clear that major changes were needed to improve the operations of the tribunal.

- ☐ U.S. strongly supports the tribunal which is central to efforts to achieve peace and justice in Rwanda and serve as deterrent against future acts of genocide.
- ☐ Believe action by Secretary General marks turning point for tribunal which now must take strong action to hold accountable those responsible for crimes in Rwanda.

CHILE

VISIT OF PRESIDENT FREI

The Opening Salvo in Intense Presidential Focus on the Americas

- ☐ Frei visit kicks off period of intense Presidential focus on the Americas: President's trip to Mexico in March; State visit of Canadian Premier Chretien in April; President's trip to Caribbean and Latin America in May; ultimately Santiago Summit of the Americas next year.
- ☐ We face historic opportunity: to help complete hemisphere's journey from dictatorship, war and closed economies to democracy, cooperation and free markets. Two years ago in Miami, President Clinton laid foundation to consolidate remarkable gains of democracy, free markets, regional cooperation. Now, challenge it to build on foundation by putting in place institutions, understandings that advance and strengthen these gains. As host of next Summit, President Frei will be essential partner in building on promise of Miami.
- ☐ Focus on Americas is making real difference in lives of Americans and people of the Americas. American people benefit from more open markets, new partners to fight problems that defy borders like drug trafficking, organized crime, and environmental decay. People of Americas benefit from greater prosperity, respect for worker/human rights, rule of law. Americas are becoming a cornerstone for security and prosperity.

Chile is a Model -- and so is U.S.-Chile Partnership

- ☐ Chile is window through we see emerging Americas: multiparty

democracy; firm
commitment to human rights and rule of law; proven and dynamic
economic reform.

☐ U.S.-Chile Partnership Can be Model for Americas.

* Growing commercial ties: Chile strong candidate for fast
track authority. U.S. \$1.9
billion trade surplus with Chile gives us strong interest in
strengthening trade ties.
Clinton and Frei will discuss comprehensive free trade agreement,
which can help lead
hemisphere toward more open markets that create jobs, growth and
opportunity.

* Valued partner within Americas: Working with US to promote
peace between Peru and
Ecuador. Working to defend democracy through the Organization of
American States.
Partner in fight against drugs, and to protect environment.

* Valued partner beyond Americas: As member of APEC and
two-year member of UN
Security Council, Chile playing important role beyond hemisphere.
Helps enforce UN
sanctions against Iraq as member of UNSCOM.

☐ Chile will also provide civilian police monitors for the UN
mission in Bosnia.

SAUDI ARABIA

PRINCE SULTAN'S VISIT

Q: Why was Prince Sultan here?

A: Prince Sultan, in his capacity as Second Deputy Prime Minister,
visited at the invitation
of the Administration to discuss the full range of issues between
our countries. This is
especially appropriate since we are at the beginning of the
second term. Prince Sultan is
also here during the period when the President has also invited
other Middle East leaders
to discuss the situation in the region. In addition to the peace

process and other regional issues, Prince Sultan and his accompanying ministers discussed environmental, energy, defense, commercial, and economic issues with members of the Cabinet and their departments.

Q: What did the President and Sultan discuss?

A: They reviewed the bilateral relationship.

They agreed on the importance of protecting the security of American troops stationed in Saudi Arabia, and they reaffirmed their commitment to the fight against terrorism.

They also reaffirmed their commitment to ensuring security and stability in the critical Gulf region and their commitment to work together to respond to any external threats to our mutual interests.

Finally, they reviewed recent developments in the Peace Process.

STABILITY

Q: Is the U.S. Government concerned about Saudi Arabia's stability?

A: Saudi Arabia faces challenges as it seeks to deal with various economic problems and rapid population growth. Nonetheless, social cohesion in Saudi Arabia is strong and some political reforms have been made. We believe that the Saudi Arabian government has the ability to deal with the challenges of leading that country into the next century.

[If the angle is the King's health]

The Saudi Arabian government has shown, most recently during the regency of Crown Prince Abdullah, the ability to maintain continuity of government and policies. We do not believe the King's health poses a threat to the stability of the government.

SUPPORT FOR THE PEACE PROCESS

Q: Are Saudis helpful on the peace process?

A: The Saudis are supportive of the peace process and want to see it move forward.

Prince Sultan renewed the Saudi commitment to give it active support.

F-16 BUY

Q: Did Sultan express interest in buying F-16s?

A: The issue of F-16s was not raised during Prince Sultan's meeting with the President.

When and if we do receive a Saudi request, it will be examined in the usual manner by

State and Defense, who will make recommendations to the President.

We have a long-standing arms supply relationship with Saudi Arabia and their security is vitally important to us, but no decisions have been made at this time on any major new weapons sale.

KHOBAR TOWERS INVESTIGATION

Q: Is the Saudi Arabian government cooperating in the Khobar Towers bombing investigation?

A: This is an ongoing investigation in which the FBI has been working with its Saudi Arabian counterparts.

We have received some cooperation and we expect to receive more.

