

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Robert Malley to Peter Bass, Kristen Cicio, Glyn Davies et al. Subject: UNHCR - Racism Resolution. (3 pages)	04/14/1997	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Records (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Senator Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/10/1997-04/15/1997]

2006-1363-F

vz5621

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 10 April 97 19:16
FROM Johnson, David T.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: GUIDANCE UPDATE FOR FRIDAY [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.
Kuipers, Keelin G.
Moore, Lori A.
Norris, John J.
Orfini, Michael H.
Wise, William M.
Woolston, Ann E.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

From: Rubin, Eric S.
To: @ALLNSC - NSC Staff
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: GUIDANCE UPDATE FOR FRIDAY [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, April 10, 1997 04:19 PM

[[APR10GUI.DOC : 4885 in APR10GUI.DOC]]

Please provide updates/changes/additions/deletions no later than 10 am
Friday 4/11 to @PRESS. Many thanks.

P

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 10 April 97 16:18
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** APR10GUI.DOC

NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

April 10, 1997

Zaire

Mykonos Verdict

Middle East

Dalai Lama

CWC

Chile

Russia/NIS

Saudi Arabia/Khobar

Bosnia

China

Trips and Visitors

Northern Ireland

Gulf War Illnesses

Nazi Assets

Fast Track

Angola

ZAIRE

Q: Is the U.S. urging that Mobutu step down?

A: The U.S. has been pressing for a negotiated solution to the conflict in Zaire and for a cessation of hostilities. We recognize that any negotiated solution is likely to entail agreement on interim transitional government arrangements leading ultimately to elections. For negotiations to succeed, the government of President Mobutu as well as the rebels must recognize a need for a change in the status quo. We believe the era of Mobutuism is past, and we urge both sides to work

together to find a negotiated solution to the current crisis in order to bring stable and representative government to Zaire.

Q: What is the U.S. reaction to the negotiations that concluded yesterday in South Africa?

A: We welcome reports of initial progress achieved in the first round of face-to-face talks between representatives of the government of Zaire and the Alliance. The communique issued by both sides indicates several areas of agreement and offers some hope for an eventual negotiated settlement. We fully support the efforts of UN Special Representative Sahnoun and the government of South Africa and welcome the progress achieved thus far.

Q: Can you give an update on the fighting and the political situation?

A: We understand Lubumbashi was occupied by the Rebel Alliance April 9, although some pockets of resistance remain.

President Mobutu named General Likulia Bolongo as Prime Minister April 9. Likulia has said he will name his cabinet today, but we don't have anything on that yet. We understand Etienne Tshisekedi is at home today; he has not been detained.

We have seen reports that rebel leader Kabila has publicly announced there would be a pause in Alliance military operations for a period of three days during which he hoped President Mobutu would make direct contact with him to arrange for his (Mobutu's) departure.

Q: (If asked) Do you recognize Likulia as the Prime Minister?

A: We do not take a position on who the Zairian Prime Minister should be. That is an internal Zairian matter.

Q: Do we still recognize Mobutu as head of state?

A: Mobutu is still the President of Zaire.

We believe Mobutu's system of government is finished, however. We think it is time for a new democratic form of government in Zaire, arrived at through direct negotiations between the government and rebels leading to elections with all parties participating.

Q: Has Ambassador Simpson seen Mobutu in the past few days?

A: No.

(if asked) Our Ambassador has requested an appointment with Mobutu, but it has not been set yet. Simpson last met with Mobutu in January.

Q: How many official Americans are still in Zaire?

A: There are 52 official Americans in Zaire at this time.

Q: What is the threat status? Is it safe for Americans to remain?

A: The situation in Kinshasa is calm today.

The Department issued a travel warning for Zaire March 20 which strongly encouraged Americans to depart Zaire in light of the uncertain political and security situation and the potential for unrest throughout the country. The travel warning remains in effect.

Q: What is the evacuation status?

A: There is no change. Americans who wish to depart Zaire at this time are able to do so via

MYKONOS VERDICT

(Type in State guidance from Thursday)

MIDDLE EAST

Q: Any progress in getting the talks between the Palestinians and Israelis re-started? Will you exert more pressure on Netanyahu to stop construction at Har Homa?

A: I don't have a lot to add to what I've said in the last few days. The Palestinian negotiators will be meeting Secretary Albright and her team today. We'll be reviewing with them ideas for dealing with the current impasse. And we are continuing to consult with the Israeli government. This is not going to be a quick or easy process, but we'll just keep working on it.

IF PRESSED ON WHAT'S NEEDED FROM PARTIES

As I have made clear, we need to see two things to get this process back on track:

- o There needs to be zero tolerance for terror. Israel has a right to expect a 100% effort by the Palestinian Authority to

prevent acts of terror and to take stern measures against those who seek to carry out such acts.

o And a readiness by both parties to take steps which build confidence in the integrity of the negotiating process in order to move forward.

Q: What are the next steps? Is Albright going out? Ross?

A: We're considering that now.

Don't rule out sending the Secretary or Ross to the region for follow-up on the discussions here, but we have not yet made any final decisions.

Q: Do you agree or disagree with PM Netanyahu that Arafat has not kept his commitments, such as amending the Palestinian Charter, collecting weapons, etc.?

A: Obviously we expect the Palestinians to keep their commitments. That's an integral part of maintaining confidence between the two sides so that they can move forward.

IF PRESSED ON WHETHER ARAFAT IS DOING ENOUGH TO PREVENT TERRORISM

A:

I've made it clear repeatedly that Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian Authority need to demonstrate zero tolerance for terrorism.

DALAI LAMA

□ The Dalai Lama, religious leader of Tibetan Buddhists and Nobel laureate, is always a most welcome visitor to the United States.

□ Americans have tremendous feelings of goodwill toward His Holiness and adherents of Tibetan Buddhism in the United States and elsewhere.

□ The administration welcomes the Dalai Lama's visit and looks forward to discussions with him.

□ He will be meeting members of the administration, but at what level and with whom has not been decided.

☐ As a religiously diverse nation, we also welcome the contributions to our nation's spiritual life of Americans who have embraced Tibetan Buddhism.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

☐ CWC enjoys broad, bipartisan support: President Bush, Colin Powell, Brent Scowcroft, Jim Baker, Ed Rowney, Paul Nitze and other leading Republican foreign policy experts support it.

☐ CWC will reduce the threat to our soldiers by requiring others to do what we are already doing -- getting out of the chemical weapons business.

☐ CWC will also make it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons by eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting the flow of chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons.

☐ Recognize that the CWC will not "solve" either the proliferation or terrorism problem. But it is a key element of any effective response.

☐ Treaty has been before the Senate since November 1993. There have been 13 Senate hearings, hundreds of questions answered for the record and numerous briefings of both members and staff. More than 1500 pages of information has been provided to the Senate. It's time for the Senate to debate and vote.

☐ If we do not ratify by April 29, Americans will be less secure. We will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons.

☐ The United States will also not have a seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors. And Americans now serving in key posts, including as head of security, administration, and industry inspections, will be replaced by nationals from countries that have ratified.

□ Without ratification, the credibility of American leadership across a full range of transnational issues will be undermined.

□ Finally, American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

HELMS AND CWC

Q: During Secretary Albright's visit to North Carolina last week, Senator Helms indicated that he would probably allow the Senate to move forward with a vote on the Chemical Weapons Convention. What is your reaction?

A: We are encouraged by the Senator's comments about the prospects for Senate action on this vital treaty. Over the past two months, we have worked closely with Senator Helms and other members of the Steering Committee established by the Majority Leader to try to address the concerns that have been raised about the treaty. We look forward to a Senate vote by mid-April -- in time for the U.S. to be an original party to the treaty.

Q: What is your reaction to Senator Helms statement that the Administration has delayed responding to his request for negotiations with his staff over the CWC?

A: In early January, the Majority Leader and I agreed to work together to try to address the concerns of members of the Republican caucus regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention.

We have been negotiating in good faith. National Security Adviser Berger has led the Administration team which has met four times with the Majority Leader's task force. These principal meetings have been followed by four extensive senior staff sessions.

Senator Helms, who is a member of the Lott group, has proposed about 30 conditions

and in nearly every case we have either reached agreement on a compromise formulation that can be accepted by the Senate or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

Our objective has been to work with the Majority Leader and the members of his CWC task force to facilitate a timely debate in the Senate on the Convention prior to April 29, when the Convention comes into force. I welcome Senator Lott's statement on Thursday that he is working a process to get the CWC done in April and that it is not his intention to stonewall on this.

Q: Senator Helms claims that unless the Administration satisfies his key concerns over the Treaty it will never reach the Senate floor and that the Administration needs to address his broader concerns regarding State Department reorganization, UN reform, and the handling of other arms control treaties in the Senate.

A: We disagree with Senator Helms that this treaty will do nothing to reduce the dangers of poison gas. During our extensive negotiations with Senator Helms and his staff, we have identified a list of key issues where we cannot agree with Senator Helms' proposed conditions. We believe these outstanding issues and our proposed alternative conditions should be debated and voted upon.

While the Administration is prepared to continue to address the broader issues Senator Helms has raised, direct linkage with the CWC is a prescription for inaction, which we cannot afford as the clock ticks on entry into force of this agreement.

Q: Senator Helms claims the April 29 date is a "chicken little" deadline with no meaning and that the Administration is trying to blackmail the Senate.

A: April 29 is a real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act positively, we will deny ourselves access to the treaty's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. We will deny ourselves the

ability to require other states to do what we are doing already on our own--getting rid of our chemical weapons.

Without ratification the credibility of American leadership across the full range of proliferation issues will be undermined. The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty.

American chemical companies will also begin losing sales to their overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in.

CHILE

Q: Has the Administration decided to permit the sale of advanced fighters to Chile?

A: No. The USG has decided to authorize the issuance of marketing licenses to companies which wish to compete in Chile's selection of fighter aircraft, while making clear to both the Government of Chile and to the companies involved that there has been no decision on whether to permit the sale itself.

The licenses are for marketing information only and do not constitute approval for an actual sale. A decision whether to permit such sale has not been made.

This decision to issue marketing licenses was made so as not to disadvantage U.S. companies in the competition. These licenses allow these companies to provide the Government of Chile with technical data on advanced fighter aircraft.

Q: Has the U.S. changed its Latin American conventional arms transfer policy?

A: No. As you know, the Administration is reviewing U.S. conventional arms transfer policy toward Latin America in the context of the significant political, economic, and

military changes that have been occurring in the past ten years.

This policy review is on-going. While the review is underway current policy remains unchanged.

Q: What is the current policy on arms exports to Latin America?

A: Our policy worldwide is to consider pending arms transfers on a case-by-case basis.

Our long-standing policy in Latin America is, and remains, to address potential transfers in the context of restraint.

Q: Why is a review necessary?

A: The welcome expansion and strengthening of democracy and democratic institutions in recent years makes it prudent for us to undertake this policy review to determine whether any changes in our policy are appropriate.

Our policy goals for the countries of Latin America are to enhance democracy, including civilian control of the military, foster regional stability, transparency and confidence building, and ensure that the weapons modernization decisions of these countries address legitimate defense needs within their existing economic resources.

Any possible change made to our current arms export policy will be in accordance with these goals.

RUSSIA/NIS

Primakov Comments in Paris on possible May 27 Signing of NATO-Russia Accord

☐ Noted Foreign Minister's comments on prospects for reaching agreement on NATO-Russia relationship in advance of Madrid summit -- encouraged Russia taking positive tack toward issue.

☐ Primakov's idea interesting, we're prepared to consider late May

meeting to sign Charter --
of course, first need to finish document, actually have agreement
between NATO and Russia
-- before we can set date, make concrete plans for any event.

If pressed on suggestion of Paris as venue and/or on May date

☐ Obviously first order of business to get agreement on document
spelling out relationship; if
that's successful, sure we with NATO members and Russia can
settle on time and place.

NATO-Russia

☐ Consultations with Russia continue; NATO Secretary General
Solana goes to Moscow again
next week to discuss contents of proposed agreement with
Primakov.

☐ Plans for NATO enlargement also proceeding on schedule -- Madrid
summit on track; will
issue first invitations to prospective new members.

☐ Enlargement part of broader effort to build comprehensive
European security system, which
includes strong NATO-Russia relationship. It is going forward in
way that does not threaten
any nation's security, enhances stability in Europe.

☐ In Helsinki, President and Yeltsin disagreed over enlargement
but agreed to work together to
build cooperative NATO-Russia relationship.

☐ See Russia as partner of NATO in shaping more secure, stable and
undivided Europe. That is
good for United States, Russia and Europe.

Allegations of Corruption in Ukraine

☐ Seriously concerned about reports of corruption coming from wide
range of American
businesses operating in Ukraine. Have made clear to Ukrainian
leadership that they must act
decisively to create open, transparent climate for investment.

☐ Ukraine proposed measures to improve investment climate in
legislative package now before
parliament; passage of package would send signal that Ukraine is
serious about investment;

also a prerequisite to \$2.5 billion multilateral support package.

☐ Congress earmarked \$225 million in assistance to Ukraine for FY97, same level proposed for FY98; ability to use this effectively depends on whether Ukraine acts on serious reform agenda, combats crime; if progress not made, will discuss appropriate actions with Congress.

(If Raised -- Risk of U.S. Funds Diverted?)

☐ U.S. does not provide cash assistance to Ukraine; assistance provided in form of technical expertise, exchange programs, selected equipment and humanitarian commodities, all of which are carefully monitored.

Russia Signs Integration Treaty with Belarus

☐ Russia and Belarus signed Treaty April 2; not very different from last year's agreement; provides for territorial integrity, sovereignty, independence of Russia and Belarus; allows one month for public comment prior to submitting to parliaments for ratification.

☐ We have no objections in principle to integration as long as voluntary, mutually beneficial, done on basis of equality, does not harm relations with other countries or create new divisions among nations.

☐ Remain concerned about political developments in Belarus -- restrictions on personal and press freedoms; unwarranted actions against foreigners, including recent expulsion of U.S. diplomat; recalled our Ambassador for consultations on situation; have cut U.S. assistance.

General Items

Helsinki Summit and Aftermath, Way Forward in U.S.-Russia Relations

☐ Welcomed Yeltsin's positive comments on summit results; Helsinki confirmed U.S.-Russian intention to work together, work through tough issues. As Yeltsin said, "our choice is for cooperation."

Yeltsin Claims Promise of Full G-8?

☐ Denver meeting will be Denver Summit of Eight; will build on increased Russian involvement; Yeltsin to arrive and depart with others; will be one press conference by leaders of the Eight.

☐ Seven will still discuss economic, financial matters; expect this to be small part of agenda.

IMF Resumes Russia Program

☐ Welcome IMF Managing Director Camdessus' comments that Russia taking necessary reforms, management steps to resume IMF program. Shows confidence in new economic team. Expect decision to be made formally later this month by IMF board.

SAUDI ARABIA -- KHOBAR BOMBING

Q: Are we getting cooperation from Syria on the Khobar bombing investigation?

A: The investigation into the Khobar bombing is ongoing. We do not comment on investigations in progress.

Regarding Syria, I'm not going to discuss the details of our diplomatic exchanges with other governments, particularly when they involve a matter under investigation.

Q: Are the Saudis helping? What have we learned from the suspect detained by Canada?

A: As I've said before, we have gotten cooperation from the Saudis and we've been assured at the highest levels of the Saudi Government that more cooperation will be forthcoming.

As has been reported, Canada has detained an individual who may have information about Khobar. I'd refer you to the FBI for any comment on that.

Q: But the Canadians charged this guy with participating in the

bombing and the papers they filed indicate he has links to Syria and Iran. Do you concur with the Canadian assessment of his culpability? Does this mean we're going to finally take action against Iran? Will it be military action?

A: Canada did make some specific allegations in the papers the Canadian government filed with its own courts. As you know, we, too, have an investigation ongoing.

At this time in our own investigation, it is neither necessary nor appropriate to make specific public charges or allegations. The FBI, the agency in our government that is in charge of this investigation and the agency that has been working with Canada, will follow all leads and will take them to their appropriate conclusion.

We are treating this as a criminal, law enforcement investigation. I'm not going to speculate about the outcome of the investigation or any actions that outcome might require.

