

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Jeffery DeLaurentis to Mara Rudman, James Baker, and Robert Kyle. Subject: Concurrence on Transmittal Package of Helms-Burton (Title I) Reports. (6 pages)	12/30/1997	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Record (Sept 97-Jan 01) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/25/1997-01/06/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5716

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]

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 11/25/97 1:10:41 PM
FROM Hilliard, Brenda I.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Blair Dinner Guest List [From Wang WPS] [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Davies, Glyn T.
Joshi, M. Kay

CARBON_COPY Millison, Cathy L.

TEXT_BODY

Glyn -

FYI, this is a reminder that you had hoped Mr. Berger would have time on the trip (or flying) to look at the latest Guest List for the Blair Official Diner. Just in case you didn't take with you a copy is attached.

KAY - Will you please print a copy of the attached for Glyn, since reading the list from the computer

it does not come out very clear but it seems to print o.k.

Hope
all is well. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Blair Guest List.Doc

DRAFT GUEST LIST FOR FEBRUARY 5, 1998
WHITE HOUSE DINNER IN HONOR OF
BRITISH PRIME MINISTER TONY BLAIR

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright
(202) 647-5291

Secretary of Defense & Mrs. William S. Cohen
(703) 695-5261

Secretary of Commerce & Mrs. William M. Daley

(202) 482-2112

Chief Justice William Rehnquist
(202) 479-3000

Secretary of Labor Alexis M. Herman
(202) 219-8271

National Security Advisor and Mrs. Samuel R. (Sandy) Berger
(Susan)
(202) 456-9481

CIA Director and Mrs. George J. Tenet
(202) 482-1100

Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and Ms. Brooke Shearer
(202) 647-9640

Chief of Protocol Mary Mel French
(202) 647-1276

General and Mrs. Hugh Shelton (Carolyn)
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
(703) 695-9121

Deputy National Security Advisor James B. Steinberg (Shere Abbott)
(202) 456-9491

Under Secretary of State & Mrs. Thomas Pickering
(202) 647-2471

Assistant Secretary (Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs) &
Mrs. Marc Grossman
(202) 647-9626

U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom and Mrs. Philip Lader
011-44-171-408-8111

Department of Defense Under Secretary for Policy Walter B.
Slocombe & Ms. Ellen Sideman
(703) 697-7200

National Security Council Senior Director for European Affairs
and Mrs. Donald Bandler (Jane)
(202) 456-9151

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State (Bureau of
European and Canadian Affairs) & Mrs. Anthony E. Wayne
(202) 647-6402

Mr. and Mrs. James M. Lyons (Marcia)
Rothgerber, Appel, Powers, and Johnson LLP
1 Tabor Center, Suite 3000
1200 17th St.
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 623-9000
Special Advisor to the President and the Secretary of State
for Economic Initiatives in Ireland

Representative and Mrs. John M. McHugh
2441 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-4604
(202) 225-4611
Member of both National Security and International Relations
Committees; was in London with the President

Representative & Mrs. Norman Sisisky (Rhoda)
2371 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-3224
(202) 225-6365
Member of National Security Committee; was in Madrid
with the President

Senator and Mrs. Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (Jill)
221 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-0802
(202) 224-5042
Ranking Democrat on Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Representative and Mrs. Lee H. Hamilton (Nancy)
2314 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-1409
(202) 225-5315
Ranking Democrat on House International Relations Committee

Senator and Mrs. Carl Levin (Barbara)
459 Russell Senate Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-2202
(202) 224-6221
Ranking Democrat on Armed Services Committee

Speaker and Mrs. Newt Gingrich
2428 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-1006
(202) 225-4501

Senator and Mrs. Edward M. Kennedy
315 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-2101
(202) 224-4543

Senator and Mrs. William V. Roth, Jr.
104 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-0801
(202) 224-2441
Chairman of Finance Committee and the NATO Observers Group

Representative and Mrs. Benjamin A. Gilman (Georgia)
2449 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-3220
(202) 225-3776
Chairman of HIRC