In that connection, we have been reassured by Prince Sultan that we will receive full cooperation.

RELATIONSHIP WITH U.S.

Q: How would you characterize our relations with Saudi Arabia?

A: The U.S. and Saudi Arabia share a close historic relationship resulting from the pivotal role played by U.S. companies in discovering Saudi oil in the 1930's.

Our relationship today is characterized by mutual respect, consultation and cooperation.

The U.S. and Saudi Arabia both benefit from a strong and balanced trade relationship.

Our country's principled stand with Saudi Arabia and other coalition allies against Iraqi aggression in 1990 and 1991 has deepened our security cooperation with those countries.

The U.S. and Saudi Arabia share important policy objectives, including regional security, the containment of Iran and Iraq, and a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East.

U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE

Q: What is the size of our military presence in Saudi Arabia?

A: The U.S. has approximately 5000 military personnel stationed in Saudi Arabia, with another 2000 there on a temporary basis. These figures are subject to fluctuation; the Department of Defense can provide up-to-date information.

The U.S. participates, along with Britain and France, in the Saudi-based Joint Task Forces/South West Asia (JTF/SWA) that enforces the U.N.-mandated no-fly zone over southern Iraq.

The U.S. military also provides essential training aimed at enabling Saudi Arabian military forces to defend their own territory.

We refer you to the Department of Defense for the numbers of personnel that perform these missions.

SECURITY FOR U.S. FORCES

Q: What is the security situation for U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia?

A: There continue to be threats directed against the American community, both private and official, in Saudi Arabia. We treat all such threats seriously.

We have undertaken a comprehensive review of every facility in Saudi Arabia where official Americans live and work and are taking measures to make our people as secure as possible.

Following the June 1996 bombing of the Khobar Towers residential building in Dhahran, most U.S. military in Saudi Arabia were moved from urban areas and relocated, with the support of the Saudi Arabian government, to more easily protected positions.

We would defer to the Defense Department for details of the relocation.

Last fall, the Secretaries of State and Defense signed a memorandum of understanding that clearly divides security responsibilities in country between the Ambassador and the CENTCOM Commander.

The Saudi authorities have been responsive in assessing these threats and taking precautionary measures.

USE OF FORCES AGAINST IRAQ

Q: Why couldn't we launch strikes from Saudi Arabia against Iraq last September?

A: Protecting Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and other Gulf countries from aggression is critical to our national interest. A U.S. military presence in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf serves as a powerful deterrent to the aggressive intentions of Iran and Iraq.

Ongoing close cooperation with the Saudis deterred Saddam from striking Kuwait in September 1994, and continues to deter Saddam from adventurism against Kuwait or Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia remains a key member of the international coalition against Iraq. During the crisis last September, the Saudis supported expansion of the southern no-fly zone.

The Saudis supported allied air operations throughout this period, and those air operations continue today.

[Note: Saudi Arabia turned down our request to launch strikes from its territory because of its concern about domestic public opinion. Saudi support was, however, critical to the success of Desert Strike -- a fact that is sensitive to the Saudis and that we would prefer, therefore, not to discuss publicly.]

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Q: Why don't the Saudis allow Americans in Saudi Arabia to worship as non-Muslims and what are you doing about it?

A: Reflecting widespread Saudi public sentiment, non-Muslim religious practice is illegal under Saudi law. This is noted in information available to Americans traveling to Saudi Arabia.

The fact that the U.S. considers this an abridgment of freedom of religion has been well documented, including in numerous Annual Human Rights Reports to the Congress.

The U.S. Mission in Saudi Arabia does not interfere with or restrict the exercise of religious beliefs. Employees are free to attend services and no restriction is imposed on home worship. The Mission does not interfere with the practice of faith by the many thousands of private Americans living and working in Saudi Arabia.

Non-Muslim religious services are held discreetly within the expatriate community in Saudi Arabia.

(Only if strongly pressed): Christian religious services are regularly held at the American Embassy in Riyadh.

Such services are not being held at the Consulates in Jeddah and Dhahran, because these services are being held elsewhere in those cities.

[Note: Although the Saudi Arabian government is aware of the religious services at the U.S. Embassy, we want to avoid public mention of this violation of Saudi Arabian law.]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Q: What is the human rights situation like in Saudi Arabia? What are we doing about it? Why don't we do more?

A: Information about human rights in Saudi Arabia is provided in our annual report to Congress.

Our concerns about human rights issues in Saudi Arabia are part of our ongoing dialogue with the Saudi government.

GOVERNMENT REFORM

Q: What is the state of government reform in Saudi Arabia?

A: King Fahd made several modest political reforms in 1992 and 1993.

The 60-member "Majlis al-Shura," a national advisory council, has a mandate to address social and economic issues. Majlis members have extensive experience in business, education, journalism, the military and administration. Half hold advanced university degrees from abroad and one-third from U.S. universities.

The Majlis hears testimony from experts and members of the government on significant domestic issues, then makes policy recommendations to the King.