Q: So you're ruling out any military action against Iran based on the clear and convincing evidence Canada's authorities have submitted to their courts?

A: I'm declining to speculate on the outcome of the case. Nothing more, nothing less.

BOSNIA

Humanitarian and Economic Assistance to Bosnia

☐ The U.S. has provided extensive humanitarian and emergency assistance during and following the war in Bosnia, but the focus in 1997 and beyond is increasingly on economic reconstruction efforts and helping to foster a stable, democratic Bosnia with a functioning market economy.

☐ U.S. humanitarian assistance to the Former Yugoslavia totaled about \$400 million in FY96,

including USAID, State and DoD contributions. With peace now taking root and the focus shifting to economic reconstruction, we expect the humanitarian assistance totals to be substantially smaller in FY97 and will be even less in FY98.

☐ In terms of economic reconstruction, we are now in the second year of a three year, \$600 million assistance program through USAID that has been approved by Congress. The FY98 request as part of this program is for about \$225 million. We, of course, also indirectly provide substantial economic assistance through support of international institutions such as the World Bank.

SFOR Mission Duration

☐ We believe that SFOR's mission should be completed in 18 months. 18 months should give sufficient extra time needed to establish conditions to maintain security and stability without an outside military presence.

Kasich Legislation/Premature Withdrawal from Bosnia

☐ We strongly urge that this legislation not be pursued. Passage of the proposed legislation and unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops could lead to a resumption of the war in Bosnia, a serious crisis in the NATO alliance, and an abdication of U.S. credibility and leadership in Europe and around the world.

Radovan Karadzic

☐ Karadzic has been out of power for almost one year. In accordance with the agreement reached with Republika Srpska, he is banned from participating in any political activities or making public appearances. We continue to monitor the situation to ensure Republika Srpska lives up to this agreement. However, we will not be satisfied until Karadzic and all others indicted by the War Crimes Tribunal stand trial in The Hague.

War Criminals

☐ We continue to remain deeply concerned with the slow progress on war crimes front in Bosnia. 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.

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

☐ We have been examining several options to assist and enhance the ability of the Tribunal to bring indicted war criminals into custody. One option may be to establish some sort of capability to execute the court's arrest warrants. We are studying the feasibility of these options but have made no decisions yet.

FRY/Republika Srpska Agreement

☐ The decision of the FRY Assembly to ratify a cooperation agreement with the Serb Republic is a violation of the Dayton Agreement and is inconsistent with the Constitutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska.

☐ The agreement includes provisions that are under the purview of the individual states and which could be in violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The agreement cannot take effect until it is ratified by the Bosnia-Herzegovina Assembly.

CHINA

COSCO

Q: Does COSCO represent a threat to US national security? Does COSCO engage in predatory pricing and operate outside the normal rules and motivations of commercial behavior? Did COSCO decide to purchase ships from US yards to curry favor?

A: COSCO is the world's largest shipping line. It operates out of

virtually every major West Coast port. And it moves much of the traffic in our trans-Pacific market.

We welcome its participation in our trading relationship. But like other companies, it must abide by our laws. I am confident that our Coast Guard, Customs and Maritime authorities will ensure that our laws are effectively enforced -- whether they involve COSCO or any other company.

Senator McCain has made some serious allegations with respect to COSCO. We are looking at those allegations. I'm not going to prejudge that review or its outcome.

UNHRC

Background: France, Germany, Italy, and Spain reportedly have decided not to co-sponsor a China resolution, which means that there will not be an EU-introduced resolution this year. However, any individual country can introduce the resolution, and we expect at least 10 EU countries to co-sponsor the resolution once it is introduced. Our position is that we are working with other countries on a resolution and will oppose China's no-action motion (which, if passed, would bar consideration of the resolution by the Commission). A vote is scheduled for the third week in April.

Points

- ☐ U.S. is working with other members of the Commission on a resolution concerning the human rights situation in China.
- ☐ U.S. will oppose motions designed to keep the resolution off the Commission's agenda.
- ☐ Aware of vigorous Chinese efforts to defeat resolution. Believe members of the Commission should make decision based on human rights situation in China, not other factors.
- ☐ Our own judgment at this point is that the current situation warrants a resolution on China's human rights record.

☐ 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.

If asked whether our efforts were "downgraded" from last year

☐ At this point, we have demarched members of the Commission to convey our views and are working with European partners on a proposed resolution.

☐ During his recent visit, Ambassador Richardson expressed the U.S. position in a statement to Commission members and met with several important delegations to convey our views.

☐ Our efforts this year are commensurate to our efforts in the past, and, more importantly, our approach remains the same: We will vote, and ask others to vote, based on the human rights situation in China.

TRIPS AND VISITORS

☐ Spanish President Aznar will be here April 30 for meeting and working lunch.

☐ President's visit to Mexico postponed to May 6-7. Regional summit meetings in Bridgetown, Barbados and San Jose, Costa Rica will go forward as scheduled during the week of May 6-10.

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

☐ Denver Summit June 20-22.

☐ POTUS will travel to Denmark in July in conjunction with the July 8-9 NATO Summit in Madrid.

☐ President's visits to Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela rescheduled to October 12-17.

If asked about Hashimoto Visit

Background: The Japanese Embassy received guidance 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 are consulting with Japanese officials about a possible PM Hashimoto visit to Washington this spring.

☐ We expect President and Hashimoto to meet at the end of April here at the White House and final details on date, time and likely topics will be available early next week.

NORTHERN IRELAND

Start of Marching Season

☐ Pleased that Easter Monday parade went off smoothly. Commend those who took courageous decision to avoid confrontation.

☐ Hope people of goodwill in Northern Ireland will work together to avoid clashes and bitterness in this year's marching season.

Bomb at Sinn Fein Office

☐ Condemn this attempted attack, as we condemn all acts of violence.

☐ Urge loyalists to return to observing cease-fire; not precipitate downward spiral of violence that can only harm all people of Northern Ireland.

Continued IRA Violence

☐ Strongly condemn continued IRA violence in Northern Ireland and in Britain, urge immediate, unequivocal cease-fire.

☐ Belfast peace talks (now in recess until June) have best chance

of long-term success if they are inclusive (that is, if Sinn Fein participates) but that can only happen after IRA cease-fire.

On Whether Ira Needs to Disarm Before Joining Talks

☐ Vice President did not address this point, but U.S., like British and Irish governments, have accepted the report issued last year by Senator Mitchell and his colleagues, which suggested decommissioning of arms in parallel with talks.

Murder of Catholic Father of Nine in Belfast

If asked about the murder of a Catholic father of nine in Belfast, possibly by loyalist gunmen:

☐ WH horrified by this brutal slaying, condemns it in strongest terms.

☐ Do not know who was responsible; police are investigating.

☐ [If pressed]: Have no way of knowing yet whether loyalists were involved, but are watching closely. Condemn it utterly, whoever did it.

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.

GULF WAR ILLNESSES

What is the significance of CIA's recently-released Khamisiyah white paper?

☐ CIA's white paper places approximately 40 just-declassified documents related to Khamisiyah into context and complements DOD's "Khamisiyah case narrative"

released in FEB 97.

☐ My understanding is that the white paper and accompanying documents do not change the essence of what we know about what happened at Khamisiyah that might be related to undiagnosed Gulf War illnesses. Moreover, the white paper is distinct from the forthcoming CIA IG report which has not yet been released.

☐ The white paper does, however, highlight certain intelligence community shortfalls and "lessons learned" from an analytical perspective, and I understand CIA is addressing these.

What about the statement in the CIA white paper that the CIA briefed the NSC staff in JAN 96 on the Khamisiyah evidence?

☐ The CIA white paper (and one of the accompanying documents containing briefing slides) reflects the classified CIA brief the NSC staff received in JAN 96.

☐ During the briefing -- which focused on the CIA's declassification initiative and ongoing study of potential exposures -- the staff was told that information had come to light about the possibility of chemical munition storage and agent release at the Khamisiyah facility. This was briefed as preliminary information, and the NSC staff noted at the close of the brief that CIA needed to pursue this possibility aggressively together with DOD.

☐ Subsequent CIA and DOD efforts to investigate this concern eventually led to the JUN 96 DOD announcement of Khamisiyah.

The CIA Khamisiyah white paper mentions that an AUG 91 "highly-classified" intelligence assessment discussing chemical munitions storage at Khamisiyah was circulated among the entire national security team. Does this mean that the Bush Administration knew about the possibility of exposure of U.S. forces soon after the Gulf War?

☐ We have no information indicating that the Bush Administration knew of this possibility.

☐ To my knowledge, the assessment you are referring to focused on the issue of whether Khamisiyah was a known chemical munitions storage site, and did not even reflect the issue of the possible exposure of U.S. forces.

How does the CIA explain these 40 or so documents coming out now,

months after we had various assurances that the Agency had done its best on behalf of Gulf War veterans?

☐ First, it's important to note that earlier statements were based on what was known at the time they were made. And the continuing DOD and CIA investigative efforts have identified new information, changing what we know over time.

☐ Finally, while these documents do not change our substantive understanding of the possible exposure of U.S. forces at Khamisiyah, they do indicate certain intelligence community shortfalls and "lessons learned" which CIA intends to act on.

The intelligence community admits making mistakes in its handling of the Gulf War illnesses investigation, and this latest batch of 40 or so documents clearly should have come out much sooner. With much of the related activity occurring during George Tenet's tenure at CIA, does the Director-designate retain the President's full confidence?

☐ Absolutely.

☐ The CIA has contributed a tremendous amount to our knowledge about chemical weapons in the Gulf War theater and specifically about exposure incidents that might be related to undiagnosed Gulf War illnesses.

☐ George Tenet is fully supportive of the President's commitment to get out all the facts, and has increased the level of resources devoted to the Gulf War illnesses problem when new information has highlighted the need to do so.

What do you see as the way forward on GWI issues?

☐ Given the scope of the investigative efforts underway, there seems little doubt we'll learn of additional information which should have been made public sooner.

☐ However, such developments should be understood in a broader context:

☐ Most, if not all, of the new information appears unlikely to change our fundamental assessment of what happened out there that might have adversely impacted the health of our veterans.

☐ This new information is coming out precisely because of the "openness" process the President directed and remains fully committed to.

☐ All of the information being developed will be used to improve policies so as to be better prepared for future deployments.

☐ Finally, while all of this investigative activity is underway, we are concurrently working very hard to further improve the quality of our medical care and research programs.

Should more veterans be warned now about Khamisiyah?

☐ We believe that the notification letters already sent by the DOD last NOV and DEC cover the overwhelming majority of those veterans who might have been affected... And all Gulf War veterans concerned about the possible adverse health effects of service in the Gulf theater are eligible for and have been strongly urged to take full advantage of free medical exams and subsequent health care, if needed -- this eligibility has been widely communicated by public service announcements and many other means.

☐ We should not lose sight of the fact that there remain no documented cases of soldiers reporting acute symptoms at the time, nor is there any clear-cut evidence of a link between low-level exposures and the undiagnosed illnesses -- that research continues, however.

☐ Significant uncertainties remain in terms of both source data and most appropriate modeling approach; CIA and DOD are working together to resolve these expeditiously.

☐ No one who has been involved in researching the Khamisiyah incident believes that the "worst case" scenarios are very credible.

☐ Finally, even the "worst case" scenarios focus on the possibility of low-level chemical exposures, and it is important to remember that there was no evidence at the time of more significant acute symptoms.

Do these "intelligence failures" -- specifically, getting an appropriate warning to troops in the field during the Gulf War and failing to uncover the possibility of chemical exposure at Khamisiyah for more than five years -- indicate that the intelligence community and/or its relationship to the military need to be reconsidered?

☐ At this juncture, I would say no. Mistakes were clearly made during this process, these mistakes have been acknowledged, and the agencies involved will seek to develop appropriate "lessons learned" for implementation.

☐ Beyond that, we need to await the outcome of the CIA IG and various other ongoing investigations to determine whether any other actions may be appropriate.

What action has been taken in response to the initiatives announced during the roll-out of the PAC (Presidential Advisory Committee) report in early JAN 97?

☐ We've accomplished a great deal since the PAC submitted its report.

☐ Leading examples:

☐ Secretary Brown prepared a recommendation -- which the President has accepted -- to initiate rulemaking to extend the compensation eligibility period for Gulf War veterans with undiagnosed illnesses to DEC 31, 2001. This measure has been strongly supported by Gulf War veterans and members of Congress.

☐ The Secretaries of DOD, HHS and VA have developed an integrated Action Plan to implement the PAC recommendations from its final report.

☐ Finally, as the PAC recommended, we have initiated a Presidential Review Directive (PRD) to address "Health Preparedness for and Readjustment of Veterans and Their Families After Future Deployments." This is the key prospective piece which will ensure that we act on the "lessons learned" to better safeguard the health of soldiers in future deployments.

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.

☐ Overall, 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, with an extension of the presumptive period for undiagnosed illness compensation forthcoming soon; (5) thousands of pages declassified; and (6) 90+ federally-sponsored research projects underway.

NAZI ASSETS

CONTINGENCY PRESS GUIDANCE: Following is contingency press guidance on the decision to delay by 1-2 weeks the target date for release of the historians' report on the postwar USG role in distributing Nazi gold and assets. The main Administration spokesman on this issue is U/S Stu Eizenstat.

☐ The team of historians and others who have been working to assess a huge amount of historical material discovered they needed a little more time than originally anticipated.. This short delay will ensure that we can provide our best possible understanding at this point of the events in question.

If asked about the President's role:

☐ The President cares deeply about this issue. The historians' report is being prepared at his behest, under the direction of U/S Eizenstat.

If pressed:

☐ The President will of course see the report when it is completed.

FAST TRACK

Q: It has been reported that the President is planning to delay his request for fast track authority to accommodate the budget process. Is that true? Does this signal Administration retreat on fast track? Has Gephardt scared the President off?

A: Not at all. The President is still firmly committed to seeking fast track authority to open foreign markets. It is critical if we want to continue creating good jobs for American workers.

Every President since Ford has had fast track authority for key periods, and the reasons for it now are more compelling than ever. Over 11 million U.S. jobs now depend on

exports, and these jobs pay 13-16 percent more than the average U.S. job. Today, 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside the U.S., and the vast majority of those consumers live in the emerging and fastest growing markets of Latin America and Asia. We simply must continue to open these markets for U.S. exports if we are to succeed in the global economy.

We cannot afford inaction. If we are not seizing opportunities to break down trade barriers and open foreign markets, we can be sure other countries will act -- to the benefit of their companies and their workers.

The United States has nothing to fear. We are the most competitive large economy in the world as judged by independent experts. But our ability to define the nature of our trade relationships will in significant measure determine our leadership role in the next century. Fast track authority is the most important factor determining these relationships.

As you know, we have been consulting with Congress to develop bipartisan support for this legislation. We think that is the best way to build a strong foundation for this effort. We will continue to consult with Congress as to the substance, tactics and timing of the fast track initiative.

Q: It has been reported that the Administration is weighing the dropping of labor and environmental goals from fast track trade authority legislation, a move certain to infuriate labor unions. Is this true?

A: As we have stated before, our goal is to build the broadest possible support for the fast track legislation. To that end, Ambassador Barshefsky and others have been consulting actively with members of Congress representing all points of view on this subject, and with all interested parties, including organized labor. We will continue to do so with the goal of enacting legislation that receives broad support.

ANGOLA

BACKGROUND

The events in Angola this week are a milestone in the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol, an agreement signed November 20, 1994, and which provides a blueprint for ending the civil war. Under its provisions, the soldiers of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) entered UN-administered quartering areas, disarmed, and will be either demobilized or integrated into the national army. In return for transforming itself into an unarmed political movement, UNITA will be able to participate in Angola's governance.

The process has been long and contentious. In February 1995, the United Nations authorized UNAVEM III, the UN Verification Mission in Angola, which is now the largest blue-helmet force in the world. As one of the official observers to the Lusaka Protocol, the United States has worked closely with the UN Special Representative and our observer partners, Portugal and Russia, to help implement the detailed provisions of the Lusaka Protocol.