Senator and Mrs. Gordon Smith (Sharon)
SD-B40 #2 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-3704
(202) 224-3753
Chairman, SFRC sub-committee on Europe

Senator and Mrs. Jesse Helms
403 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-3301
(202) 224-6342

Senator and Mrs. Tom Daschle
509 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-3301
(202) 224-2321
Senate Minority Leader

Senator and Mrs. Trent Lott
487 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-2403
(202) 224-6253
Senate Majority Leader

Senator Christopher Dodd
444 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-0702
(202) 224-2823
Comm. on Foreign Relations; Friends of Ireland, Exec. Comm.

Senator John Warner
225 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-4601
(202) 224-2023
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower

PROMINENT AMERICANS

Mr. and Mrs. John J. Sweeney (Maureen)
President, American Federation of Labor and
Congress of Industrial Organizations
815 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006
(202) 637-5000

The Most Reverend and Mrs. Edmund Lee Browning (Patricia)
Presiding Bishop
Episcopal Church, USA
815 2nd Avenue
New York, NY 10017-4503
(212) 867-8400

His Eminence James Cardinal Hickey
Archdiocese of Washington Pastoral Center
P.O. Box 29260
Washington, D. C. 20017-0260
(301) 853-4540
Archbishop of Washington with the title of Cardinal

Mr. and Mrs. William H. Luers (Wendy)
President, Metropolitan Museum of Art
1000 5th Avenue
New York, NY 10028-0113
(212) 879-5500
former Ambassador, now President of the
Metropolitan Museum, New York
a leader in cultural exchanges

The Honorable and Mrs. Raymond G. H. Seitz
Lehman Brothers
1 Broadgate
London EC2M7HA
United Kingdom
011-44-171-260-2939
Chairman of the International Advisory Board of the
British-American Business Council and
Former U.S. Ambassador to the UK
Currently at the London office of Lehman Brothers,
and International Investment firm

Mr. and Mrs. Peter I. Bijur

Chief Executive Officer
Texaco, Inc.
2000 Westchester Avenue
White Plains, N.Y. 10650-0001
(914) 253-4000

The Honorable and Mrs. William J. Crowe, Jr., Adm. USN (Ret.)
1406 Coventry Lane
Alexandria, VA 22304
(703) 823-2197
Chairman of the Advisory Board, Capitoline/MS&L, Wash., D.C.
Visiting Prof. at George Washington University's Elliott
School of Int'l Affairs
Former U.S. Ambassador to the UK
Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Former Chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence
Advisory Board

Mr. and Mrs. George Mitchell (Heather)
Verner, Liipfert, et al.
901 15th St., N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 371-6155
Independent Chairman of the multi-party talks in Northern
Ireland; former U.S. Senator

Mr. and Mrs. Christopher B. Galvin
Chief Executive Officer
Motorola, Inc.
1303 E. Algonquin Road
Schaumburg, IL 60196
(847) 576-8500

Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Crandall
Chief Executive Officer
AMR Corporation
4333 Amon Carter Blvd.
Fort Worth, TX 76155
(817) 963-1234
CEO of American Airlines,
currently orchestrating a merger with
British Airways

Mr. & Mrs. Robert E. Allen (Betty)
CEO
AT&T Corporation
32 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10013
(212) 387-5400
AT&T is a prominent presence in the

telecommunications market in Britain

Mrs. Katherine Graham
Chairman of the Executive Committee
Washington Post Company
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071-0001
(202) 334-6652

Mr. & Mrs. David Brinkley
This Week
1717 DeSales Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-4401
(202) 222-7100

Mr. & Mrs. Martin Peretz (Anne)
Chairman and Editor-in-Chief
The New Republic
1220 19th Street NW #600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 331-7494

Ms. Barbara Walters
20/20
147 Columbus Avenue, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10023-5900
(212) 456-7050

Robert G. Kaiser
Managing Editor
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071
(202) 334-7513