Provincial councils, also established in 1993, play a similar role in managing regional and local issues.

It is too soon to judge how effective the Majlis will be in broadening participation in national-level decision-making.

COMMERCIAL CLAIMS

Q: Is Saudi Arabia responsive to U.S. commercial claims? If not, what are you doing

about it?

A: Saudi Arabia is our largest trading partner in the Middle East. Given the large and growing volume of bilateral trade, some commercial claims by American companies are inevitable. We have made considerable progress with Saudi Arabia in addressing claims that have been brought to our attention.

We are committed to making serious efforts to address new disputes with the Saudi Arabian government as they occur. We also continue to work with the Saudi Arabian government on all unresolved disputes.

Not every case has been resolved to the complete satisfaction of the U.S. companies, particularly cases where the Saudi Arabian government maintains that the dispute has been fully and fairly settled by the Saudi judicial process.

Even in such cases, the U.S. government continues to use its good offices to attempt to guide the parties to mutually agreeable conclusions. Our Ambassador and his country team officers are fully engaged on behalf of U.S. business.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
February 25,
1997

STATEMENT BY THE PRESS SECRETARY

President's Meeting with Prince Sultan of Saudi Arabia

President Clinton's meeting today with Prince Sultan -- Saudi Arabia's second Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defense and Aviation -- and his accompanying delegation is the latest chapter in a decades long relationship of mutual respect and support between the United States

and Saudi Arabia.

The President told Prince Sultan that we remain committed to ensuring security and stability in the critical Gulf region and will work with Saudi Arabia to respond to any external threats to our mutual interests. He stressed his determination to protect the security of American troops stationed in Saudi Arabia, and they discussed our cooperation in the fight against terrorism.

The President also told Prince Sultan we look forward to working with our Saudi Arabian friends to further the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. Saudi Arabia pledged its active support for the peace process.

Following the Presidential meetings, Prince Sultan and the Vice President, joined by their respective ministers of foreign affairs, commerce, and energy, discussed a number of issues of bilateral interest, concentrating on environmental, energy, economic and trade matters.

U.S.-Saudi relations are strong and will remain so. Our countries have been friends in peace and allies in war. We have expanding trade and commercial ties that benefit both our economies. U.S. firms have traditionally played an important role in the Saudi Arabian economy and we are working to maintain and expand our participation in Saudi Arabia's development. We are supporting Saudi Arabia's accession to the World Trade Organization, and we look forward to the increasing trade opportunities which will flow from Saudi Arabia's membership in the WTO.

Prince Sultan will be meeting tomorrow with Secretary Cohen to discuss bilateral defense issues in more detail. Prince Sultan will meet with Secretary Albright on Thursday to explore the range of diplomatic initiative underway or under review including, among other issues, the Middle East Peace Process, Afghanistan, Bosnia and our mutual efforts to contain the threat posed by Saddam. Prince Saud will also meet with Secretary Albright on Thursday. Also this week, the Saudi Arabian Ministers of Commerce and Petroleum and Deputy Minister of Finance will conduct bilateral discussions with their U.S. counterparts.

###

DIALOGUE WITH IRAQ

Q: What is your reaction to the Iraqi offer of dialogue with the U.S. expressed in the official Iraqi newspaper Al Thawra this week?

A: This is not a serious offer. It is a clumsy propaganda ploy.

The Iraqis know that actions speak louder than words, and they continue to evade their responsibilities to the Security Council.

The real point is Iraqi behavior. They must comply fully with all Security Council Resolutions.

KUWAIT LIBERATION DAY

Q: Any thoughts on the sixth anniversary of Kuwait Liberation Day?

A: February 26 was Kuwait Liberation Day. On this day six years ago, an international coalition led by the United States liberated Kuwait by driving the last of the brutal Iraqi occupation forces from that land.

It is appropriate for us on this anniversary to rededicate ourselves to the task of ensuring that aggressors like Saddam Hussein will never again threaten their neighbors and that the people of Kuwait and the other Gulf states can continue to live in peace and security.

Six years after the invasion, Iraq remains a threat to regional peace and stability. Baghdad has chosen to defy the U.N. through a combination of half-measures and deception. Even now, U.N. weapons inspectors are concerned that Iraq may still have weapons of mass destruction.

The U.S. remains determined to ensure that Iraq comply fully with all of its obligations under the UNSC resolutions. The U.S. will continue to oppose any relaxation of sanctions until Iraq demonstrates its peaceful intentions through such compliance, and will continue to work with its regional partners and other coalition members to maintain its commitment to the security of Kuwait and to the Gulf region.

TURKEY

TURKISH OIL AND GAS DEALS WITH IRAN

Q: Has the U.S. talked to the Turkish Government about their oil and gas deals with Iran?

A: The U.S. is in continuous dialogue with Turkey. There is no question that the government of Turkey understands our position: that we are concerned with any cooperation with Iran while Tehran continues its unacceptable international policies, notably support for terrorism, acquisition of weapons of mass destruction, and opposition to the Middle East Peace Process.