Q: The formation of a Government of National Unity and Reconciliation is to be sworn in tomorrow in Angola. What does this mean?

A: More than two years after the Government and UNITA signed the Lusaka Protocol, they will form a Government of National Unity and Reconciliation tomorrow in Luanda.

The Lusaka Protocol gives UNITA positions in the government, including four ministries, seven deputy ministries, eight ambassadorships, governorships, and other posts down to the communal and municipal levels.

Our delegation to this event is headed by Assistant Secretary of State Princeton Lyman, and includes Special Envoy Amb. Paul Hare, Amb. K. F. Inderfurth from our Mission to the United Nations, our present and past Ambassadors to Angola, Donald K. Steinberg and Edmund De Jarnette, and our Director for Southern African Affairs, Mr. John Blaney.

This follows the swearing-in of the UNITA deputies to the Angolan Parliament yesterday. UNITA won 70 of the 220 seats in the 1992 election, and 66 of them who were present yesterday took their seats.

We look forward to UNITA playing a constructive role in the government of Angola.

It is important the political parties in Angola continue to work together as the remaining steps of the Lusaka Protocol are implemented including incorporation of UNITA troops into the national army and extension of state administration.

Q: What is Jonas Savimbi's role in the process?

A: Under the provisions of the Lusaka Protocol, the leader of the largest opposition party, UNITA, is to have a "special role." After a long negotiation, both sides agreed that Dr. Savimbi would become the official "Leader of the Opposition," a role which allows him access to the President along with certain rights and privileges including a house, staff, powers to travel throughout Angola, and personal protection. The legal statute for Dr. Savimbi's role was passed by the National Assembly on April 8.

Q: (If asked) Will Jonas Savimbi, leader of UNITA, be in Luanda for the event tomorrow?

A: We understand that he may not come to Luanda, but hope that he will. The important point is that the formation of the Government of National Unity and Reconciliation is moving forward.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 11 April 97 22:10

FROM Millison, Cathy L.

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT Foreign Policy Dinner Talking Points ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TO Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.

CARBON_COPY Davies, Glyn T.
Kerrick, Donald L.

TEXT_BODY

After extensive edits by Dohse, changes have been made to the talking points for the Foreign Policy Dinner (package #2315). Original and 3 copies are in the box to go upstairs in the morning. Mr. Steinberg received an advance copy earlier today. He should NOT review those -- he was walking through and I alerted him to that. Reminder, we've been asked to get this package to the President for his review over the weekend.

Also, attaching document just in case.....

[[2315PTS.DOC : 5702 in 2315PTS.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE 11 April 97 22:2

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME 2315PTS.DOC
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Reason: 1.5 (b)(d)
Declassify on: 04/11/07
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SEGMENT I: EUROPE (6:30-7:30 P.M.)

EUROPEAN SECURITY/NATO ENLARGEMENT

☐ NATO enlargement top priority for second term -- key test of American leadership. Requires Senate ratification, House support because of new security commitments.

☐ European security vital U.S. interest; through NATO, NATO enlargement and NATO-Russia, have opportunity, for first time in history, to build secure, undivided, democratic Europe.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 5/16/2017
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VZ NARA, Date 2/7/2019
2006-1363-F(?)

- NATO enlargement will project stability and security into all of Europe; will strengthen and safeguard region's democratic and free-market transformation.
- Prospect of NATO membership strengthening democratic forces in Eastern Europe, weakening nationalists, promoting resolution of regional disputes (e.g., Hungary-Romania).
- Won't let Russian pressure spook us. Had we taken initial Russian "no" in 1989, Germany would not be reunited today. Won't bring Russia in by keeping other democracies out.
- Helsinki put NATO-Russia on track without sacrificing enlargement, which is moving forward on schedule.
- NATO-Russia relationship -- via Charter, formal consultative mechanism -- can bring Russia into emerging security system.

Costs/Robust NATO Posture

- Current threat low. Defense of new members possible through reinforcement and modernization of new members' forces.
- Therefore, NATO concluded no need to permanently station substantial NATO combat forces; no intention or need to deploy nuclear forces on soil of new members.
- U.S. costs affordable: \$150-200M per year. Costs to new members also affordable -- as CEE governments already said.
- New NATO members will be valuable, committed members. IFOR -- where Poles, Czechs, others have combat troops; Hungary supplying bases -- shows CEE will make meaningful contribution.

Why not EU enlargement vice NATO? (if raised)

- EU, NATO enlargement part of same historic process. Both important, not mutually exclusive.
- EU not equipped to be lead organization for European security and integration, as Bosnia demonstrated. Key to long-term European stability is U.S. engagement and leadership, which comes only through NATO.

American people don't support (if raised)

☐ Americans not isolationist: Majority (62%) support NATO enlargement to Poland, Czech, Hungary; 68% would favor defending Poland with U.S. troops.

Why enlarge NATO absent a threat? (if raised)

☐ Need NATO enlargement for same reason we need NATO: America's core alliance in uncertain world. Cannot foresee all threats, but know preparedness deters them. Through enlargement can extend same stability to Central Europe that Western Europe enjoyed for 45 years.

☐ Failure to enlarge NATO would betray our traditions and America's role throughout 20th century. Must not exclude countries that have demonstrated commitment to defend our common values and to share in common burdens.

RUSSIA

☐ Supporting development of democracy and market economy in Russia profoundly in America's interest -- one of my highest foreign policy priorities.

☐ Have historic opportunity to convert adversarial relationship into partnership for 21st century.

☐ Yeltsin back in charge. New team has potential to take on economic problems that overshadow everything else in Russia.

☐ Yeltsin showed at Helsinki ready to tackle tough issues and make decisions. Summit reenergized U.S.-Russian relations.

☐ Important progress on arms control: START, ABM/TMD.

☐ Turned corner on NATO enlargement. Russia opposed, but ready to develop NATO-Russia relationship.

☐ Defined path to stimulate trade and investment; will bolster reform in Russia and mean new jobs for Americans.

☐ Russian reform -- and bilateral relations - likely be bumpy road, but overall direction positive.

☐ Bipartisan support critical, especially for FY-98 Partnership for Freedom request. Funding for Russia, NIS will promote trade and investment, lock in reforms, expand people-to-people contacts that will forge important ties with tomorrow's leaders.

BOSNIA

☐ Difficult challenge of building lasting peace in Bosnia continues.

Must not forget enormous progress made.

☐ In summer of 1995, bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II raged. Few believed peace possible; many questioned NATO's role in post-Cold War era.

☐ Since then, U.S. leadership produced Dayton Accords, and revitalized NATO helped consolidate peace, providing environment for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction.

☐ Efforts in Bosnia have exceeded expectations:

☐ Implemented military aspects of Dayton with no combat casualties; held national elections in September; created joint national institutions; returned more than 200,000 refugees.

☐ U.S.-led, Train-and-Equip program building stable military balance and facilitating formation of joint defense structures.

☐ Making progress on economic reconstruction, especially in Bosniak-Croat Federation. Today, Sarajevo bustles with reconstruction; hundreds of cafes, shops, banks and other commercial endeavors open.

☐ Still have long way to go: must do more to rebuild economy, create jobs, stimulate investment. Need greater cooperation from parties on freedom of movement and return of refugees.

☐ Bosnian people, with help of international NGOs, must assume responsibility for building own future.

☐ SFOR will provide stability and confidence for Bosnian people to continue toward these goals. Withdrawal of U.S. forces in mid-1998 should give sufficient time to ensure self-sustaining peace.

☐ Early, unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops would endanger progress made since Dayton. Could lead to resumption of war with resulting crisis in NATO; would erode U.S. credibility and leadership around

world.

☐ Strongly urge your support for our efforts in Bosnia. Stability in Europe central to U.S. interests, as is preserving U.S. leadership of strong, effective NATO as it embarks on enlargement and new partnership with Russia.

SEGMENT II: (8:00 - 8:45 p.m.)

150 RESOURCES

☐ Foreign affairs programs small part of federal budget -- about 1% of spending. But that 1% is perhaps most important parts of budget.

☐ Helps us to avoid wars and save lives; stems inflow of illegal drugs; helps us in war on terrorism; promotes democracy and other American values; and stimulates American exports and jobs.

☐ International affairs spending has fallen by roughly 20%, in real terms, over past four years. Steep decline has diminished ability to influence events overseas, raised serious questions about our willingness to remain engaged in international arena and cost us opportunities to promote American exports and jobs.

☐ Some call for cutting spending even further. But truth is further reductions will only create bigger problems for us down road.

☐ My budget calls for increasing international affairs spending by \$1.4 billion. Funding increase will enable us to sustain American global leadership and continue existing programs such as trade promotion activities that generate \$15 to \$20 billion in exports each year and support more than 300,000 jobs.

UN ARREARS

☐ UN is important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Serves American interests in range of areas from refugee assistance, disease control and air traffic control. Its peacekeepers promote American interests around globe.

☐ Committed to American participation and leadership in reformed UN and to paying our financial obligations, but must insist on real reform.

☐ UN and member states have heard our message. UN reform primary motivation for insisting on new UN leadership -- and they understand

we are committed to working with you to develop tough, but achievable, benchmarks that make UN more effective and accountable.

☐ Pleased with initial steps of Kofi Annan. Believe stage set for improved relations between U.S. and UN.

☐ Appreciate offer by Senator Lott to lead Task Force on UN Reform. Secretary Albright, OMB Director Raines and Ambassador Richardson have reported to me on progress of group.

☐ My last budget request is straightforward:

☐ UN commits to reduce future U.S. assessments to roughly amount Congress approved past two years, with no new arrears.

☐ With your support, USG would offer advance appropriation to cover our arrears, but it would not be available until FY 99 and would be disbursed if agreed benchmarks met.

☐ Your early consideration of proposal would give our diplomats leverage they need in difficult negotiations. Many nations at point they do not believe American promises to repay arrears to UN. UN members need to see legitimate offer if they are to make the reforms we demand.

☐ Need to get this done within next weeks to have effect on budgetary changes being considered for 1998 and 1999.

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

☐ Have historic opportunity to turn nascent NIS market economies into competitive, open markets; benefits their citizens, Americans alike.

☐ Assistance working: two-thirds NIS under democratically elected leaders in emerging market economies; U.S. assistance can make change endure.

☐ Priority one is to tackle barriers to investment, fight crime,

lock

in economic reform, open region's vast resources to American business. Our efforts can leverage billions of dollars in trade and investment, which means jobs for Americans at home.

☐ Priority two is to bolster generational change, strengthen democracy; want to double people-to-people exchanges and support American foundations, volunteer groups to build civil society.

☐ Convinced after Helsinki time is ripe; Yeltsin committed to bold reform agenda; leaders of Ukraine, Georgia, other NIS committed to make reform irreversible.

☐ Entrenching democracy, market economies advances overarching national interest in seeing NIS develop as partners of America; \$900 million under Partnership for Freedom real investment in peace and security that merits bipartisan support.

CWC

Why Support the Treaty?

☐ Need your support for Chemical Weapons Convention.

☐ Last Friday, had honor of hosting broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters at White House: James Baker, Colin Powell, Paul Nitze and Ed Rowny as well as 100 other prominent, former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.

☐ Prior to event received two important letters expressing strong support for ratification. First was from former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and former Senators Kassebaum and Boren.

☐ Second letter was from 17 retired flag officers, including three former Chairmen of the JCS (Powell, Vessey, Jones), five former Service Chiefs (McPeak, Mundy, Sullivan, Zumwalt and Dugan), Norman Schwarzkopf and 8 other Generals and Admirals.

☐ Letters join previous letters/expressions of support from former President Bush, Larry Eagleburger, former Senator Sam Nunn and many other leading Republican and Democratic officials.

☐ Would like to outline some reasons why all of these people believe CWC is in our national interest.

☐ First, reduces chemical threat to our soldiers. Well before CWC

concluded, Congress directed destruction of majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. CWC requires others do same, under strict international supervision. That is why every Chairman of JCS since the Carter Administration -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell and General Shali -- as well as former Secretaries of Defense Melvin Laird, Harold Brown and William Perry support treaty.

□ Second, our participation is tangible demonstration of international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support treaty.

□ Third, treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help Intelligence Community do better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- task they face with or without CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet support treaty.

□ Fourth, gives us new tools to deal with emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting flow of chemicals used to make chemical weapons, CWC makes it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, International Union of Police Associations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers and National Association of Police Organizations support treaty.

□ Fifth, provides level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not party, our chemical companies face CWC-mandated trade restrictions that could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales. That is why Chemical Manufacturers Association, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America support treaty.

□ Finally, establishes global norm against possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, U.S. Catholic Conference, Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church,

United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support treaty.

☐ Recognize CWC will not "solve" chemical weapons problem, but it is key element of any effective response.

Treaty Status in Senate

☐ Since January, have negotiated in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and group he put together in effort to address concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about treaty.

☐ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on compromise or identified reasonable alternative, leaving it to Senate to decide between two.

☐ Will work with Majority Leader and CWC task force to facilitate Senate vote by mid-April, so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when treaty enters force.

☐ We have moved well beyond resolution of ratification on Senate calendar last September. Now time for Senate to vote.

Importance of April 29 Deadline

☐ April 29 is real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Also denied ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- get out of chemical weapons business.

☐ Without ratification, credibility of American leadership across range of transnational issues undermined.

☐ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors.

☐ American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

FAST-TRACK

☐ Will seek legislation from Congress to secure fast-track authority.

Every President since Ford has had fast-track authority for key periods with bipartisan Congressional support. Our choice is clear:

can either move to break down barriers to our exports -- or let other countries do that for their companies and workers while we sit on sidelines.

☐ Trade is Increasingly Important to the Future of Our Nation. Exports

have generated over one quarter of our strong economic growth over past four years. Exports support an estimated 11.3 million U.S. jobs. Over 95% of the world's consumers live outside the United States. No question our future lies with selling American products to rest of world.

☐ Our economy is envy of world; have nothing to fear. Over past four

years, have created nearly 12 million new jobs, far more than other G-7 countries combined. We are once again world producer of autos, semiconductors. Once again largest exporter in world. Our competitors can't beat us, but we can lose if we sit on sidelines.

☐ American barriers are negligible compared with barriers in foreign markets. After Uruguay Round phased in, our tariffs will average 2.8%. Other countries far higher: India (31%); Turkey and Thailand

(26%); Argentina, Chile and Brazil (10-11%). These are essentially one-way deals: we get more than we give up.

☐ Need Fast-Track Authority to Respond to Global Challenges. We need

authority to conclude new trade agreements that open markets to our goods and services.

☐ About More than Economics. Debate about more than economics. By expanding trade, we advance cause of freedom and democracy around world. There is no better example than Latin America where democracy and open markets are on march together.

ASIA (Korea, China, MFN) (8:45-9:15 p.m.) SEGMENT III

KOREA

☐ Security alliance with South Korea has sustained peace on Korean peninsula for forty years.

- ☐ Strength of alliance enabled us to reach agreement with North Korea on framework that freezes and eventually eliminates North Korea's nuclear program.
- ☐ KEDO, an international consortium of contributors, oversees process. Funding for KEDO and light water reactor project essential to achieving non-nuclear Korean peninsula. Look to Congress to supply funds to sustain U.S. participation in critical endeavor. (FYI: asking for \$30 million in FY 98 budget.)
- ☐ The North Koreans face severe food shortages; UN estimate shortfall between 1-2 million tons. Responding to most recent international humanitarian appeal for assistance. Distribution of assistance monitored by World Food Program. Confident food aid is being delivered to those most in need, particularly children. Appreciate Congressional support for maintaining the U.S. tradition of not using food as a tool to advance a particular political agenda.
- ☐ Because of structural problems in North Korea's economy, believe regime moving slowly toward acceptance of proposal for four-party peace talks I proposed with President Kim last April. Meeting North Koreans next week for further discussion.
- ☐ Nuclear freeze, peace talks, and our continued engagement offer best prospect for reducing tension in last outpost of Cold War.

CHINA

- ☐ China at critical turning point. Manner in which we engage China in months ahead will determine whether China becomes destabilizing threat or constructive force in Asia and world.
- ☐ Substantial U.S. interests at stake: need China's cooperation in curbing proliferation of WMD, securing permanent peace on Korean peninsula. China will become world's largest economy within 15 years; want access to that market for U.S. exports.
- ☐ Each of these interests is best served by stable, open, prosperous China that increasingly embraces international trade and nonproliferation

rules.