Mr. & Mrs. Steven Erlanger (Betsy)
c/o The New York Times
1627 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-9999
(202) 862-0300
Steven Erlanger is the Washington correspondent for the New York Times

Mr. & Mrs. Jim Lehrer (Kate)
Station WETA-TV
P.O. Box 2626
Washington, D.C. 20013-2626
(703) 998-2600

Mr. Ted Turner & Ms. Jane Fonda

Turner Broadcasting
1 CNN Center
P.O. Box 105366
Atlanta, GA 30335
(404) 522-7630

Mr. Eric Clapton
c/o Warner Brothers, Inc.
75 Rockefeller Plaza
21st Floor
New York, NY 10019
(212) 275-4900
British musician, a cultural contemporary
of the Prime Minister

Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Springsteen (Patti)
c/o Premier Talent Agency
Attn: Barry Bell
3 E. 54th Street
New York, NY 10022-3108
(212) 758-4900
Celebrated American musician, and
contemporary of both the President and
Prime Minister Blair

Mr. & Mrs. Denzel Washington (Pauletta)
c/o Alan Nierob, Publicist
Rogers and Cowan
1888 Century Park East, Suite 500
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 550-4000
Denzel Washington is a thoughtful actor and
Democrat. Among his many films is a rendition
of Shakespeare's "Much Ado About Nothing."

Ms. Susan Abigail Sarandon (Tim Robbins)
c/o Nancy Seltzer and Associates
6220 Del Valle Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90048
(213) 938-3562
Academy Award winner Susan Sarandon is a politically-involved
member of the Hollywood community.

.??

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/12/97 3:48:27 PM
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT December 12 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.
Miyaoka, Lester H.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Press Briefing
December 12 McCurry Press Briefing

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT mike1212.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release December 12, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING BY
MIKE MCCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:40 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: The end of the week.

Q Is the President going to name a civil rights Attorney General on Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: The President hasn't made any final decision on that because the President would prefer to see him confirmed. The President believes that Bill Lann Lee is certainly the right person to be the head of the Civil Rights Division at the Justice Department and wants him in that job because he is the right person for the job. But far preferable would be to see the United States Senate confirm him. And we've gone back and made a request for a fair vote on the nomination, and until the President is absolutely convinced that Bill Lann Lee won't get a fair vote I imagine he won't have anything further to say. I don't rule out he may say something on it on Monday.

Q Does he have any new hope?

Q What? Excuse me -- what?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't rule out that he might say something on it on Monday. But on the other hand, I don't think he's made a decision at this point.

Q Does he have any new hope? I mean, has he been given any kind of encouragement?

MR. MCCURRY: He hasn't been given any encouragement.

Q Mike, there are sources on the Hill saying that the White House has actually begun making courtesy calls to advise them that a decision has been made.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know how that could happen because the President hasn't made a decision to move ahead with a recess appointment at this point.

Q Is that the process, though, that you would notify Lott in advance, and other people?

MR. MCCURRY: We've had conversations with the Majority Leader, it's pretty obvious. I think the Majority Leader ought to explain why Bill Lann Lee doesn't deserve a fair vote in the Senate. We're convinced that if he had a fair vote in the Senate he would be confirmed.

Q Well, Mike, is a fair vote a vote that does not include a filibuster?

MR. MCCURRY: A vote is a vote. A filibuster is a filibuster.

Q Well, I mean, that's part of the Senate rules. I'm asking you if you're asking them to waive that.

MR. MCCURRY: We're just asking them to confirm the guy because the position needs to be filled.

Q Well, now, does he fear retaliation?

MR. MCCURRY: We're not even at the point where they're even willing to entertain filibusters, let alone votes.

Q Does the President fear a lot of retaliation on the upcoming agenda?

MR. MCCURRY: No, because he doesn't imagine that the Republican leadership of the Congress is that lame-brained. (Laughter.)

Q Is Monday a deadline, Mike?