Q: Does the oil deal or the gas deal violate the D'Amato Bill?

A: It is too early to tell, but we are actively looking into the question.

STATUS OF TURKEY'S EFFORTS TO COMBAT THE PKK MILITARILY

☐ The Turkish Government is best positioned to provide details on the status of Turkey's campaign against the terrorist PKK. Our impression is that Turkey has made progress in reducing the violence and incidence of terrorism.

☐ We recognize Turkey's right to defend itself from the attacks of the vicious, terrorist PKK.

☐ However, we have also expressed our belief to the Turkish Government that, to be successful, it will have to pursue more than just a military solution to the conflict.

TURKISH OVERFLIGHTS OVER CYPRUS

☐ We have no independent information on these reports and are therefore unable to comment.

FMC SANCTIONS AGAINST JAPANESE SHIPPING

Background: The U.S. Government has pressed Japan for fifteen years to reform restrictive and discriminatory port practices without progress. The Japan Harbor Transport Association retains monopoly control over costly, non-transparent and discriminatory provision of port services (especially cargo unloading). Organized crime reputedly controls labor at the docks. GOJ appears to discriminate against U.S. shippers by refusing to license foreign cargo unloading companies. Following a 1995-96 investigation supported by American shipping lines, the FMC in November proposed sanctions. High-level demarches and meetings of relevant parties over the past few months have failed to produce progress.

Q: What is your reaction to the Federal Maritime Commission (FMC) announcement that it will impose \$100,000 per voyage sanctions on three Japanese shipping lines on April 14 in connection with port practices in that country?

A: The FMC is an independent agency, acting under its own authority. The Administration regrets Japan's failure to address restrictive and discriminatory port practices following years of discussion between our governments. Given these circumstances, we concur with the FMC action.

The liberalization that the United States, Europeans and others seek is consistent with Prime Minister Hashimoto's deregulation efforts. Reform of port practices in Japan would benefit both domestic and foreign carriers, consumers and manufacturers by reducing costs. Costs in Japanese ports are among the highest in the world and drive up

the price of goods imported by or exported from Japan.

Q: What happens next?

A: There is time to resolve this problem before sanctions are imposed on April 14. We are willing to work closely with the Japanese government achieve a solution that will benefit both nations.

Q: What authority does FMC have to make such a decision?

A: The Federal Maritime Commission is an independent U.S. government agency with authority to address unfavorable conditions in the U.S. international ocean shipping market. Its authority in this case is based on Section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

POLAND

Arson Attack on Warsaw Synagogue

- ☐ Tuesday night's fire, which seriously damaged Warsaw's only working synagogue, appears to have been an act of arson.
- ☐ We strongly condemn this ugly and despicable act.
- ☐ We welcome Polish President Kwasniewski's strong and immediate denunciation of this outrage, which he called an act of terror. We agree. We also welcome President Kwasniewski's statement that this and any such acts will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law in Poland.

MIDDLE EAST

HAR HOMA

Q: PLO Chairman Arafat recently said that the Israeli decision to build homes at Har Homa was illegal according to their agreements and international law. Do you agree?

A: Not going to get into the legalities. As we've said, we would have preferred that the decision not have been taken because it undermines rather than builds confidence between Israelis and Palestinians.

Q: Has the President received a letter from Chairman Arafat relating to Har Homa?

A: Yes. We will have an opportunity to discuss the concerns raised in the letter when the President meets with Chairman Arafat next Monday.

Q: So Arafat hasn't canceled his trip to the U.S.?

A: We're looking forward to seeing him on Monday.

Q: What's your reaction to the Israeli decision to build a new settlement in east Jerusalem?

A: Our focus now must be on building confidence and ultimately trust between Israelis and Palestinians. This is the only way to create a durable relationship between them.

Today's decision on Har Homa is not a step that will build confidence.

Frankly, we would have preferred that this decision not have been taken.

Q: Are you saying that you're opposed to settlements in east Jerusalem?

A: Our policy on Jerusalem is clear.

As for the decision on Har Homa, I just said that this undermines rather than builds confidence between Israelis and Palestinians.

And now is the time to accelerate the process of building confidence.

Q: Did you give Prime Minister Netanyahu a green light to go forward with this decision

when he was in Washington?

A: No. We made it clear that the priority now is to create the best possible environment for Israelis and Palestinians to work out the issues that divide them.

Q: But he ignored your advice, didn't he?

A: The Prime Minister heard what we had to say.

The question now is to focus on ways to ensure that Israelis and Palestinians work through the issues that divide them through the negotiations and that they do so in a practical way.

Q: What's your policy on settlements? Are they an obstacle to peace?

A: Said many times, settlements are a complicating factor in the negotiations, and they are unhelpful.

Q: Does that policy apply to Har Homa?

A: Said before that the decision on Har Homa undermines confidence and we would have preferred it not be taken.

DEATH OF A PALESTINIAN MAN IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

Q: What is your reaction to the slaying of a 56-year-old Palestinian man by a covert Israeli army unit?