☐ Continuing to engage China on number of fronts: UN Human Rights Commission

resolution in Geneva, MFN renewal, and Hong Kong reversion.

Working with

Congress we can manage our interests with China soberly and prudently.

Engagement does not mean endorsement.

☐ Human Rights. Continue to support those in China who stand for freedom and human rights.

☐ Hong Kong. Future of Hong Kong remains serious concern as we approach July 1. Working with allies to ensure China understands action that allows Hong Kong's political and economic way of life to continue.

☐ Trade. Expect China to follow international trade rules and norms and live up to its commitments to us. Support WTO membership for China, but only on commercially meaningful terms.

☐ Nonproliferation. Continue to elicit Chinese support in combating proliferation; pressing China to tighten export controls and cease cooperation with such states as Iran.

☐ But must speak with one voice. Weakens our efforts to influence China's

behavior if signals we send appear confused and conflicting.

Important

Congress avoid precipitous action that undermines our interests.

☐ Failure to extend MFN would undermine all of our interests, and reverse thirty years of bipartisan China policy. MFN revocation would curtail contacts with Chinese people; prompt increased Chinese sales of destabilizing weapons; harm Taiwan's economy; and slash Hong Kong's trade by over \$30 billion.

☐ Curbing our contact with China because of concerns about Hong Kong's future eliminates an important access point to Beijing decision-makers.

☐ Similarly staking all of our China policy solely on human rights makes human rights bilateral issue, weakening our ability to keep international spotlight on China's human rights record and keep faith with those in China who work to

promote universal rights and freedoms.

- ☐ Our policy is working and urge you to help sustain it as you examine merits of MFN, evaluate soundness of Hong Kong's future and communicate importance of improving human rights.

MISCELLANEOUS

MIDDLE EAST

Peace Process

- ☐ At very serious moment in peace process. Working hard with parties to come up with way to get them back to sustained negotiations.
- ☐ Had number of conversations with leaders from region over last two months. Main objective is to restore calm and confidence so they can return to talks.
- ☐ Arafat has to show 100% effort against terrorism. Both sides need to avoid actions that tend to preempt negotiating process.
- ☐ Will stay involved, but it's parties themselves who will have to make hard choices to make it work.

Iraq

- ☐ Would like to see Iraq reintegrated back into region and into international community -- ultimate objective.
- ☐ However, time has not come since it is abundantly clear Saddam Hussein remains danger both to region and to Iraqi people.
- ☐ Therefore, containing Saddam will remain strategic priority for Administration in second term.
- ☐ Saddam must meet all of his UN obligations, including demonstrating his peaceful intentions toward his neighbors and his people. Until then, sanctions must remain in place.

NORTHERN IRELAND

- ☐ Committed to Northern Ireland peace process; never thought it would

be short or easy, given long history of conflict.

- ☐ Have extraordinary alliance with UK and close friendship with Ireland; thus able to play helpful role in supporting British and Irish efforts to get negotiating process going.
- ☐ Proud of role Senator Mitchell is playing; has won respect of all parties.
- ☐ British parliamentary election scheduled for May 1 dominating political scene in Northern Ireland as well as rest of UK.
- ☐ Little expectation of breakthrough before election; situation precarious with continued IRA violence putting pressure on fragile loyalist cease-fire.
- ☐ If Blair elected, would not anticipate major change in British policy, though atmospherics could improve. Will work with him or new Major government to get peace process moving again.

Sinn Fein (if asked)

- ☐ Want to see Sinn Fein at table because inclusive talks have better chance of long-term success; but cannot happen without unequivocal cease-fire.

Loyalist cease-fire (if raised)

- ☐ Some recent attacks widely attributed to loyalist paramilitaries but loyalist command has not declared their cease-fire over, as IRA has. Better for peace process if loyalist cease-fire remains in effect.
- ☐ Belfast peace talks reconvene June 3. With election behind them, hope parties, willing to move to substantive negotiations.

Senator Mitchell (if asked)

- ☐ Senator Mitchell has said he will be there to reconvene talks in June; do not know how long he will stay as chairman.

MEXICO

- ☐ In May, will visit our closest southern neighbors as first trip of three to hemisphere. Chose Mexico, Costa Rica and Barbados to deal with issues that matter most to Americans -- economic growth, protecting environment, drugs, illegal immigration and crime.

- ☐ The United States and Mexico face serious challenge in fighting drug trafficking. Success in our efforts depends on deepened cooperation with Mexico and support for President Zedillo's efforts to reform and strengthen law enforcement.
- ☐ Intend to make improving counternarcotics cooperation top priority in my discussions with President Zedillo and other Latin American and Caribbean leaders.
- ☐ All share same objective -- keep drugs out of our neighborhoods and away from our children. Accomplishing goal requires that we work closely with other nations in hemisphere -- especially with country whose 2,000-mile border with us makes it target of traffickers seeking to smuggle contraband into United States.
- ☐ Success also requires we all do more about turning our young people away from drugs. America's drug habits are fueling trafficking and corruption in hemisphere. Hope Congress fully supports budget request for counternarcotics activities.
- ☐ Mexico undergoing profound transition, emerging from 67 years of one-party rule. Longstanding problems, like corruption, coming to light for first time. Important to support and encourage reforms that are driving change in Mexico and the reformers, like Zedillo.

ZAIRE

- ☐ Situation in Zaire remains precarious. Deeply concerned about implications of ongoing fighting. Rebels have political and military advantage. Despite our efforts to promote cease-fire, seem determined push Mobutu aside.
- ☐ Pleased peace talks resumed in South Africa under UN Special Representative Sahnoun's auspices. Doing all we can to support Sahnoun and the South Africans.
- ☐ For the sake of Zaire's future and stability, Mobutu must be persuaded to step aside gracefully in favor of inclusive, interim transitional government. That government should be mandated to organize elections with international help within a reasonable period of time.
- ☐ Such a measure would give maximum leverage to press regional states

to halt all support for further military action and enable us to work together to craft mutually acceptable interim transitional government.

☐ Deeply concerned about plight of several hundred thousand refugees in Zaire. Worked hard to secure access to these people for international relief agencies; hope repatriation effort can begin shortly.

TERRORISM

☐ Worked with Congress to add \$1.1 billion to fight against terrorism.

☐ Also worked with Congress to pass Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act in 1996.

☐ Still need to fill gaps in antiterrorism bill and maintain spending for combatting terrorism.

☐ Administration focused on apprehending and prosecuting terrorists, protecting our troops and diplomats overseas, and ensuring American cities can manage consequences of terrorist attack involving weapons of mass destruction.

☐ Need to continue to work together on these tasks.

ABM/TMD

☐ President Yeltsin and I worked hard at Helsinki to come up with mutually acceptable solution to the issue of ABM/TMD demarcation.

☐ Our joint statement on ABM Treaty records resolution of all outstanding demarcation issues, and commits us to explore cooperation on early warning support for TMDs, technology cooperation related to TMD, and expansion of ongoing program of cooperation in TMD exercises.

☐ Helsinki agreement will in no way limit U.S. TMD programs, now or in future. Under this agreement, all six U.S. TMD programs will go forward as planned.

☐ Moreover, by providing stable, predictable strategic environment, agreement should help facilitate Russian ratification of START II

as well as further stabilizing reductions in strategic nuclear arms, such as those agreed to in the Helsinki Joint Statement on Future Reductions in Nuclear Forces.

☐ Administration officials prepared to brief you in greater detail on agreements reached at Helsinki, both on missile defense and nuclear arms control. Believe you will find them to be overwhelmingly in our national security interests.

Elements of Helsinki agreement (if asked)

☐ Basic elements include:

☐ limit on velocity (five kilometers/second) and range (3,500 kilometers) of target missiles used in TMD testing;

☐ ban on space-based TMD interceptors; and

☐ information exchange on TMD programs,

☐ Sides stated they have no plans to flight test "higher velocity" TMD systems through April 1999 or to develop TMD systems with speeds exceeding certain velocities.

Space-based TMD interceptors (if pressed)

☐ Neither side has plans for space-based TMD interceptors. Banning space-based TMD interceptors is logical corollary to ABM Treaty's ban on space-based ABMs.

Interceptor Velocity of TMD systems (if pressed)

☐ Neither side has plans for TMD interceptors with velocities greater than 5.5 km/sec for land-based and air-based TMD systems, or 4.5 km/sec for sea-based TMD systems.

PROLIFERATION ISSUES

☐ Preventing the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and missile deliver systems remains a vital objective.

☐ Three central elements of our strategy.

☐ First, we're working with international community to strengthen international treaty regimes, especially NPT, CWC and BWC.

NPT: In May, IAEA will approve new measures to strengthen nuclear safeguards.

CWC: Timely Senate ratification essential to allow U.S. participation to set up CWC inspection regime.

BWC: Tough negotiations ahead to meet our objective of establishing legally binding compliance protocol by 1998.

☐ Second, dealing with consequences and motivations for proliferation in three regional "proliferation zones."

Korean peninsula: Our strategy succeeded so far. Want to keep North Korean nuclear program under control through Agreed Framework.

South Asia: No near-term solution to proliferation problem. Trying to convince India and Pakistan to maintain existing areas of restraint (e.g., no nuclear testing and missile deployment) and build closer relations with U.S. and between India and Pakistan to serve as basis for eventual solution.

Middle East: Again, no near-term political solution at hand. Making every effort to retain UN curbs on Iraq and limit programs by Iran, Syria and Libya. Need cooperation from allies and others to prevent export of dangerous technologies to Middle East.

☐ Third, concerted effort to work with countries that might be source of material, equipment and technology for proliferation.

Russia: Many cooperative programs underway to strengthen security of nuclear materials, combat nuclear smuggling, re-employ weapons scientists. Much remains to be done; look to Congress to maintain funding for CTR and related programs.

China: Nonproliferation is central issue in bilateral relations. Making progress on nuclear issues; hope to be able to implement peaceful nuclear cooperation soon. Still problems on chemical and missile-related exports, especially to Iran and Pakistan. We'll be working with Chinese to strengthen controls.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 April 97 00:01
FROM Murray, Lori E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Update on status of conditions [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bell, Robert G.
Harris, Elisa D.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY
[[BIDEN3.DOC : 34 in BIDEN3.DOC]]
Attached is the latest update on the status of conditions after
Biden/Helms staff meeting on Friday. They are expected to meet again on
Monday.
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 13 April 97 23:59
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** BIDEN3.DOC

Conditions for the Resolution of Ratification 4/13

Agreed 18 **(Italics)* Under Negotiation 9 No Agreement 5 **(Bold)**
Dropped 1

*(1) Effect of Article XXII--agreed

(2) Limitation on the Scale of Assessment-- under negotiations.
unacceptable, unless joint resolution is replaced with
appropriate legislation or similar language. Still under
negotiation. Helms will remove BDA/verification cap if Jt/Res
stays on assessment.

*(3) Financial Contributions--Agreed

*(4) Establishment of an Internal Oversight Office--Agreed

*(5) Cost-Sharing Arrangements--Agreed

(6) Intelligence Sharing and Safeguards--under negotiation; MB
talking to Lauder. Shelby/Biden agree.

*(7) Amendments to Convention--Agreed

(8) Russian Elimination of Chemical Weapons--No Agreement

(9) Chemical Weapons in Countries Other Than Russia--No Agreement

(10) Criteria For United States Assistance to Russia--Helms has dropped.

(11) Continuing Vitality of the Australia Group--Under negotiation; must decide formulation for diplomatic contacts, description of effectiveness. MB may accept Biden definition of highest diplomatic contact.

*(12) Negative Security Assurances--Agreed

*(13) Protection of Advanced Biotechnology--Agreed

*(14) Monitoring and Verification of Compliance--Agreed just about--took Biden formulation on which countries listed.

*(15) Enhancements to Robust Chemical and Biological Defenses-- Agreed Need letter.

*(16) Noncompliance--Agreed

*(17) Primacy of United States Constitution--Agreed

*(18) Financing Russian Implementation--Agreed

*(19) Assistance Under Article X--Agreed. MB would not accept Biden addition.

(20) Riot Control Agents--Under negotiation.

(21) Protection of Confidential Information--Under negotiation.

*(22) Constitutional Prerogatives--Agreed

(23) Laboratory Sample Analysis--Agreed

(24) Designation of Inspectors--No Agreement

*(25) Amendments to the Annex on Chemicals--Agreed. Accepted Biden alternative.

(26) Constitutional Protection Against Unreasonable Search and Seizure--Under negotiation--criminal warrants for declared facilities is a problem.

*(27) Effect on Terrorism--Agreed

(28) Stemming the proliferation of Chemical Weapons--No Agreement

(29) Essential Verifiability--No Agreement

(30) Constitutional Separation of Powers. Under negotiation, Senate declaration may be acceptable.

Three more conditions may be added:

*(31) OSIA and industry inspections (Biden) will be Sense of Senate.

(32) Byrd-Biden revised (Helms) under negotiation; would add another section that would say nothing should be construed that would allow for amendments or modification of treaties to be made by statute.

*(33) Section 33 Foreign Assistance Act (Biden).

Senator Helms has also indicated that he may offer a condition which would not allow US deposit until Russia, China, and Iran ratify. No language has been shared and the issue has not come up in the most recent staff meetings.

Senator Helms is also indicating that he may offer a change to the chem demil condition which would relate to federal authority and proceeding with incineration if no alternative technology available.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 April 97 11:00
FROM Malley, Robert
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT UNHRC -- Racism Resolution [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Bass, Peter E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dohse, Fred J.
Friedrich, M. K.
Hall, Wilma G.
Harmon, Joyce
Helweg, M. Diana
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Kessinger, Jodi
Millison, Cathy L.
Veit, Katherine M.

CARBON_COPY Barks-Ruggles, Erica
Battenfield, Pat
Bendick, Gordon L.
Burrell, Christina L.
Danvers, William C.
Davis, William K.
McCormick, Shawn H.
Orr, Robert C.
Prendergast, John P.
Rice, Susan E.

TEXT_BODY

Please pass to JS ASAP -- We need a decision on this by this afternoon.
Thanks

Jim,

This e-mail has been coordinated with NSC/Legislative; Africa; and Global (which dissents):

In light of Eric's memorandum on the subject, we strongly believe that the US delegation should be instructed to join the consensus and issue an explanation of position (EOP) making clear our opposition to a World Conference.

While abstaining clearly would be preferable to a "no" vote, it still would put us in a very uncomfortable position: (1) We would be forced to call for a vote, thereby giving this issue higher visibility, singling out the US on this resolution, and angering both the African countries and domestic groups (both Congressional and NGO); (2) we would not oppose the resolution, thereby doing little to placate members of Congress opposed to the Conference.

An abstention also would be very difficult to justify domestically in light of recent reports that the President wants to make race relations a centerpiece of his Second Term (in particular by hosting a White House summit on the subject), and given that -- the Conference issue aside -- we fully agree with the resolution.

NSC/LEG VIEWS: Bill Danvers agrees, and adds that in his view it would be difficult for Senator Helms to make a great deal out of the Administration's support for a resolution on racism.

NSC/AFRICA VIEWS: Susan Rice agrees, both on foreign policy and on domestic grounds.

NSC/GLOBAL VIEWS: Mike Sheehan disagrees on the grounds that we need to take a strong position against UN Conferences. He would prefer that we vote "no," but could live with an abstention and a strong explanation of vote.

OPTIONS:

1) Join Consensus and Issue EOP (NSC/Dem; NSC/Africa; NSC/Leg support):

Agree _____ Disagree _____

2) Call for a Vote and Abstain:

Agree _____ Disagree _____

3) Call for a Vote and Oppose (NSC/Global supports):

Agree _____ Disagree _____

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Robert Malley to Peter Bass, Kristen Cicio, Glyn Davies et al. Subject: UNHCR - Racism Resolution. (3 pages)	04/14/1997	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Records (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Senator Helms])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[04/10/1997-04/15/1997]

2006-1363-F

vz5621

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 April 97 12:16
FROM Harris, Elisa D.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT POTUS CWC calls [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bass, Peter E.
Cicio, Kristen K.
Hall, Wilma G.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.
Veit, Katherine M.