MR. MCCURRY: No. Not necessarily.

Q Well, do you think he possibly could come to a conclusion over the weekend --

Q Explain why it would be lame-brained.

MR. MCCURRY: Because the American people would look and say, the President had this perfectly qualified guy he wanted to be head of the Civil Rights Division. The President tried every which way to get the Senate to take it up. They made it clear they weren't going to consider someone because they want to change affirmative action laws and they don't want a guy there to enforce laws that are already on the books with respect to affirmative action. So the President went ahead, perfectly appropriately, perfectly constitutionally, exactly like his predecessors, put the guy in the job. And so, therefore, they are going to extract great retaliation on the President and the program and get all out of joint -- I think the American people would say what silliness and what stupidity. So that's why it would be lame-brained.

Q This has become a charade, because you have been giving us the same story for two weeks.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've been trying to get the Senate to wise up, Helen. We're trying to give them a chance to do the right thing, as opposed to doing the stupid thing.

Q Have you been able to shore up any public support for --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there's been a lot of public support for Bill Lann Lee around the country, the groups that have been supportive of him and his nomination have been very active. I think it's correct to say that they've been putting some heat on Republican members of the Senate, as we think it's proper that they should.

Q Have any Republican members of the Senate indicated that they're going to change their position as a result of that pressure?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I'm aware of. Many of them privately have said that they think that they've been put in a very uncomfortable spot by their leadership.

Q Mike, do you think calling them stupid, lame-brained and silly is going to have any positive impact? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: No. I said that would be -- that was a hypothetical question, I gave hypothetical answer. (Laughter.) I said it would be lame-brained and stupid for them to extract a lot of retaliation on the President. I mean, that's not behavior that the American people would find becoming. Maybe that's a more gentle way of saying it. (Laughter.)

Q What you've been saying, does it have any resonance in the country at all?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, it does, as a matter of fact. People -- when they hear Bill Lann Lee as he was on national television this morning saying that he wants to enforce the law -- that's all he wants to do, and he's perfectly qualified to do so, and he is a person of extraordinary personal commitment and someone with a very compelling personal story that speaks to his commitment. What he wants to do is enforce the law on the books. And they see the guy and they say, well, what's wrong with that. What is wrong with that?

Q They also wonder why the President doesn't use the power he has to put him in that job.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'm not saying that he won't at some point.

Q Mike, when you talk about the President's constitutional prerogatives -- the Senate has, in effect, rejected him by not giving committee approval. So why isn't that final, and being final, why not just make a recess appointment now?

MR. MCCURRY: Because in Article II, advice and consent doesn't mean that individual senators can block consideration because they don't like the political philosophy of the nominee sent forward by the President. The constitutional balances are pretty clear that the President is the one who gets to nominate. They don't get to just flat out reject; they get to advise and consent.

Q -- individual senator like Jesse Helms and Weld, this is -- the fact that you don't have a majority on the committee, isn't that --

MR. MCCURRY: The committee has never voted.

Q Because you didn't have a majority on there.

MR. MCCURRY: They haven't voted because it's quite clear that the committee is going to take action that will prevent the nomination from going to the floor, and the floor it's pretty clear that the votes are there.

Q You have a constitutional right to be on the floor? If they do due process and you lose in committee on a fair up-and-down vote, isn't the process served?

MR. MCCURRY: That hasn't happened.

Q Mike, is the fact that if you name him now he could only serve to the end of '98, but if you wait until next year he could serve to the end of '99 -- is that the reason for delay?

MR. MCCURRY: No, from what I've heard that has been effectively ruled out. There was some speculation that that was true, but I haven't heard anyone confirm that that actually is true.

Q How long can he serve?

Q If he were appointed next Monday, how long could he serve?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe until the end of the next session of Congress, as it sits, whenever that -- sometime presumably towards the end of 1998.

Q Can I ask you a political question in this area? The President is going to bat for Lee. He has provided a pretty ringing defense of Colin Powell style affirmative action. He's undertaken this race initiative around the country over the next six months or so. What is the long-term political effort, do you think, of the President staking out support in these areas of the Democratic Party?