A: We extend our deep condolences to the family of the slain man.

This is clearly a very regrettable incident.

We do not have any additional information on the circumstances that led to the killing at this time. We would refer you to the Israelis and the Palestinians for more detail. We understand that the Israelis may have initiated a formal inquiry.

VISITS BY LEADERS TO CONSULT ON PEACE PROCESS

-- The schedule of visits:

- Prime Minister Netanyahu - February 13
- Chairman Arafat - March 3
- President Mubarak - March 10
- King Hussein - March 18

POSSIBLE ISRAELI LAUNCHES IN U.S.
(for use on background)

- ☐ Israel Aircraft Industries has informed us it is considering bidding on launches of U.S. commercial payloads from U.S. launch sites.
- ☐ In that connection, Administration currently reviewing request for a site survey at a U.S. facility by IAI.
- ☐ It's a complex issue involving a number of considerations, among them non-proliferation, commercial space policy, and foreign policy.
- ☐ Not going to comment further while it is under review.

ISRAELI DECISION ON ROADS AROUND JERUSALEM

Q: Any comment on the Israeli decision to proceed with roads around Jerusalem?

A: We understand that the road which will be built was approved by Prime Minister Rabin's government to relieve congestion.

We would have preferred it not be done at this time.

Q: Why?

A: We have said to both parties since the Hebron agreement that they should act in ways which build confidence and enhance prospects for future progress.

We would prefer to see steps taken now which continue to build positive momentum.

Q: So there might be a time when you'd acquiesce?

A: We'd have preferred it not be done at this time.

Q: Was this step agreed to during Netanyahu's visit?

A: No.

Q: Was it discussed?

A: We don't get into the details in public of our diplomatic exchanges.

Q: You've said in the past that both sides should avoid steps which prejudice the outcome of permanent status talks? Is that still your view?

A: Yes, that remains our view.

Q: Is this such a step?

A: We've said we would have preferred it not be done at this time.

KOREA

NORTH KOREA AGREES TO ATTEND U.S./ROK JOINT BRIEFING

Q: Has North Korea agreed to attend the joint briefing on the four-party peace proposal?
Did the United States offer any food aid to the North in exchange for their attendance? Is there a connection between the U.S. decision to participate in the UN World Food Program appeal and North Korea's decision to attend the joint briefing?

A: North Korea contacted us Wednesday and requested the joint briefing be rescheduled to the first week in March. Subsequently, the U.S., South Korea and North Korea agreed on 5 March as the date of the joint briefing. The briefing was originally scheduled to occur 29 January, but was postponed by the North.

The United States and South Korea have not offered North Korea food aid in exchange for its attendance at the joint briefing. The United States and South Korea have responded to the UN WFP food aid appeal for North Korea on a humanitarian basis as we did last year. There is no connection between U.S. and South Korea participation in the WFP appeal and the joint briefing. The North contacted us about rescheduling the briefing.

[FYI for background only: The U.S. and South Korea have been straight forward in our contact with the North and have clearly told them that our response to the WFP appeal is based on humanitarian reasons only. The North may choose to use the U.S. and ROKG participation as a face-saving rationale for rescheduling the joint briefing, BUT NO connection was ever suggested or intended.]

DPRK DEFECTOR IN BEIJING

Q: What's the situation with the North Korean defector? Have we been asked by the ROK to intervene with the PRC? Have we? Have we met with the defector? Do we believe the situation on the peninsula is unstable and North is near collapse? Will we provide \$10 million in food aid? Is the ROK against that? Have we engaged in a failed effort over the last six months to get the North to open up?

A: Since start of administration, been working to create more secure, stable environment on peninsula, in consultation with ROK Ally. First goal, obligation in all of Korea policy is to deter attack; that's why we maintain 37,000 troops in ROK.

-- 1994 Framework agreement froze North's nuclear program, shut down nuclear facilities, placed spent fuel under safeguards, will eventually replace it with safer, more proliferation-resistant nuclear power financed largely by others.

-- Framework agreement also set goals for North/South dialogue and changes in US relationship with N. Korea. Some of these objectives met, e.g. canning of spent fuel, missile proliferation discussions, KEDO; others remain works in progress, e.g. establishment of liaison offices.

-- US/ROK proposal for Four-party talks grows out of overall effort to address security, stability on peninsula. Believe proposal holds long-term promise, important for North to sit down, hear what proposal could mean for them.

-- Shooting in Seoul under investigation; will await

investigation's outcome. USG interest in Beijing defector case narrow: that it be resolved peacefully and in accordance with international norms with respect to asylum. Also encourage Chinese, Koreans not to let issue drag on.

-- Change in North Korean rhetoric could presage solution; won't speculate.

-- Formal WFP food aid request received 13 FEB. Our response will be based on US humanitarian policy: won't use food as weapon; hungry children aren't our enemy. Expect to contribute significant portion of \$40 million appeal. [IF RAISED: ROK aware of USG approach, support it; ROK reviewing WFP appeal, understand they're inclined to treat it favorably.]