CARBON_COPY Bell, Robert G.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Burrell, Christina L.
Danvers, William C.
Davis, William K.
Gibney, James S.
Gray, Wendy
LaFleur, Vinca A.
Murray, Lori E.
Naplan, Steven J.
Sonenshine, Tara D.

TEXT_BODY [[2230B.DOC : 3131 in 2230B.DOC]]

PLEASE PASS TO SANDY:

Here are points for the President to use in his CWC calls to Senators. Bill will be sending you the list of Senators we would like to have called.
Thanks!

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 14 April 97 12:14

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 2230B.DOC

CWC Points for Hill Meeting

Why Support the Treaty

☐ Need your support for the Chemical Weapons Convention, which we expect to be voted on in next two weeks.

☐ Earlier this month, had the honor of hosting broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters here at White House, including former Sec State James Baker, former JCS Chairman Colin Powell, former Reagan arms control advisors Paul Nitze and Ed Rowny and 100 other prominent former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, small and large business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.

☐ Prior to event, received two important letters expressing strong support for ratification. First was from former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft and former Senators Kassebaum and Boren.

☐ Second letter was from 17 retired flag officers, including three former Chairmen of the JCS (Powell, Vessey, Jones), five former Service Chiefs (McPeak, Mundy, Sullivan, Zumwalt and Dugan), Norman Schwarzkopf and 8 other Generals and Admirals.

☐ These letters join previous letters/expressions of support from former President Bush, Larry Eagleburger, former Senator Sam Nunn and many other leading Republican and Democratic officials.

☐ Would like to spend a few minutes outlining some of reasons why all of these people, with such diverse backgrounds and political views, believe CWC is in our national security interest.

☐ First, because it will reduce the chemical threat to our soldiers in the future. Well before the CWC was concluded, Congress directed the destruction of the vast majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. The CWC will require that others do the same, under strict international supervision. That is why every Chairman of the JCS since the Carter Administration -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell, and General Shali -- as well as former Secretaries of Defense Melvin Laird, Harold Brown and William Perry support this treaty.

☐ Second, because our participation is a tangible demonstration of our willingness to lead international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former

President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support this treaty.

☐ Third, because the treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help the Intelligence Community do a better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- a task they face with or without the CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet all support this treaty.

☐ Fourth, because it will give us new tools to deal with the emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting the flow of chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons, the CWC will make it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Attorney General Janet Reno, the International Union of Police Associations, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers and the National Association of Police Organizations all support this treaty.

☐ Fifth, because it will ensure a level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in certain dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not a party, our chemical companies will face CWC-mandated trade restrictions which could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales.

That is why the Chemical Manufacturers Association, the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America all support the treaty.

☐ Finally, because it will establish a global norm against the possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why the Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, the United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support this treaty.

☐ Recognize that the CWC will not "solve" the chemical weapons problem. But it is a key element of any effective response.

Treaty Status in Senate

☐ Since January, we have been negotiating in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and a group he has put together in an effort to address the concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about the treaty.

☐ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on a compromise or identified a reasonable alternative, leaving it to the Senate to decide between the two.

☐ Our objective has been to work with the Majority Leader and his CWC task force to facilitate a Senate vote by mid-April so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when the treaty comes into force.

☐ CWC has been before the Senate since November 1993. There have been 13 Senate hearings, hundreds of questions answered for the record and numerous briefings of both members and staff.

☐

☐ We have moved well beyond the resolution of ratification that was on the Senate calendar last September. It's now time for the Senate to debate and vote.

Importance of April 29 Deadline

☐ April 29 is a real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act before then, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Will also be denied the ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- getting out of the chemical weapons business.

- ☐ Without ratification, the credibility of American leadership across a full range of transnational issues will be undermined.
- ☐ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors. And Americans now serving in key posts, including as head of security, administration, and industry inspections, will be replaced by nationals from countries that have ratified.
- ☐ American chemical companies will also begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 April 97 19:05

FROM Blinken, Antony J.

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ Revised Retreat Q&A

TO Brown, Nancy E.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dohse, Fred J.
Friedrich, M. K.
Harmon, Joyce
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.
Sonenshine, Tara D.

CARBON_COPY Luzzatto, Anne R.

TEXT_BODY [[RETREAT.DOC : 4948 in RETREAT.DOC]]

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 5/16/2017
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By 12 NARA, Date 8/14/2019
2006 - 1368 - F(3)

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE 14 April 97 19:4

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME RETREAT.DOC
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Reason: 1.5 (b)(d)
Declassify on: 04/11/07
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SEGMENT I: EUROPE (6:30-7:30 P.M.)

EUROPEAN SECURITY/NATO ENLARGEMENT

NATO enlargement priority for second term -- key test of American leadership. Requires Senate ratification, House support because of new security commitments.

Now that the Cold War is over, why place so much emphasis on Europe, expend so much energy on NATO?

☐ European security vital U.S. interest; through NATO adaptation, NATO

enlargement, enhanced PFP, NATO-Russia and OSCE, have opportunity, for first time in history, to build secure, undivided, democratic Europe.

Won't enlargement just dilute European security?

☐ NATO enlargement will project stability and security into all of Europe; will strengthen and safeguard region's democratic and free-market transformation.

☐ Prospect of NATO membership strengthening democratic forces in Eastern Europe, weakening nationalists, promoting resolution of regional disputes (e.g., Hungary-Romania).

Aren't you letting Russia set terms of enlargement? Conversely, won't

enlargement isolate Russia and threaten its democracy?

☐ Helsinki put NATO-Russia on track without sacrificing enlargement, which is moving forward on schedule. Russia should have a voice, but no veto.

☐ NATO-Russia relationship -- via Charter, formal consultative mechanism -- can bring Russia into emerging security system.

What are the costs and how did you calculate them?

☐ U.S. costs affordable: \$150-200M per year. Costs to new members also affordable -- as CEE governments already said.

☐ Current threat low. Defense of new members possible through assuring the capability for reinforcement and modernization of new members' forces.

☐ Therefore, NATO concluded no need to permanently station substantial NATO combat forces; no intention or need to deploy nuclear forces on soil of new members.

☐ New NATO members will be valuable, committed members. IFOR -- where Poles, Czechs, others have combat troops; Hungary supplying bases -- shows CEE will make meaningful contribution.

Why not EU enlargement vice NATO?

☐ EU, NATO enlargement part of same historic process. Both

important,
not mutually exclusive.

☐ EU not equipped to be lead organization for European security and integration, as Bosnia demonstrated. Key to long-term European stability is U.S. engagement and leadership, which comes only through NATO.

Will the American people support enlargement?

☐ Americans not isolationist: Majority (62%) support NATO enlargement to Poland, Czech, Hungary; 68% would favor defending Poland with U.S. troops.

Why enlarge NATO absent a threat?

☐ Need NATO enlargement for same reason we need NATO: America's core alliance in uncertain world. Cannot foresee all threats, but know preparedness deters them. Through enlargement can extend same stability to Central Europe that Western Europe enjoyed for 45 years.

☐ Failure to enlarge NATO would betray our traditions and America's role throughout 20th century. Must not exclude countries that have demonstrated commitment to defend our common values and to share in common burdens.

RUSSIA

Aren't the reformers fighting an uphill battle?

☐ Yeltsin back in charge. New team has potential to take on economic problems that overshadow everything else in Russia.

☐ Yeltsin showed at Helsinki ready to tackle tough issues and make decisions.

☐ Russian reform -- and bilateral relations - likely be bumpy road, but overall direction positive.

☐ As we continue to support reform, will also maintain commitment to sovereignty and independence of other NIS, like Ukraine.

Wasn't Helsinki just an agreement to disagree on NATO?

☐ Summit re-energized U.S.-Russian relations.

☐ Turned corner on NATO enlargement. Russia opposed, but ready to develop NATO-Russia relationship. If we can get Charter nailed down, possibility of signing before Madrid.

☐ Important progress on arms control: START, ABM/TMD.

☐ Defined path to stimulate trade and investment; will bolster reform in Russia and mean new jobs for Americans.

Why are you asking for more money in your FY98 budget for assistance to the NIS?

☐ Bipartisan support critical, especially for FY-98 Partnership for Freedom request. Funding for Russia, NIS will promote trade and investment, lock in reforms, expand people-to-people contacts that will forge important ties with tomorrow's leaders.

BOSNIA

What have we accomplished in Bosnia other than to enforce artificial peace that will collapse when we leave?

☐ In summer of 1995, bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II raged. Few believed peace possible; many questioned NATO's role in post-Cold War era.

☐ Since then, U.S. leadership produced Dayton Accords, and revitalized NATO helped consolidate peace, providing environment for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction.

☐ Efforts in Bosnia have exceeded expectations:

☐ Implemented military aspects of Dayton with no combat casualties; held national elections in September; created joint national institutions; returned more than 200,000 refugees.

☐ U.S.-led, Train-and-Equip program building stable military balance and facilitating formation of joint defense structures.

☐ Making progress on economic reconstruction, especially in Bosniak-Croat Federation. Today, Sarajevo bustles with reconstruction; hundreds of cafes, shops, banks and other commercial endeavors open.

Why didn't we call it a day when the IFOR mandate ended?

- ☐ Still have long way to go: must do more to rebuild economy, create jobs, stimulate investment. Need greater cooperation from parties on freedom of movement and return of refugees.
- ☐ Bosnian people, with help of international NGOs, must assume responsibility for building own future.
- ☐ SFOR will provide stability and confidence for Bosnian people to continue toward these goals. Withdrawal of U.S. forces in mid-1998 should give sufficient time to ensure self-sustaining peace.

Why not cut our losses and get out now?

- ☐ Early, unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops would endanger progress made since Dayton. Could lead to resumption of war with resulting crisis in NATO; would erode U.S. credibility and leadership around world.
- ☐ Strongly urge your support for our efforts in Bosnia. Stability in Europe central to U.S. interests, as is preserving U.S. leadership of strong, effective NATO as it embarks on enlargement and new partnership with Russia.

SEGMENT II: Dinner and Discussion (8:00 - 8:45 p.m.)

RESOURCES AND REORGANIZATION

You're asking for more money for foreign affairs. What will we get out of it?

- ☐ Foreign affairs programs small part of federal budget -- about 1% of spending. But that 1% pays enormous dividends.
- ☐ Helps us to avoid wars and save lives; stems inflow of illegal drugs; helps us in war on terrorism; promotes democracy and other American values; and stimulates American exports and jobs.
- ☐ My budget calls for increasing international affairs spending by \$1.4 billion. Funding increase will enable us to sustain American global leadership and continue existing programs such as trade promotion activities that generate \$15 to \$20 billion in exports each year and support more than 300,000 jobs.

How can you be asking us to spend more on foreign affairs when we're trying to balance the budget?

☐ International affairs spending has fallen by roughly 20%, in real terms, over past four years. Steep decline has diminished ability to influence events overseas, raised serious questions about our willingness to remain engaged in international arena and cost us opportunities to promote American exports and jobs.

☐ Further reductions will create bigger problems for us down road.

UN ARREARS

Why should we throw money at a bloated bureaucracy like the U.N.?

☐ UN is important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Serves American interests in range of areas from refugee assistance, disease control and air traffic control. Its peacekeepers promote American interests around globe.

☐ Committed to American participation and leadership in reformed UN and to paying our financial obligations, but must insist on real reform.

Have you seen any signs of progress on reform?

☐ UN and member states have heard our message. UN reform primary motivation for insisting on new UN leadership -- and they understand we are committed to working with you to develop tough, but achievable, benchmarks that make UN more effective and accountable.

☐ Pleased with initial steps of Kofi Annan. Believe stage set for improved relations between U.S. and UN.

☐ Appreciate offer by Senator Lott to lead Task Force on UN Reform. Secretary Albright, OMB Director Raines and Ambassador Richardson have reported to me on progress of group.

What's your plan for paying our debts and dues while keeping reform on track?

☐ My last budget request is straightforward:

☐ UN commits to reduce future U.S. assessments to roughly amount

Congress approved past two years, with no new arrears.

☐ With your support, USG would offer advance appropriation to cover our arrears, but it would not be available until FY 99 and would be disbursed if agreed benchmarks met.

☐ Your early consideration of proposal would give our diplomats leverage they need in difficult negotiations. Many nations at point they do not believe American promises to repay arrears to UN. UN members need to see legitimate offer if they are to make the reforms we demand.

☐ Need to get this done within next weeks to have effect on budgetary changes being considered for 1998 and 1999.

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

What have we gotten out of our assistance to the NIS?

☐ Assistance working: two-thirds NIS under democratically elected leaders in emerging market economies; and two-thirds of Russia's economy now privatized. U.S. assistance can make change endure.

Why this new Partnership for Freedom initiative? What are the goals?

☐ Entrenching democracy, market economies advances overarching national interest in seeing NIS develop as partners of America; \$900 million under Partnership for Freedom real investment in peace and security that merits bipartisan support.

☐ Priority one is to tackle barriers to investment, fight crime, lock in economic reform, open region's vast resources to American business. Our efforts can leverage billions of dollars in trade and investment, which means jobs for Americans at home.

☐ Priority two is to bolster generational change, strengthen democracy; want to double people-to-people exchanges and support American foundations, volunteer groups to build civil society, focus on grass roots.

☐ Convinced after Helsinki time is ripe; Yeltsin committed to bold reform agenda; leaders of Ukraine, Georgia, other NIS committed to

make reform irreversible.

REORGANIZATION (IF NO DECISION REACHED)

Are we ever going to see a reorganization plan?

- ☐ Recognize there is great deal of speculation surrounding reorganization of foreign affairs organizations.
- ☐ Know some Members believe there must be significant change in international affairs agencies.
- ☐ As Secretary Albright has told Chairman Helms, we want to work with you on improving the coherence and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies.
- ☐ A high-level Administration working group is now concluding a careful examination of various proposals for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies. Working very hard developing a proposal on reorganization.
- ☐ Will forward my own proposal shortly so that we can begin more detailed discussions with you.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Who Supports the Treaty?

- ☐ Ten days ago, hosted broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters at White House: James Baker, Colin Powell, Paul Nitze and Ed Rowley, 100 other prominent, former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.
- ☐ Treaty has "made in America" written all over it: started by Reagan Administration, completed and signed by Bush Administration, submitted to Senate by my administration where many Republicans as well as Democrats support ratification..

Why Support the Treaty?

- ☐ First, reduces chemical threat to our soldiers. A decade ago, well before CWC concluded, Congress directed destruction of majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. CWC requires others do same, under strict international supervision. That's why every Chairman of JCS

since 1976 -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell and General Shali -- and former Secretaries of Defense Mel Laird, Harold Brown and Bill Perry -- support treaty.

☐ Second, our participation is tangible demonstration of international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support treaty.

☐ Third, treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help Intelligence Community do better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- task they face with or without CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet support treaty.

☐ Fourth, gives us new tools to deal with emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting flow of chemicals used to make chemical weapons, CWC makes it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, International Union of Police Associations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers and National Association of Police Organizations support treaty.

☐ Fifth, provides level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not party, our chemical companies face CWC-mandated trade restrictions that could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales. That is why Chemical Manufacturers Association, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America support treaty.

☐ Finally, establishes global norm against possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, U.S. Catholic Conference, Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support treaty.

☐ Recognize CWC will not "solve" chemical weapons problem, but it is key element of any effective response.

What is Treaty Status in Senate?

- ☐ Since January, have negotiated in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and group he put together in effort to address concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about treaty.
- ☐ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on compromise or identified reasonable alternative, leaving it to Senate to decide between two.
- ☐ Will work with Majority Leader and CWC task force to facilitate Senate vote by mid-April, so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when treaty enters force.
- ☐ We have moved well beyond resolution of ratification on Senate calendar last September. Now time for Senate to vote.

What's the Importance of April 29 Deadline?

- ☐ April 29 is real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Also denied ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- get out of chemical weapons business.
- ☐ Without ratification, credibility of American leadership across range of transnational issues undermined.
- ☐ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors.
- ☐ American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

FAST-TRACK

Why do you need fast track?