MR. MCCURRY: I have no -- I wouldn't want to predict. I would hope there would be a positive impact because the President believes it's the right thing to do and he obviously hopes that doing what he believes is the right thing to do would generate political support for him and his program. But I think he's doing it because it's the right thing to do, first and foremost.

Q Is he also trying to appease the liberal wing of his party?

MR. MCCURRY: No, he's trying to get a good, qualified person into the job of Civil Rights Division head at the Justice Department because it's important that laws on the books be effectively enforced.

Q Does this go beyond the specifics of the Lee nomination? There are so many nominations that have been held up, dozens of judges -- is the White House essentially saying with this one, that's it, enough is enough?

MR. MCCURRY: There's a temptation to say that, but I think it would be more the President that would say that. And we have said to the leadership of the Senate that the Constitution is designed to work so that the nation's business can move forward and it is not -- the nomination and confirmation process has never, in our history, been a surrogate for the political disagreements that we legitimately have.

There has been, in fact, some deference shown to a President even when there's been a Democratic Congress and a Republican President, that the President is entitled to pick and choose the people with whom he would like to carry out the executive responsibilities of our government. So I think there's been a shift now in that presumed accommodation in the way we do government around here and it is troubling and the President, I think, has indicated his concern to the Majority Leader, among others.

Q If I could follow up, to use a term from another administration, I mean, is this effectively a line in the sand here?

MR. MCCURRY: No, because there will be other nominations and there will be other nomination battles and, frankly, the Senate will no doubt confirm nominees, too. Some Senate committees did reasonably good job before going out for the

recess of confirming some of the President's nominees.

Q Aren't a lot of federal judgeships being held up and would be held up even further?

MR. MCCURRY: There have been a number held up, but they've also moved from time to time to clear that calendar and confirm them. And there should be a working process that allows nominations to go forward. Our point is, nomination fights should not be surrogates for disagreements on policy issues, like affirmative action, which is the case here.

Q Mike, the argument that you just made about the deference that's normally been afforded to Presidents, that's precisely the argument that Senator Byrd and Senator Hatch made in their letters to you, that Presidents have afforded a deference to the Senate and you're the ones who are threatening to go around the deference normally afforded to the Senate.

Q Senator Bryd is a good enough constitutional historian that he understands that that argument is upside down with the kind of action we've seen this past year with respect to some of the President's nominations. These are philosophical disagreements with the President. They are not principle disagreements with the qualities of a nomination sent to the Senate for advice and consent.

Q Well, Mike, I think the last time a Republican President tried this, I think it was Byrd himself who held up like 5,700 appointments. I mean, he knows very well what the Senate can do if they feel like it.

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't dispute his authority or his expertise; I just said his argument is wrong.

Q Well as you pointed out yourself, when you look at this dispute, fairly or unfairly, affirmative action is at the heart of it. And you've got the President with this year-long race initiative and yet sort of trying to push affirmative action into the background. You're going to have the President meeting with the critics of affirmative action, but not in open session. Why, in the course of this 12-month period, can't the President find the time to at least stage one

open, thorough, constructive debate on affirmative action? I don't mean that he's got to debate Ward Connerly, but --

MR. MCCURRY: He may very well, and he probably will.

Q Do you know when?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I don't.

Q It's not going to be next week, right?

MR. MCCURRY: No, we're going to have -- that will be a session that's informal, designed to have a dialogue. It will be one in which we'll arrange coverage, but it will not be in the town hall format of the previous one. But I don't rule out that we might do that on that topic at some point next year.

Q I happened to see Henry Cisneros coming in here on Tuesday. Why would he have been here?

MR. MCCURRY: I didn't know he had been here, and we're checking, Connie. I was not aware he had been here.

Q What does the White House know about Russian President Boris Yeltsin's health? Is there any reason to believe he's critically ill?