-- Can't be certain about North's stability; opaque society, clearly under stress. Framework agreement, Four-Party Talks proposal lets us respond in step-by-step way. Will pursue that, but also avoid misunderstanding, miscalculation in North about USG commitment to defend ROK.

U.S. HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTERS: RUSSIA, CHINA

Q: The Administration has stated that it has not approved high performance computers to Russian facilities that have been associated in the past with the Russian nuclear weapons program (Arzamas and Chelyabinsk). Yet Ministry of Atomic Energy (Minatom) officials have been quoted as saying that Minatom has purchased several supercomputers that are now installed at their nuclear research centers, including both Silicon Graphics systems and an IBM supercomputer bought through a European middleman. What's the story?

A: The Administration has not approved the export of any high performance computers to the two Russian nuclear centers, nor do we have any requests pending for such exports.

However, we are aware of the recent press statements made by Minatom officials.

The Departments of Commerce and Justice are conducting a joint investigation into the export of the Silicon Graphics and IBM systems to Minatom. We are taking this issue very seriously.

The companies involved are cooperating, and the Russian Government has offered its cooperation in the investigation. Because there is an active investigation, however, further comment at this time would be inappropriate.

Q: What about reports that Silicon Graphics also exported computers to China's Academy of Sciences last year?

A: We also are aware of these reports, in which Silicon Graphics apparently discussed an export to China's Academy of Sciences. The Commerce and Justice joint investigation will examine the range of Silicon Graphics' exporting practices.

Q: In early 1996, the Administration liberalized its controls on computer exports. What level of computers were liberalized to Russia? To China?

A: In January 1996, the Administration implemented the following computer export policy to, among other countries, Russia and China:

- ☐ Computers at any level require an export license when the exporter knows, or has reason to know, that the shipment is being made to a facility engaged in, among other activities, the design, development, production or stockpiling of nuclear weapons.
- ☐ Computers up to 2000 MTOPS may be sold to all other end users in Russia and China, including military end-users, without a license.
- ☐ Computers up to 7000 MTOPS may be sold to strictly civilian end users for civilian uses, without a license.
- ☐ Computers above 7000 MTOPS, for all end users/end-uses, require a license.

Q: Isn't it difficult for a company to know in every case whether an end-user is civilian, or military, or engaged in proliferation activities?

A: It can be. That is why U.S. exporters have been clearly instructed to contact the government (i.e., the Commerce Department) when they are uncertain about an end-user.

Q: Would you expect U.S. exporters to know that the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy (MINATOM) was engaged in nuclear weapons work? Did the government let exporters know that these two sites were end users of concern?

A: Minatom and the sites at Arzamas and Chelyabinsk have been long associated with the Russian nuclear weapons program. In fact, there have been several recent press reports about these facilities.

We expect U.S. exporters to know their customers. In fact, U.S. companies have contacted the Commerce Department to ask if shipments to these two entities would be approved. This indicates that U.S. exporters doing business with Minatom have understood their obligations to seek export licenses before making any shipments.

If an exporter had any doubts about the activities of Minatom, however, that company had an obligation to resolve those doubts or to contact the government for assistance.

Q: What has the Administration done to ensure that more U.S. supercomputers don't go to these sites without an export license?

A: The relevant companies have been contacted, and we are satisfied that they are aware that computer shipments to these end users require an export license.

Q: Don't these shipments show that the Administration's computer policy was a mistake, and has allowed a serious breach to our national security - namely that U.S. supercomputers are now helping the Russians refine their nuclear

weapons, or the
Chinese build long range missiles?

A: The Administration's computer policy recognized the growing worldwide availability of high performance computers. It also recognized that U.S.-origin computers should not be shipped to certain end users without explicit U.S. authorization.

This was, and is, a reasonable balance to our security and economic interests that was carefully considered and supported by all of the national security agencies involved in the export policy development process, including Defense, Energy, State and Commerce.

A shipment of U.S.-origin high performance computers to the Russian nuclear weapons program or the Chinese missile development program without proper authorization is a matter for our enforcement officials. In order to determine if any U.S. export regulations have been violated, an investigation has been initiated.

KASHMIR

Q: Does Wisner's recent trip to Kashmir indicate that the U.S. has changed its policy toward the territory?

A: No. U.S. position remains the same. The Kashmiri dispute needs to be resolved through negotiations between India and Pakistan that must take into account the wishes of the people of Kashmir.

It is our position that all territory of the former princely states of Jammu and Kashmir remains disputed.

TRIPS AND VISITORS

☐ VP and PM Chernomyrdin announced that POTUS and Yeltsin will meet in Helsinki March

20-21. POTUS will then travel to Denmark March 21; first visit to Denmark by sitting President.

☐ Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada will make an official visit to Washington on April 8.

☐ Chilean President Frei arrives February 26 for a state visit.

☐ President will travel to Mexico April 11-12, Latin America and the Caribbean May 6-13.