- ☐ Every President since Ford has had fast-track authority for key periods with bipartisan Congressional support. Our choice is clear:

can either move to break down barriers to our exports -- or let other countries do that for their companies and workers while we sit on sidelines.

☐ Trade is increasingly important to the future of our nation.

Exports

have generated over one quarter of our strong economic growth over past four years. Exports support an estimated 11.3 million U.S. jobs. Over 95% of the world's consumers live outside the United States. No question our future lies with selling American products to rest of world.

☐ About more than economics. Debate about more than economics. By expanding trade, we advance cause of freedom and democracy around world. There is no better example than Latin America where democracy and open markets are on march together.

How can we and why should we compete with developing countries who pay their workers less and don't meet the same tough labor and environmental standards as our companies?

☐ Our economy is envy of world; have nothing to fear. Over past four years, have created nearly 12 million new jobs, far more than other G-7 countries combined. We are once again world producer of autos, semiconductors. Once again largest exporter in world. Our competitors can't beat us, but we can lose if we sit on sidelines.

☐ American barriers are negligible compared with barriers in foreign markets. After Uruguay Round phased in, our tariffs will average 2.8%. Other countries far higher: India (31%); Turkey and Thailand (26%); Argentina, Chile and Brazil (10-11%). These are essentially one-way deals: we get more than we give up.

SEGMENT III: ASIA (Korea, China, MFN) (8:45-9:15 p.m.)

KOREA

What is the status of North Korea's nuclear program?

☐ With help of our allies South Korea and Japan, reached agreement with North Korea on framework that freezes production of nuclear material and eventually eliminates North Korea's nuclear program.

☐ KEDO, an international consortium of contributors, oversees process.

Funding for KEDO and light water reactor project essential to achieving non-nuclear Korean peninsula. Overwhelming bulk of funding

picked up by Japan, South Korea. Look to Congress to supply funds to sustain U.S. participation in critical endeavor. (FYI: asking for \$30 million in FY 98 budget.)

What are we doing about the signs of starvation in North Korea?

☐ The North Koreans face severe food shortages; UN estimate shortfall

between 1-2 million tons. We are reviewing appropriate response to most recent international humanitarian appeal for assistance.

Distribution of assistance monitored by World Food Program. Confident food aid is being delivered to those most in need, particularly children. Appreciate Congressional support for maintaining the U.S. tradition of not using food as a tool to advance

a particular political agenda.

What is the status of the four party peace talks?

☐ Hope that North Korea may now be ready to accept proposal for four-party peace talks I proposed with President Kim last April. Meeting North Koreans next week for further discussion.

☐ Also seeking progress on MIA's, missile proliferation.

CHINA

What is there to engage over with China -- aren't our differences so

basic and fundamental that your policy is meaningless?

☐ China's future has an enormous impact on our interests. Manner in which we

engage China in months ahead will affect whether China becomes destabilizing threat or constructive force in Asia and world.

☐ Substantial U.S. interests at stake: need China's cooperation in curbing

proliferation of WMD, securing permanent peace on Korean peninsula, alien

smuggling, counternarcotics. China will become world's largest economy

within 15 years; want access to that market for U.S. exports.

☐ Each of these interests is best served by stable, open, prosperous China that increasingly embraces international trade and nonproliferation rules. Isolating or containing China counterproductive. Want to work with Congress to forge common strategy.

Doesn't engagement come at the expense of our principles?

☐ Engagement does not mean endorsement. Working with Congress we can manage our interests with China soberly and prudently.

☐ Human Rights. Continue to support those in China who stand for freedom and human rights. Sponsored resolution in Geneva.

☐ Hong Kong. Future of Hong Kong remains serious concern as we approach July 1. Working with allies to ensure China understands action that allows Hong Kong's political and economic way of life to continue.

☐ Trade. Expect China to follow international trade rules and norms and live up to its commitments to us. Support WTO membership for China, but only on commercially meaningful terms.

☐ Nonproliferation. Continue to elicit Chinese support in combating proliferation; pressing China to tighten export controls and cease cooperation with such states as Iran.

Why should we extend MFN?

☐ Failure to extend MFN would undermine all of our interests, and reverse thirty years of bipartisan China policy. MFN revocation would not lead to improve human rights or better non-proliferation record; but would damage not only U.S. jobs but also Taiwan's economy and slash Hong Kong's trade by over \$30 billion.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 April 97 20:41
FROM Millison, Cathy L.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SUBJECT FW: ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
TO Brown, Nancy E.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dohse, Fred J.
Friedrich, M. K.
Harmon, Joyce
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Package has been forwarded back up to Mr. Berger. This new version has been placed on the G drive to replace the old ones.

[[2315PTS.DOC : 5194 in 2315PTS.DOC]]

From: Blinken, Antony J.
To: Sonenshine, Tara D.; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary
CC: /R, Record at A1; Luzzatto, Anne R.
Subject: ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~ Revised Retreat Q&A
Date: Monday, April 14, 1997 07:05 PM

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE 14 April 97 20:37

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME 2315PTS.DOC
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Reason: 1.5 (b)(d)
Declassify on: 04/11/07
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SEGMENT I: EUROPE (6:30-7:30 P.M.)

EUROPEAN SECURITY/NATO ENLARGEMENT

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 5/16/2017
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VL NARA, Date 2/14/2014
2006 -1363 - F (3)

NATO enlargement priority for second term -- key test of American leadership. Requires Senate ratification, House support because of new security commitments.

Now that the Cold War is over, why place so much emphasis on Europe, expend so much energy on NATO?

☐ European security vital U.S. interest; through NATO adaptation, NATO enlargement, enhanced PFP, NATO-Russia and OSCE, have opportunity, for first time in history, to build secure, undivided, democratic Europe.

Won't enlargement just dilute European security?

☐ NATO enlargement will project stability and security into all of Europe; will strengthen and safeguard region's democratic and free-market transformation.

☐ Prospect of NATO membership strengthening democratic forces in Eastern Europe, weakening nationalists, promoting resolution of regional disputes (e.g., Hungary-Romania).

Aren't you letting Russia set terms of enlargement? Conversely, won't enlargement isolate Russia and threaten its democracy?

☐ Helsinki put NATO-Russia on track without sacrificing enlargement, which is moving forward on schedule. Russia should have a voice, but no veto.

☐ NATO-Russia relationship -- via Charter, formal consultative mechanism -- can bring Russia into emerging security system.

What are the costs and how did you calculate them?

☐ U.S. costs affordable: \$150-200M per year. Costs to new members also affordable -- as CEE governments already said.

☐ Current threat low. Defense of new members possible through assuring the capability for reinforcement and modernization of new members' forces.

☐ Therefore, NATO concluded no need to permanently station substantial NATO combat forces; no intention or need to deploy nuclear forces on soil of new members.

☐ New NATO members will be valuable, committed members. IFOR -- where Poles, Czechs, others have combat troops; Hungary supplying bases -- shows CEE will make meaningful contribution.

Why not EU enlargement vice NATO?

☐ EU, NATO enlargement part of same historic process. Both important, not mutually exclusive.

☐ EU not equipped to be lead organization for European security and integration, as Bosnia demonstrated. Key to long-term European stability is U.S. engagement and leadership, which comes only through NATO.

Will the American people support enlargement?

☐ Americans not isolationist: Majority (62%) support NATO enlargement to Poland, Czech, Hungary; 68% would favor defending Poland with U.S. troops.

Why enlarge NATO absent a threat?

☐ Need NATO enlargement for same reason we need NATO: America's core alliance in uncertain world. Cannot foresee all threats, but know preparedness deters them. Through enlargement can extend same stability to Central Europe that Western Europe enjoyed for 45 years.

☐ Failure to enlarge NATO would betray our traditions and America's role throughout 20th century. Must not exclude countries that have demonstrated commitment to defend our common values and to share in common burdens.

RUSSIA

Aren't the reformers fighting an uphill battle?

☐ Yeltsin back in charge. New team has potential to take on economic problems that overshadow everything else in Russia.

☐ Yeltsin showed at Helsinki ready to tackle tough issues and make decisions.

☐ Russian reform -- and bilateral relations - likely be bumpy road, but overall direction positive.

☐ As we continue to support reform, will also maintain commitment to sovereignty and independence of other NIS, like Ukraine.

Wasn't Helsinki just an agreement to disagree on NATO?

☐ Summit re-energized U.S.-Russian relations.

☐ Turned corner on NATO enlargement. Russia opposed, but ready to develop NATO-Russia relationship. If we can get Charter nailed down, possibility of signing before Madrid.

☐ Important progress on arms control: START, ABM/TMD.

☐ Defined path to stimulate trade and investment; will bolster reform in Russia and mean new jobs for Americans.

Why are you asking for more money in your FY 98 budget for assistance to the NIS?

☐ Bipartisan support critical, especially for FY 98 Partnership for Freedom request. Funding for Russia, NIS will promote trade and investment, lock in reforms, expand people-to-people contacts that will forge important ties with tomorrow's leaders.

BOSNIA

What have we accomplished in Bosnia other than to enforce artificial peace that will collapse when we leave?

☐ In summer of 1995, bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II raged. Few believed peace possible; many questioned NATO's role in post-Cold War era.

☐ Since then, U.S. leadership produced Dayton Accords, and revitalized NATO helped consolidate peace, providing environment for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction.

☐ Efforts in Bosnia have exceeded expectations:

☐ Implemented military aspects of Dayton with no combat casualties; held national elections in September; created joint national institutions; returned more than 200,000 refugees.

☐ U.S.-led, Train-and-Equip program building stable military balance and facilitating formation of joint defense structures.

☐ Making progress on economic reconstruction, especially in Bosniak-Croat Federation. Today, Sarajevo bustles with reconstruction; hundreds of cafes, shops, banks and other commercial endeavors open.

Why didn't we call it a day when the IFOR mandate ended?

☐ Still have long way to go: must do more to rebuild economy, create jobs, stimulate investment. Need greater cooperation from parties on freedom of movement and return of refugees.

☐ Bosnian people, with help of international NGOs, must assume responsibility for building own future.

☐ SFOR will provide stability and confidence for Bosnian people to continue toward these goals. Withdrawal of U.S. forces in mid-1998 should give sufficient time to ensure self-sustaining peace.

Why not cut our losses and get out now?

☐ Early, unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops would endanger progress made since Dayton. Could lead to resumption of war with resulting crisis in NATO; would erode U.S. credibility and leadership around world.

☐ Strongly urge your support for our efforts in Bosnia. Stability in Europe central to U.S. interests, as is preserving U.S. leadership of strong, effective NATO as it embarks on enlargement and new partnership with Russia.

SEGMENT II: Dinner and Discussion (8:00 - 8:45 p.m.)

RESOURCES AND REORGANIZATION

You're asking for more money for foreign affairs. What will we get out of it?

☐ Foreign affairs programs small part of federal budget -- about 1% of spending. But that 1% pays enormous dividends.

☐ Helps us to avoid wars and save lives; stems inflow of illegal

drugs; helps us in war on terrorism; promotes democracy and other American values; and stimulates American exports and jobs.

☐ My budget calls for increasing international affairs spending by \$1.4 billion. Funding increase will enable us to sustain American global leadership and continue existing programs such as trade promotion activities that generate \$15 to \$20 billion in exports each year and support more than 300,000 jobs.

How can you be asking us to spend more on foreign affairs when we're trying to balance the budget?

☐ International affairs spending has fallen by roughly 20%, in real terms, over past four years. Steep decline has diminished ability to influence events overseas, raised serious questions about our willingness to remain engaged in international arena and cost us opportunities to promote American exports and jobs.

☐ Further reductions will create bigger problems for us down road.

Are we ever going to see a reorganization plan?

☐ Recognize there is great deal of speculation surrounding reorganization of foreign affairs organizations.

☐ Know some Members believe there must be significant change in international affairs agencies.

☐ As Secretary Albright has told Chairman Helms, we want to work with you on improving the coherence and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies.

☐ A high-level Administration working group is now concluding a careful examination of various proposals for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies. Working very hard developing a proposal on reorganization.

☐ Will forward my own proposal shortly so that we can begin more detailed discussions with you.

UN ARREARS

Why should we throw money at a bloated bureaucracy like the U.N.?

☐ UN is important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Serves American interests in range of areas from refugee assistance, disease control and air traffic control. Its peacekeepers promote American interests around globe.

☐ Committed to American participation and leadership in reformed UN and to paying our financial obligations, but must insist on real reform.

Have you seen any signs of progress on reform?

☐ UN and member states have heard our message. UN reform primary motivation for insisting on new UN leadership -- and they understand we are committed to working with you to develop tough, but achievable, benchmarks that make UN more effective and accountable.

☐ Pleased with initial steps of Kofi Annan. Believe stage set for improved relations between U.S. and UN.

☐ Appreciate offer by Senator Lott to lead Task Force on UN Reform. Secretary Albright, OMB Director Raines and Ambassador Richardson have reported to me on progress of group.

What's your plan for paying our debts and dues while keeping reform on track?

☐ My last budget request is straightforward:

☐ UN commits to reduce future U.S. assessments to roughly amount Congress approved past two years, with no new arrears.

☐ With your support, USG would offer advance appropriation to cover our arrears, but it would not be available until FY 99 and would be disbursed if agreed benchmarks met.

☐ Your early consideration of proposal would give our diplomats leverage they need in difficult negotiations. Many nations at point they do not believe American promises to repay arrears to UN. UN members need to see legitimate offer if they are to make the reforms we demand.

☐ Need to get this done within next weeks to have effect on budgetary

changes being considered for 1998 and 1999.

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

What have we gotten out of our assistance to the NIS?

☐ Assistance working: two-thirds NIS under democratically elected leaders in emerging market economies; and two-thirds of Russia's economy now privatized. U.S. assistance can make change endure.

Why this new Partnership for Freedom initiative? What are the goals?

☐ Entrenching democracy, market economies advances overarching national interest in seeing NIS develop as partners of America; \$900 million under Partnership for Freedom real investment in peace and security that merits bipartisan support.

☐ Priority one is to tackle barriers to investment, fight crime, lock in economic reform, open region's vast resources to American business. Our efforts can leverage billions of dollars in trade and investment, which means jobs for Americans at home.

☐ Priority two is to bolster generational change, strengthen democracy; want to double people-to-people exchanges and support American foundations, volunteer groups to build civil society, focus on grass roots.

☐ Convinced after Helsinki time is ripe; Yeltsin committed to bold reform agenda; leaders of Ukraine, Georgia, other NIS committed to make reform irreversible.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Who Supports the Treaty?

☐ Ten days ago, hosted broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters at White House: James Baker, Colin Powell, Paul Nitze and Ed Rowley, 100 other prominent, former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.

☐ Treaty has "made in America" written all over it: started by Reagan Administration, completed and signed by Bush Administration,

submitted to Senate by my administration where many Republicans as well as Democrats support ratification..

Why Support the Treaty?

- ☐ First, reduces chemical threat to our soldiers. A decade ago, well before CWC concluded, Congress directed destruction of majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. CWC requires others do same, under strict international supervision. That's why every Chairman of JCS since 1976 -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell and General Shali -- and former Secretaries of Defense Mel Laird, Harold Brown and Bill Perry -- support treaty.
- ☐ Second, our participation is tangible demonstration of international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support treaty.
- ☐ Third, treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help Intelligence Community do better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- task they face with or without CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet support treaty.
- ☐ Fourth, gives us new tools to deal with emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting flow of chemicals used to make chemical weapons, CWC makes it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, International Union of Police Associations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers and National Association of Police Organizations support treaty.
- ☐ Fifth, provides level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not party, our chemical companies face CWC-mandated trade restrictions that could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales. That is why Chemical Manufacturers Association, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America support treaty.

☐ Finally, establishes global norm against possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, U.S. Catholic Conference, Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support treaty.

☐ Recognize CWC will not "solve" chemical weapons problem, but it is key element of any effective response.

What is Treaty Status in Senate?

☐ Since January, have negotiated in good faith with Majority Leader Lott and group he put together in effort to address concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about treaty.

☐ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on compromise or identified reasonable alternative, leaving it to Senate to decide between two.