MR. MCCURRY: He's sick, and they've said so. Apparently it's a holiday in Russia today, so there is no one around to deny the rumors that you're all actively pursuing. But we don't have any information indicating that it's true.

Q What do you know about his health?

MR. MCCURRY: We have seen the statements made by the Russian government and by the President's spokesman, and we evaluate those and assess those, and are not aware of anything that leads us to believe that they are incorrect.

Q But you only have public information? You have no other information that --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not going to talk about what kind of information we have.

Q WTO --

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't heard anything more. I would keep very closely tied to the USTR and the Commerce Department because they'll give you updates on that as the afternoon goes on.

Q Does the President have any reaction, or do you have additional White House reaction to comments a staff member of the Race Initiative made in Dallas yesterday?

MR. MCCURRY: Not beyond what we've already indicated.

Q The financial crisis in South Korea has worsened markedly this week, in large part for two reasons: one, they won't implement the IMF reforms, and two, they made some less than honest statements about their currency reserves and their short-term debt. In light of that, is the U.S. concerned about how they're handling the crisis and do you have any plans to push them down the road toward the IMF?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, without sharing your assessment phrase in your question, we obviously have concerns about the financial situation. That's why we have worked together with the IMF to develop the facility that's available. That's why we believe that the Republic of Korea should move promptly to implement aspects of the arrangement it has made with the IMF. But we are watching the situation closely.

Q Mike, three years ago, when we had the Mexico peso crisis, the President took the leave in the G-7 to use the IMF to set up a kind of global early warning system and to have greater transparency in financial markets to avoid a repeat of that. And all of a sudden we're in a meltdown in Asia, South Korea, et cetera. What went wrong with the preventive mechanism that led to all kinds of self-congratulatory comments of the last two or three G-7 summits.

MR. MCCURRY: Exactly that mechanism and those facilities have been the basis of the work the IMF has done with respect to Indonesia, Thailand and some of the

other actions that they've taken. But the reason for the fluctuations in Asian markets go well beyond monitoring decisions made by the G-7.

Q Well, wait a minute. The whole idea after the Mexican peso crisis and the G-7 was to avoid further meltdowns --

MR. MCCURRY: Leo, it was also to avoid the situation which the United States had to be the sole provider of credit in situations like that and that that's the position that we've been in now as a result of that work that we did within the G-7.

Q Does the President at Birmingham at the next G-7 plan to review this whole process and perhaps recommend stronger preventative measures in the future?

MR. MCCURRY: I imagine that market and financial market stability will continue to be a feature of the discussions that they have at the G-7/G-8. And I imagine the situation as it's developed in Asia this past year will be something that the leaders will want to discuss.

Q How much of a toll have all these fundraisers and travels had on the President? He spoke yesterday in Miami of being one of the oldest baby-boomers and part of a -- he felt near-elderly. He said --

MR. MCCURRY: He's younger than you, though, right, Terry?

Q Younger.

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, he is younger than you.

Q He said recently it's been an exhausting week and a killer of a week. Has all this taken a toll on him?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think so. The President, you saw him throughout last year during a campaign year campaign tirelessly and relentlessly. And his schedule, while it's been active, it's been not nearly as active as last year. But he's worked hard and he works hard always at his job and he works hard whatever's on the schedule.

Q Does he ever complain about the pace of the travel or the demands that are put on him?

MR. MCCURRY: Not generally, because he generally is the one who adds things to the schedule to keep the kind of frenetic pace that he maintains.

Q But on the way to Denver he was the one who said that you guys are the ones who keep adding stuff on to his schedule and he wanted a break.

MR. MCCURRY: No, he was complaining about the fact we always lock him in the hotel rooms and don't let him go out and see foreign countries when he's there, and we keep him going to meetings when he'd like to be out seeing the sights and visiting with people.

Q The Miami Herald is reporting today, speaking of Miami, that the head of the Cuban interest section and the CIA analyst had a meeting with a senior Cuban official and took some kind of a message that maybe the U.S. is willing to change its policy.