☐ President will travel to Netherlands May 28 for US-EU Summit and Marshall Plan commemoration event. No details yet.

☐ Announced that Portuguese Prime Minister Guterres will be here for meeting and working lunch April 3. Do not yet know what other events will be included in his visit.

☐ Also announced that Spanish President Aznar will be here April 30 for meeting and working lunch. Again, no details available.

☐ G-7 Summit in Denver June 20-22.

If asked about Bruton visit:

☐ Yes, we expect Irish Prime Minister here for annual St. Patrick's Day celebration.

If asked about Hashimoto Visit

Background: The Japanese Embassy received guidance this morning in reaction to a leaked story in Tokyo about a possible Hashimoto visit to Washington in April. The Japanese are saying, "The Prime Minister intends to visit Washington in late April and the two governments have begun consultations."

☐ We have seen reports indicating that PM Hashimoto wishes to visit Washington this spring.

☐ Nothing on the President's schedule yet.

ZAIRE

Q: Is the U.S. involved in Zairian peace talks?

A: The Government of South Africa and the United States of America are engaged in dialogue with representatives of the Government of Zaire and the Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo-Zaire (AFDL) for the purpose of ending hostilities in Eastern Zaire, facilitating the provision of relief to displaced persons and refugees as well as refugee repatriation, and establishing the framework for future dialogue between the parties to resolve the internal and regional dimensions of the conflict. These efforts have been undertaken in support of the work of United Nations, the OAU, and the Nairobi Regional Initiative's efforts to resolve the crisis in the Great Lakes region.

Q: What is the status of the peace process?

A: Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo-Zaire (AFDL) leader Laurent Desire Kabila and his delegation left South Africa February 28 following meetings with South African and American officials. He has said he will engage in consultations related to the peace process. A member of the Government delegation has also returned to Kinshasa for brief consultations. Progress is being made, and we expect these discussions to continue.

The United Nations calls upon both the Government of Zaire and the AFDL to refrain from any military action in coming days that would undermine prospects for peace and create further suffering and instability in Zaire. Continued hostilities would only serve to undermine the initial steps now underway to find a peaceful solution to the crisis in Eastern Zaire.

Q: Does the Zairian delegation have authority to negotiate?

A: President Mobutu has assured the South African Government that his Security Advisor,

Mr. Honore Ngbanda Nzambo-Ko-Atumba, is the President's representative in these initial stages of the peace process. As the process evolves, we expect representatives of Prime Minister Kengo's Government to take the lead in any peace negotiations.

Q: Are these discussions linked to any other initiatives for Eastern Zaire?

A: American and South African contacts with the Zairian parties are complementary with the efforts of the United Nations, the OAU and the Nairobi Regional Initiative. We are in close consultation with UN/OAU Special Representative Sahnoun, EU Special Envoy Ajello, and concerned governments.

CYPRUS

Q: What is the U.S. reaction to recent Turkish violations of Cypriot airspace?

A: We have no independent information that Turkish military aircraft have overflowed Cyprus. We note that we have been concerned for many months about tensions created by Turkish and Greek overflights of Cyprus.

We have worked hard to promote a solution to this issue through a flight moratorium, first advanced by then-Ambassador Albright during her trip to the region last summer.

During his last trip to the region, Mr. Cavanaugh advanced this tension-reducing measure as part of our efforts to reduce the crisis atmosphere in the region. Unfortunately, it has not yet been possible to finalize a moratorium of military overflights. Mr. Cavanaugh was able to secure Turkey's agreement to our moratorium proposal -- contingent upon acceptance by the other side. But on January 17, in Athens, President Clerides told journalists that he could not yet accept such a moratorium.

SOUTH AFRICA: ARMSCOR SETTLEMENT

Q: South African export violations of U.S. origin defense articles took place before the Mandela government took office. Why did the State Department pursue this case with the current South African Government?

A: The export violations were committed by various companies, two of which are owned by the South African government. The companies in question were subject to criminal and civil sanctions. Both the U.S. and the South African governments, as well as the companies, were eager to put the question of the violations behind them and reach an appropriate resolution of the cases. To do that, the cases had to be resolved.

Q: How can settlement be justified? What signal does this send to other potential violators?

A: This settlement was the result of a long and difficult negotiating process which the court has accepted as meeting the requirements of U.S. law regarding the export of U.S.-origin defense articles. We appreciate that this South African government has taken on commitments to ensure its companies will comply with U.S. laws and regulations in the future.

The signal sent to potential violators elsewhere is that trade in U.S.-origin defense articles carries with it serious legal obligations and that the USG is serious about enforcing arms export control laws.

Q: What did the companies do?

A: The South African companies were charged with acquiring U.S. defense articles, without the required USG approval, during the time of a U.S. and international arms embargo against South Africa.

The Justice Department's criminal indictment lists specific violations with which the

parties were charged, but we refer you to the Justice Department for those details.

Q: Will the South African companies involved in this case now be able to export and import U.S. defense articles and technology? If not, at what point will they become eligible?