☐ Will work with Majority Leader and CWC task force to facilitate Senate vote by mid-April, so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when treaty enters force.

☐ We have moved well beyond resolution of ratification on Senate calendar last September. Now time for Senate to vote.

What's the Importance of April 29 Deadline?

☐ April 29 is real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Also denied ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- get out of chemical weapons business.

☐ Without ratification, credibility of American leadership across range of transnational issues undermined.

☐ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors.

☐ American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase

in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

FAST-TRACK

Why do you need fast track?

☐ Every President since Ford has had fast-track authority for key periods with bipartisan Congressional support. Our choice is clear:

can either move to break down barriers to our exports -- or let other countries do that for their companies and workers while we sit on sidelines.

☐ Trade is increasingly important to the future of our nation.

Exports

have generated over one quarter of our strong economic growth over past four years. Exports support an estimated 11.3 million U.S. jobs. Over 95% of the world's consumers live outside the United States. No question our future lies with selling American products to rest of world.

☐ About more than economics. Debate about more than economics. By expanding trade, we advance cause of freedom and democracy around world. There is no better example than Latin America where democracy and open markets are on march together.

How can we and why should we compete with developing countries who pay

their workers less and don't meet the same tough labor and environmental standards as our companies?

☐ Our economy is envy of world; have nothing to fear. Over past four

years, have created nearly 12 million new jobs, far more than other G-7 countries combined. We are once again world producer of autos, semiconductors. Once again largest exporter in world. Our competitors can't beat us, but we can lose if we sit on sidelines.

☐ American barriers are negligible compared with barriers in foreign markets. After Uruguay Round phased in, our tariffs will average 2.8%. Other countries far higher: India (31%); Turkey and Thailand

(26%); Argentina, Chile and Brazil (10-11%). These are essentially one-way deals: we get more than we give up.

SEGMENT III: ASIA (Korea, China, MFN) (8:45-9:15 p.m.)

KOREA

What is the status of North Korea's nuclear program?

☐ With help of our allies South Korea and Japan, reached agreement with North Korea on framework that freezes production of nuclear material and eventually eliminates North Korea's nuclear program.

☐ KEDO, an international consortium of contributors, oversees process.

Funding for KEDO and light water reactor project essential to achieving non-nuclear Korean peninsula. Overwhelming bulk of funding picked up by Japan, South Korea. Look to Congress to supply funds to sustain U.S. participation in critical endeavor. (FYI: asking for \$30 million in FY 98 budget.)

What are we doing about the signs of starvation in North Korea?

☐ The North Koreans face severe food shortages; UN estimate shortfall

between 1-2 million tons. We are reviewing appropriate response to most recent international humanitarian appeal for assistance. Distribution of assistance monitored by World Food Program. Confident food aid is being delivered to those most in need, particularly children. Appreciate Congressional support for maintaining the U.S. tradition of not using food as a tool to advance a particular political agenda.

What is the status of the four party peace talks?

☐ Hope that North Korea may now be ready to accept proposal for four-party peace talks I proposed with President Kim last April. Meeting North Koreans next week for further discussion.

☐ Also seeking progress on MIA's, missile proliferation.

CHINA

What is there to engage over with China -- aren't our differences so basic and fundamental that your policy is meaningless?

☐ China's future has an enormous impact on our interests. Manner in which we engage China in months ahead will affect whether China becomes

destabilizing
threat or constructive force in Asia and world.

☐ Substantial U.S. interests at stake: need China's cooperation in curbing proliferation of WMD, securing permanent peace on Korean peninsula, alien smuggling, counternarcotics. China will become world's largest economy within 15 years; want access to that market for U.S. exports.

☐ Each of these interests is best served by stable, open, prosperous China that increasingly embraces international trade and nonproliferation rules. Isolating or containing China counterproductive. Want to work with Congress to forge common strategy.

Doesn't engagement come at the expense of our principles?

☐ Engagement does not mean endorsement. Working with Congress we can manage our interests with China soberly and prudently.

☐ Human Rights. Continue to support those in China who stand for freedom and human rights. Sponsored resolution in Geneva.

☐ Hong Kong. Future of Hong Kong remains serious concern as we approach July 1. Working with allies to ensure China understands action that allows Hong Kong's political and economic way of life to continue.

☐ Trade. Expect China to follow international trade rules and norms and live up to its commitments to us. Support WTO membership for China, but only on commercially meaningful terms.

☐ Nonproliferation. Continue to elicit Chinese support in combating proliferation; pressing China to tighten export controls and cease cooperation with such states as Iran.

Why should we extend MFN?

☐ Failure to extend MFN would undermine all of our interests, and reverse thirty years of bipartisan China policy. MFN revocation would not lead to improve human rights or better non-proliferation record; but would damage not only U.S. jobs but also Taiwan's economy and slash Hong Kong's trade by

over \$30
billion.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 15 April 97 11:33
FROM Lindsay, James M.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SUBJECT Reorg Next Steps ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
TO Davis, William K.
Ragan, Richard F.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 5/16/2017
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VZ NARA, Date 2/17/2014
2006-1363-7(3)

[[STEPS-1.DOC : 2901 in STEPS-1.DOC]]

Will and Richard,

I've been tasked to come up with a short list of next steps to go in a cover memo to the President re reorg. I'd appreciate any comments, additions or edits to the attached. To keep the people across the street smiling, I need the feedback by early afternoon.

Thanks,

Jim

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE 15 April 97 11:30

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME STEPS-1.DOC

Next Steps

If you decide to reorganize the foreign policy apparatus, we will need to move quickly to communicate that decision to the affected agencies, to the Hill and to the public. After it is decided when and how you will announce your decision, we will take the following steps:

The Administration

- ☐ Notify the Secretary of State and agency heads so that they may inform their senior staff of the decision.
- ☐ Direct the Secretary of State to appoint a reorganization "czar" to oversee all reinvention and reorganization efforts (if you select options A, C or D).

- ☐ Appoint an interagency task force to coordinate the reinvention effort or review. The task force will be composed of representatives from State, ACDA, AID, USIA, NSC, OMB and OVP. (Under Option B, OMB chairs the task force.)
- ☐ Prepare any necessary legislative requests for reorganization authority.

Capitol Hill

- ☐ Notify the Congressional leadership and other relevant members of your decision. We recommend that you call Speaker Gingrich and Majority Leader Lott. We will ask Secretary Albright to call Senator Helms and other members.
- ☐ Arrange briefings for relevant Congressional committees.
- ☐ Submit legislation requesting reorganization authority.

The Public

- ☐ Prepare fact sheets and other briefing materials to support your announcement.
- ☐ Hold background briefings for the news media.
- ☐ Brief nongovernmental organizations that have been vocal on the issue of reorganization.
- ☐ Arrange for prominent foreign policy experts from both political parties to endorse your decision.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 15 April 97 19:27
FROM Millison, Cathy L.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SUBJECT Foreign Policy Retreat [~~CONFIDENTIAL~~]
TO Wise, William M.
CARBON_COPY Kerrick, Donald L.
TEXT_BODY

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 13526 5/16/07
 White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
 By VZ NARA, Date 2/14/2009
 2006-1313-1 (3)

Per your discussion with General Kerrick:

[[2315PTS.DOC : 4932 in 2315PTS.DOC]][[2315TPS.DOC : 4933 in
 2315TPS.DOC
]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 14 April 97 20:44

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 2315PTS.DOC
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 Reason: 1.5 (b)(d)
 Declassify on: 04/11/07
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
 SEGMENT I: EUROPE (6:30-7:30 P.M.)

EUROPEAN SECURITY/NATO ENLARGEMENT

NATO enlargement priority for second term -- key test of American leadership. Requires Senate ratification, House support because of new security commitments.

Now that the Cold War is over, why place so much emphasis on Europe, expend so much energy on NATO?

☐ European security vital U.S. interest; through NATO adaptation, NATO enlargement, enhanced PFP, NATO-Russia and OSCE, have opportunity, for first time in history, to build secure, undivided, democratic Europe.

Won't enlargement just dilute European security?

☐ NATO enlargement will project stability and security into all of Europe; will strengthen and safeguard region's democratic and free-market transformation.

☐ Prospect of NATO membership strengthening democratic forces in Eastern Europe, weakening nationalists, promoting resolution of regional disputes (e.g., Hungary-Romania).

Aren't you letting Russia set terms of enlargement? Conversely, won't enlargement isolate Russia and threaten its democracy?

☐ Helsinki put NATO-Russia on track without sacrificing enlargement, which is moving forward on schedule. Russia should have a voice, but no veto.

☐ NATO-Russia relationship -- via Charter, formal consultative mechanism -- can bring Russia into emerging security system.

What are the costs and how did you calculate them?

☐ U.S. costs affordable: \$150-200M per year. Costs to new members also affordable -- as CEE governments already said.

☐ Current threat low. Defense of new members possible through assuring the capability for reinforcement and modernization of new members' forces.

☐ Therefore, NATO concluded no need to permanently station substantial NATO combat forces; no intention or need to deploy nuclear forces on soil of new members.

☐ New NATO members will be valuable, committed members. IFOR -- where Poles, Czechs, others have combat troops; Hungary supplying bases -- shows CEE will make meaningful contribution.

Why not EU enlargement vice NATO?

☐ EU, NATO enlargement part of same historic process. Both important, not mutually exclusive.

☐ EU not equipped to be lead organization for European security and integration, as Bosnia demonstrated. Key to long-term European stability is U.S. engagement and leadership, which comes only

through
NATO.

Will the American people support enlargement?

☐ Americans not isolationist: Majority (62%) support NATO enlargement to Poland, Czech, Hungary; 68% would favor defending Poland with U.S. troops.

Why enlarge NATO absent a threat?

☐ Need NATO enlargement for same reason we need NATO: America's core alliance in uncertain world. Cannot foresee all threats, but know preparedness deters them. Through enlargement can extend same stability to Central Europe that Western Europe enjoyed for 45 years.

☐ Failure to enlarge NATO would betray our traditions and America's role throughout 20th century. Must not exclude countries that have demonstrated commitment to defend our common values and to share in common burdens.

RUSSIA

Aren't the reformers fighting an uphill battle?

☐ Yeltsin back in charge. New team has potential to take on economic problems that overshadow everything else in Russia.

☐ Yeltsin showed at Helsinki ready to tackle tough issues and make decisions.

☐ Russian reform -- and bilateral relations - likely be bumpy road, but overall direction positive.

☐ As we continue to support reform, will also maintain commitment to sovereignty and independence of other NIS, like Ukraine.

Wasn't Helsinki just an agreement to disagree on NATO?

☐ Summit re-energized U.S.-Russian relations.

☐ Turned corner on NATO enlargement. Russia opposed, but ready to develop NATO-Russia relationship. If we can get Charter nailed down, possibility of signing before Madrid.

☐ Important progress on arms control: START, ABM/TMD.

☐ Defined path to stimulate trade and investment; will bolster reform in Russia and mean new jobs for Americans.

Why are you asking for more money in your FY 98 budget for assistance to the NIS?

☐ Bipartisan support critical, especially for FY 98 Partnership for Freedom request. Funding for Russia, NIS will promote trade and investment, lock in reforms, expand people-to-people contacts that will forge important ties with tomorrow's leaders.

BOSNIA

What have we accomplished in Bosnia other than to enforce artificial peace that will collapse when we leave?

☐ In summer of 1995, bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II raged. Few believed peace possible; many questioned NATO's role in post-Cold War era.

☐ Since then, U.S. leadership produced Dayton Accords, and revitalized NATO helped consolidate peace, providing environment for political reconciliation and economic reconstruction.

☐ Efforts in Bosnia have exceeded expectations:

☐ Implemented military aspects of Dayton with no combat casualties; held national elections in September; created joint national institutions; returned more than 200,000 refugees.

☐ U.S.-led, Train-and-Equip program building stable military balance and facilitating formation of joint defense structures.

☐ Making progress on economic reconstruction, especially in Bosniak-Croat Federation. Today, Sarajevo bustles with reconstruction; hundreds of cafes, shops, banks and other commercial endeavors open.

Why didn't we call it a day when the IFOR mandate ended?

☐ Still have long way to go: must do more to rebuild economy, create jobs, stimulate investment. Need greater cooperation from parties on freedom of movement and return of refugees.

☐ Bosnian people, with help of international NGOs, must assume

responsibility for building own future.

☐ SFOR will provide stability and confidence for Bosnian people to continue toward these goals. Withdrawal of U.S. forces in mid-1998 should give sufficient time to ensure self-sustaining peace.

Why not cut our losses and get out now?

☐ Early, unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops would endanger progress made since Dayton. Could lead to resumption of war with resulting crisis in NATO; would erode U.S. credibility and leadership around world.

☐ Strongly urge your support for our efforts in Bosnia. Stability in Europe central to U.S. interests, as is preserving U.S. leadership of strong, effective NATO as it embarks on enlargement and new partnership with Russia.

SEGMENT II: Dinner and Discussion (8:00 - 8:45 p.m.)

RESOURCES AND REORGANIZATION

You're asking for more money for foreign affairs. What will we get out of it?

☐ Foreign affairs programs small part of federal budget -- about 1% of spending. But that 1% pays enormous dividends.

☐ Helps us to avoid wars and save lives; stems inflow of illegal drugs; helps us in war on terrorism; promotes democracy and other American values; and stimulates American exports and jobs.

☐ My budget calls for increasing international affairs spending by \$1.4 billion. Funding increase will enable us to sustain American global leadership and continue existing programs such as trade promotion activities that generate \$15 to \$20 billion in exports each year and support more than 300,000 jobs.

How can you be asking us to spend more on foreign affairs when we're trying to balance the budget?

☐ International affairs spending has fallen by roughly 20%, in real terms, over past four years. Steep decline has diminished ability

to influence events overseas, raised serious questions about our willingness to remain engaged in international arena and cost us opportunities to promote American exports and jobs.

☐ Further reductions will create bigger problems for us down road.

Are we ever going to see a reorganization plan?

☐ Recognize there is great deal of speculation surrounding reorganization of foreign affairs organizations.

☐ Know some Members believe there must be significant change in international affairs agencies.

☐ As Secretary Albright has told Chairman Helms, we want to work with you on improving the coherence and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies.

☐ A high-level Administration working group is now concluding a careful examination of various proposals for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the international affairs agencies. Working very hard developing a proposal on reorganization.

☐ Will forward my own proposal shortly so that we can begin more detailed discussions with you.

UN ARREARS

Why should we throw money at a bloated bureaucracy like the U.N.?

☐ UN is important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Serves American interests in range of areas from refugee assistance, disease control and air traffic control. Its peacekeepers promote American interests around globe.

☐ Committed to American participation and leadership in reformed UN and to paying our financial obligations, but must insist on real reform.

Have you seen any signs of progress on reform?

☐ UN and member states have heard our message. UN reform primary motivation for insisting on new UN leadership -- and they understand

we are committed to working with you to develop tough, but achievable, benchmarks that make UN more effective and accountable.

- ☐ Pleased with initial steps of Kofi Annan. Believe stage set for improved relations between U.S. and UN.
- ☐ Appreciate offer by Senator Lott to lead Task Force on UN Reform. Secretary Albright, OMB Director Raines and Ambassador Richardson have reported to me on progress of group.

What's your plan for paying our debts and dues while keeping reform on track?

- ☐ My last budget request is straightforward:
- ☐ UN commits to reduce future U.S. assessments to roughly amount Congress approved past two years, with no new arrears.
- ☐ With your support, USG would offer advance appropriation to cover our arrears, but it would not be available until FY 99 and would be disbursed if agreed benchmarks met.
- ☐ Your early consideration of proposal would give our diplomats leverage they need in difficult negotiations. Many nations at point they do not believe American promises to repay arrears to UN. UN members need to see legitimate offer if they are to make the reforms we demand.
- ☐ Need to get this done within next weeks to have effect on budgetary changes being considered for 1998 and 1999.

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

What have we gotten out of our assistance to the NIS?

- ☐ Assistance working: two-thirds NIS under democratically elected leaders in emerging market economies; and two-thirds of Russia's economy now privatized. U.S. assistance can make change endure.

Why this new Partnership for Freedom initiative? What are the goals?

- ☐ Entrenching democracy, market economies advances overarching

national interest in seeing NIS develop as partners of America;
\$900

million under Partnership for Freedom real investment in peace and security that merits bipartisan support.

☐ Priority one is to tackle barriers to investment, fight crime, lock

in economic reform, open region's vast resources to American business. Our efforts can leverage billions of dollars in trade and

investment, which means jobs for Americans at home.

☐ Priority two is to bolster generational change, strengthen democracy; want to double people-to-people exchanges and support American foundations, volunteer groups to build civil society, focus

on grass roots.

☐ Convinced after Helsinki time is ripe; Yeltsin committed to bold reform agenda; leaders of Ukraine, Georgia, other NIS committed to make reform irreversible.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

Who Supports the Treaty?

☐ Ten days ago, hosted broad-based, bipartisan group of treaty supporters at White House: James Baker, Colin Powell, Paul Nitze and

Ed Rowny, 100 other prominent, former government officials, retired military officers, veterans, business leaders, religious leaders, scientists and arms control experts.

☐ Treaty has "made in America" written all over it: started by Reagan

Administration, completed and signed by Bush Administration, submitted to Senate by my administration where many Republicans as well as Democrats support ratification..

Why Support the Treaty?

☐ First, reduces chemical threat to our soldiers. A decade ago, well

before CWC concluded, Congress directed destruction of majority of our chemical weapons stockpile. CWC requires others do same, under strict international supervision. That's why every Chairman of JCS since 1976 -- General David Jones, General John Vessey, Admiral William Crowe, General Colin Powell and General Shali -- and former Secretaries of Defense Mel Laird, Harold Brown and Bill Perry -- support treaty.

- ☐ Second, our participation is tangible demonstration of international efforts against CW proliferation and other transnational problems. That is why former President Bush and former Secretaries of State Baker and Eagleburger support treaty.
- ☐ Third, treaty's declaration and inspection provisions will help Intelligence Community do better job of monitoring CW programs worldwide -- task they face with or without CWC. That is why former CIA Directors Gates, Woolsey and Deutch and Acting DCI Tenet support treaty.
- ☐ Fourth, gives us new tools to deal with emerging threat of CW terrorism. By eliminating existing stockpiles and restricting flow of chemicals used to make chemical weapons, CWC makes it harder and more costly for terrorists to acquire or use chemical weapons. That is why Janet Reno, International Union of Police Associations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers and National Association of Police Organizations support treaty.
- ☐ Fifth, provides level playing field for our chemical companies, our largest exporters, by requiring all parties to control trade with non-parties in dual-use chemicals that can be used to make chemical weapons. If we are not party, our chemical companies face CWC-mandated trade restrictions that could cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year in sales. That is why Chemical Manufacturers Association, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America support treaty.
- ☐ Finally, establishes global norm against possession of poison gas, thus making any attempts to develop or use it not only immoral but illegal. That is why Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, U.S. Catholic Conference, Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church, United Methodist Church and so many other religious organizations support treaty.
- ☐ Recognize CWC will not "solve" chemical weapons problem, but it is key element of any effective response.

What is Treaty Status in Senate?

- ☐ Since January, have negotiated in good faith with Majority Leader

Lott and group he put together in effort to address concerns of some members of the Republican caucus about treaty.

□ During these discussions, Senator Helms has proposed about 30 conditions, and in nearly every case, we have either reached agreement on compromise or identified reasonable alternative, leaving it to Senate to decide between two.

□ Will work with Majority Leader and CWC task force to facilitate Senate vote by mid-April, so we can deposit our instrument of ratification prior to April 29, when treaty enters force.

□ We have moved well beyond resolution of ratification on Senate calendar last September. Now time for Senate to vote.

What's the Importance of April 29 Deadline?

□ April 29 is real deadline with real consequences. If Congress fails to act, Americans will be less secure. Will be denied access to CWC's tools against rogue states and terrorists who seek to acquire chemical weapons. Also denied ability to require other states to do what we are already doing -- get out of chemical weapons business.

□ Without ratification, credibility of American leadership across range of transnational issues undermined.

□ The United States will also lose its seat on the governing body implementing the treaty. Americans will be ineligible to serve as inspectors.

□ American chemical companies will begin losing sales to overseas competitors, as mandatory trade sanctions against non-parties phase in. Industry estimates this could put at risk as much as \$600 million in sales and many jobs.

FAST-TRACK

Why do you need fast track?

□ Every President since Ford has had fast-track authority for key periods with bipartisan Congressional support. Our choice is clear: can either move to break down barriers to our exports -- or let other countries do that for their companies and workers while we sit on sidelines.

☐ Trade is increasingly important to the future of our nation.

Exports

have generated over one quarter of our strong economic growth over past four years. Exports support an estimated 11.3 million U.S. jobs. Over 95% of the world's consumers live outside the United States. No question our future lies with selling American products to rest of world.

☐ About more than economics. Debate about more than economics. By expanding trade, we advance cause of freedom and democracy around world. There is no better example than Latin America where democracy and open markets are on march together.

How can we and why should we compete with developing countries who pay their workers less and don't meet the same tough labor and environmental standards as our companies?

☐ Our economy is envy of world; have nothing to fear. Over past four years, have created nearly 12 million new jobs, far more than other G-7 countries combined. We are once again world producer of autos, semiconductors. Once again largest exporter in world. Our competitors can't beat us, but we can lose if we sit on sidelines.

☐ American barriers are negligible compared with barriers in foreign markets. After Uruguay Round phased in, our tariffs will average 2.8%. Other countries far higher: India (31%); Turkey and Thailand (26%); Argentina, Chile and Brazil (10-11%). These are essentially one-way deals: we get more than we give up.

SEGMENT III: ASIA (Korea, China, MFN) (8:45-9:15 p.m.)

KOREA

What is the status of North Korea's nuclear program?

☐ With help of our allies South Korea and Japan, reached agreement with North Korea on framework that freezes production of nuclear material and eventually eliminates North Korea's nuclear program.

☐ KEDO, an international consortium of contributors, oversees process. Funding for KEDO and light water reactor project essential to

achieving non-nuclear Korean peninsula. Overwhelming bulk of funding picked up by Japan, South Korea. Look to Congress to supply funds to sustain U.S. participation in critical endeavor. (FYI: asking for \$30 million in FY 98 budget.)

What are we doing about the signs of starvation in North Korea?

☐ The North Koreans face severe food shortages; UN estimate shortfall between 1-2 million tons. We are reviewing appropriate response to most recent international humanitarian appeal for assistance. Distribution of assistance monitored by World Food Program. Confident food aid is being delivered to those most in need, particularly children. Appreciate Congressional support for maintaining the U.S. tradition of not using food as a tool to advance a particular political agenda.

What is the status of the four party peace talks?

☐ Hope that North Korea may now be ready to accept proposal for four-party peace talks I proposed with President Kim last April. Meeting North Koreans next week for further discussion.

☐ Also seeking progress on MIA's, missile proliferation.

CHINA

What is there to engage over with China -- aren't our differences so basic and fundamental that your policy is meaningless?

☐ China's future has an enormous impact on our interests. Manner in which we engage China in months ahead will affect whether China becomes destabilizing threat or constructive force in Asia and world.

☐ Substantial U.S. interests at stake: need China's cooperation in curbing proliferation of WMD, securing permanent peace on Korean peninsula, alien smuggling, counternarcotics. China will become world's largest economy within 15 years; want access to that market for U.S. exports.

☐ Each of these interests is best served by stable, open, prosperous China that increasingly embraces international trade and nonproliferation

rules.

Isolating or containing China counterproductive. Want to work with Congress to forge common strategy.

Doesn't engagement come at the expense of our principles?

☐ Engagement does not mean endorsement. Working with Congress we can manage our interests with China soberly and prudently.

☐ Human Rights. Continue to support those in China who stand for freedom and human rights. Sponsored resolution in Geneva.

☐ Hong Kong. Future of Hong Kong remains serious concern as we approach July 1. Working with allies to ensure China understands action that allows Hong Kong's political and economic way of life to continue.

☐ Trade. Expect China to follow international trade rules and norms and live up to its commitments to us. Support WTO membership for China, but only on commercially meaningful terms.

☐ Nonproliferation. Continue to elicit Chinese support in combating proliferation; pressing China to tighten export controls and cease cooperation with such states as Iran.

Why should we extend MFN?

☐ Failure to extend MFN would undermine all of our interests, and reverse thirty years of bipartisan China policy. MFN revocation would not lead to improve human rights or better non-proliferation record; but would damage not only U.S. jobs but also Taiwan's economy and slash Hong Kong's trade by over \$30 billion.

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE**

15 April 97 14:17

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME**

2315TPS.DOC

TALKING POINTS FOR FOREIGN POLICY DINNER
BLAIR HOUSE

INTRODUCTION

☐ Wanted to have this meeting since beginning of second term.
Less
than 1000 days before year 2000. Moment of historic opportunity.

Much disappeared: Iron Curtain, Soviet Union, Cold War, containment. Much new: global economy, information/technological revolution. Market democracy ascendant. First time in history, 2/3 of world's people live under governments of own choosing.

☐ But promising state of affairs did not arise out of blue; no guarantee it will endure. Era forged by steadfast American leadership over last half century -- through NATO, Marshall Plan, UN, World Bank and IFI's. Now our generation has chance and duty to build new frameworks, partnerships and institutions that will lock in gains, better place America to succeed and win in this new era, create better world for our children and theirs.

☐ Time of extraordinary opportunities and challenges in increasingly interdependent world. To meet them, we must lead -- and to lead, we must act. But that can't happen without renewed bipartisan consensus on importance of American engagement in world. And while you would not expect me to cede my basic Presidential prerogatives, believe strongly that close cooperation between Congress and Executive is crucial to effective foreign policy -- now as 50 years ago.

☐ Only have 3 hours tonight; want to make most of limited time together. I've asked NSA Sandy Berger to monitor our discussion, keep it moving, help us cover as comprehensively as possible broad range of issues on our agenda.

☐ Want to start with a brief overview of our priority goals; then with help of VP and foreign policy team move into three areas for more intensive discussion: European security, international affairs resources and Asia.

SIX STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

☐ In State of the Union, set out six strategic objectives to keep America secure and prosperous and preserve our global leadership.

Together, form roadmap to security, peace, prosperity -- not just

for next 4 years but next 50.

□ First, help build an undivided, democratic Europe at peace. Lesson of this century: When Europe in turmoil, America drawn into war; when Europe stable and prosperous, America benefits too. We have historic chance to create lasting peace by replacing Europe's divisions with ties of partnership, unity.

Leading effort by adapting and enlarging NATO to meet demands of new era; forging strong NATO-Russia partnership. Convinced enlargement will strengthen NATO, bolster Europe's new democracies, enhance regional cooperation, improve climate for prosperity, help make sure Central Europe never again a seedbed of war. This will require Senate ratification and the whole Congress to vote the needed resources. We must do this together.

Also extending reach of democracy and open markets across continent. \$900 million investment in our budget Partnership for Freedom for newly independent states will help turn fledgling market economies into competitive, open markets; will benefit their citizens, Americans alike. Convinced after Helsinki that time is ripe; urge bipartisan support.

□ Second, lead in building a strong and stable Asia Pacific community. America must remain balance wheel of stability in region where wars have claimed more than 200,000 American lives and markets now support more than 2 million American jobs.

Doing that by: strengthening our security and trade ties with Japan, working with South Korea to bring peace and stability to Korean Peninsula; engaging with China to advance our shared interests -- while addressing plainly our differences on important issues like human rights, trade.

□ Third, America must remain world's leading force for peace. Might of our military, force of our ideals, power of our example give our nation unique ability to help heal divisions, resolve conflicts before they explode -- e.g. Bosnia, Middle East, Haiti, Northern Ireland.

Can't be everywhere; can't respond to every emergency. But sometimes America and only America can tip balance toward peace.

When our interests and values at stake, and where we can make a difference, have responsibility to act.

Middle East an example of Democrats and Republicans alike putting resources, prestige on line for peace. Long term effort; steadfast support especially important in difficult moments.

□ Fourth, respond to new security threats like terrorism, drug trafficking, proliferation and crime -- threats that disregard national borders, demand collective solutions. Every nation must do its part to defeat these dangerous forces. Sometimes, our nation must and will act alone. But our hand is strengthened when we persuade others to work with us.

That's why doing all we can to build strong international coalitions: arms control agreements like CWC, greater law enforcement cooperation against international criminals, intelligence sharing to root out corruption, comprehensive strategy against terror.

□ Fifth, build new, open trading system for 21st century. America's future lies in trade. More than 95 percent of world's consumers live abroad; exports support more than 11 million U.S. jobs. In last four years, reached more than 200 trade agreements, each of which opened someone else's markets to U.S. business. Now asking Congress for fast-track authority every President has had since 1974 to negotiate new trade agreements, create opportunities for U.S.

We have nothing to fear: Our economy is envy of world. Over last four years, created more jobs than all other G-7 nations combined.

We have much to gain: with fast-track, I can work to open trade in areas where American firms are leading, e.g. high technology, agriculture. Can further open markets in Latin America and Asia -- fastest-growing in world.

□ Finally, must have tools to meet these challenges. Vice President will discuss this more in the next session. But want to emphasize that leadership has a price. Can't sit on some illusory Olympus and expect to remain global superpower. Need to meet responsibilities to family of nations.

Spending on international affairs programs plummeted 50 percent in the last ten years, roughly 20 percent in last four years. Steep decline diminished our ability to influence events abroad, undermined our leadership, cost us opportunities to promote exports and jobs. Further reductions will only create bigger problems for us later. Ounce of prevention worth pound of cure.

We're not in business of writing blank checks. Holding IFI's accountable for efficiency, effectiveness. Won uphill battle for new UN leadership; now, UN has Secretary General committed to reform. As we hold these institutions to their commitments, have to make good on our own by paying our debts and dues.

Also need to give trade finance agencies -- Ex-Im Bank, OPIC, TDA -- tools they need to help our exporters compete and succeed.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

- ☐ Ready to move on to first topic for broader discussion -- European security, in particular NATO enlargement and Bosnia.
- ☐ But first, want to focus on CWC, which as you know is before Senate over next several days.
- ☐ Urge you to remember bottom line: U.S. already getting rid of virtually all our chemical weapons. It's been U.S. policy since 1991 to renounce the use of CW for any purpose in war, including retaliation. Clearly in our interest for as many other nations as possible to follow our lead.
- ☐ With CWC, troops less likely to face CW on battlefield. Rogue states and terrorists will have harder time getting ingredients for weapons. New tools for verification, global network for intelligence will make it easier to prevent and punish would-be outlaws.
- ☐ On other hand, lose great deal if we don't ratify: Not there to enforce treaty we helped write, leaving US troops and citizens more vulnerable. Put ourselves in company of pariah nations like Libya and Iraq. Subject our chemical makers to trade penalties that could cost jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in sales. Send signal of retreat to world.

□ CWC reflects best of American bipartisanship. Negotiated under Presidents Reagan and Bush; supported by broad, growing number of Americans -- including every Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff since the Carter Administration. I urge Senate to do what is right and ratify CWC.

TARGETED DISCUSSION

□ Now, I'd like to ask Secretary Albright to open the discussion on European security with a few words on NATO enlargement...

[Approximately 6:35 p.m. Albright speaks, followed by approx. 20 minutes of discussion.]

[Approximately 7:00 p.m.]

□ I'd like to turn the subject to Bosnia, where 8,500 Americans are currently serving in NATO's Stabilization Force (SFOR) to help the peace become self-sustaining. Secretary Cohen and General Shalikashvili will each say a few words and then we'll open the discussion...

[Cohen and Shalikashvili speak 2 minutes each, followed by approx. 20 minutes of discussion.]

[7:30 p.m. Break for dinner. VP opens discussion of international affairs resources.]

[8:45 President returns to podium]

□ To conclude tonight, I'd like to turn our focus to Asia. My National Security Adviser Sandy Berger will open the discussion with a few comments on China. How China evolves, and how our relationship with China evolves, will have a profound affect on our nation and the world...

[Berger speaks, followed by discussion.]

[Concluding thank yous...]