A: Once plea agreements are entered, the companies will be subject to a period of debarment from participation in exports from the U.S. of defense articles and services.

When the South African companies take certain steps specified in the agreement--e.g., establishment of mutually satisfactory internal programs that help ensure compliance with U.S. export law and regulations regarding U.S. origin articles--the debarments would be lifted. The agreements also contain provisions for reimposing the debarments if the State Department determines that the companies have not fully complied with their compliance programs.

Q: Are these companies debarred from defense trade transactions with the United States?

A: For some time, these companies have been denied defense trade privileges, at first as part of the arms embargo against South Africa and later as a matter of U.S. policy because of alleged export violations. Under the terms of the agreement and after the entry of their pleas, the companies will be debarred until they have satisfied the criteria in the agreements.

Q: What information do you have that these companies are now complying with U.S. law and policy with regard to U.S.-origin defense articles?

A: The U.S. and the South African governments will monitor the performance of the companies involved to ensure their compliance to the terms of the agreement.

IF ASKED ONLY:

Q: Are any of these companies involved in any way with potential sales to Syria?

A: The ARMSCOR/KENTRON case involves several companies, subsidiaries and affiliates that are involved in South Africa defense trade. I'm not going to get into hypothetical questions about which of these might or might not be involved in other transactions that may or may not take place. Defense sales must be reviewed and approved by appropriate South African government authorities who are aware that the United States broadly opposes sales of military equipment to any country that is a state sponsor of terrorism.

Q: Why did the U.S. settle these cases at a time when South Africa is considering selling arms to Syria? Is this the right time to settle cases that involve arms violations?

A: The ARMSCOR/KENTRON and FUCHS cases concerned past violations involving U.S. defense equipment. We have agreed to a method to redress these problems and have established the means to verify compliance with relevant law and regulations.

Concerning the reported potential sale of South African arms to Syria, we have had discussions in diplomatic channels, including at the most senior levels of government, and South Africa has said it will take U.S. and other countries' views into consideration in making a decision.

Q: We understand that Senator Helms, noting the potential sales to Syria, specifically requested that the State Department not conclude these agreements. Why did you proceed with them?

A: We view these as separate issues.

The agreements that have been reached address law enforcement concerns that arose because of past violations in handling U.S. defense articles. The USG and the Government of South Africa, through the compliance agreements, have established a

mutually satisfactory mechanism that will help prevent similar violations.

CUBA: EXTENDING EMERGENCY IN FLORIDA STRAIT

Background: The President today (Friday) is notifying the Congress that he is continuing the national emergency with regard to Cuba -- first declared in the wake of Cuba's shootdown of two U.S. aircraft one year ago -- under which the U.S. Coast Guard can regulate certain vessel activity in the Florida Strait.

Q: Why is the President extending the emergency? Wasn't last Monday's peaceful commemorative activity evidence of diminished tensions in the Florida Strait?

A: The President first declared a national emergency to address the disturbance or threatened disturbance of international relations caused by Cuba's destruction of two unarmed U.S. aircraft in international airspace on February 24, 1996. Four innocent men lost their lives in that act of brutality.

Since then, despite international condemnation of the incident, the Cuban Government has not accepted responsibility for the shootdown, nor has it forsworn the use of force against civilian aircraft. In fact, as recently as two weeks ago, Cuba reiterated that it will use whatever means it deems necessary against vessels and

The President has chosen to extend the emergency because of the continuing danger to U.S. citizens and permanent residents posed by Cuba's policies and practices.

Q: What does continuing the emergency mean?

A: The proclamation authorizes the Secretary of Transportation and the U.S. Coast Guard to establish and implement regulations governing certain vessel activities in the Florida Strait. In particular, it allows the Coast Guard to implement regulations prohibiting

masters and crews from entering Cuban territorial waters without first attaining Coast Guard approval.

Enforcement of the regulations has helped avoid misunderstandings and potentially dangerous situations during several seaborne activities that Cuban-American groups have held in the Strait to commemorate the pilots shot down last year and to demonstrate against the Castro regime.

NATIONAL GUARD FUNDING WOES

Background: In a February 28 AP story, the National Guard Association contends the FY98 budget submission underfunds the National Guard by \$740 million. Army National Guard leaders assert that the proposed budget would "irreparably harm" the Guard by under funding training and maintenance programs. The article also cited recent testimony by Defense Secretary Cohen where Cohen said he would look into this matter.

☐ Understand from the AP story that Secretary Cohen has promised to look into the matter, so recommend National Guard budget questions be addressed to DoD.

☐ President has been a strong supporter of the National Guard, both as Governor of Arkansas and President of the United States. Under this President, the Guard and Reserve have achieved increased levels of integration with the Active military components and have been involved in every major military operation over the last several years (Haiti, Bosnia, etc.).

☐ President has more than once stressed his commitment to a strong National Guard. In his September 1996 speech to the National Guard Association, the President noted that "our use of the Reserve Components has been one of the secrets of our success" and that he "will not let the Guard become the backup force of last resort."