MR. MCCURRY: It's not unusual that they have working level sessions from time to time. But there was no message carried and no indication of any change in our fundamental policy, which is defined by the Cuban Democracy Act and by the steps that we have taken to bring pressure to bear on Cuba to change its form of government, something that the President believes must happen if Cuba is ever to get on the right side of history. There's been no indication of any change in that meeting in our underlying policy.

Q I'm going to take another quick stab at South Korea. Is the U.S. satisfied with the pace of reform in South Korea at this point?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the United States believes it's very important for the Republic of Korea to quickly implement those arrangements it has made with the IMF. There should be no delay in that.

Q Mike, on the WTO negotiations, you said stick close to the USTR. Do you expect an announcement to come out of there or out of Geneva or --

MR. MCCURRY: No, it will probably come from Geneva or -- most likely from -- the negotiation is in Geneva and our folks here are following it very carefully, closely.

Q In '95 the U.S. nixed a deal by walking away from it and refusing to agree. Is that possible that they might do it again?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not in Geneva, I can't update you on the status of the negotiations.

Q Can I ask you, since Mr. Lawrence has been moved from Arlington, what is the White House position? Have you determined if he should have been buried in Arlington and will you continue with that inquiry?

MR. MCCURRY: We're not examining that question. The State Department is examining a set of questions and they've, I think, largely completed their work. And if there's any review of burial guidelines for Arlington National Cemetery, you might want to contact the Department of the Army. I'm not aware that we're doing that kind of review work here.

Q But will you be making public the results of the review into his statements about his record?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe that's the State Department's intent today.

Q Do you feel that it was appropriate that he was dug up?

MR. MCCURRY: I think we've already expressed ourselves on that.

Q Do you think there was a mistake that he was ever named ambassador?

MR. MCCURRY: I think the State Department is going to be addressing the question of the vetting process in the examination of his credentials.

Q Going back to Bill Lann Lee for a second, your comments make it sound as though you do think he is going to make a recess appointment. Why the delay?

Why wait until Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: We spent about 20 minutes on that already. I think I made myself clear.

Q But you didn't explain why not now.

MR. MCCURRY: I said, we have made another effort to see if we can't get the kind of vote that he deserves in the Senate. And until the President is absolutely convinced that that's not going to happen, he's going to avoid making any final decision, although I think it's reasonably clear what we're doing.

Q When was that effort made, Mike?

Q This is like the longest drum roll in history.

MR. MCCURRY: We've been in contact on and off with the Majority Leader.

Q Is the President planning to do anything this weekend, talk to Lott?

MR. MCCURRY: We've been working the issue.

Q Is it fair to say that this is last effort you're going to make on this?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that's most likely, yes.

Q Is there some new approach in this effort that makes it different from past efforts?

MR. MCCURRY: It comes in the aftermath of what we think has been a good effort this past week to make the public argument about why the Senate should conduct itself under regular order and take up this nomination and consider the credentials of a very qualified nominee. We've made, I think, a very strong effort this week to make the argument publicly. We hope that has had some impact on senators who might express themselves to their leadership. And we'll see what happens.

Q Do you have any reason to believe that there is flexibility?

MR. MCCURRY: No.

Q Is it fair to say, just to be clear, is this a process that's ongoing?

MR. MCCURRY: Maybe because the people we are trying to affect are rather inflexible at times.

Q But is this an ongoing effort even as we speak?

MR. MCCURRY: Sure. We've got groups out there that have been working -- I think Mr. Lee plans to continue to speak out.

Q So what will the President or his staff be doing over the next 48 hours to make this determination? Are you going to be talking to Trent Lott? Will you be talking to other senators?

MR. MCCURRY: If we need to, we will, sure.

Q So if they don't decide to have a vote, then you will definitely make your recess at the press conference on Monday?

MR. MCCURRY: We have press conferences so the President can make news, so don't expect me standing here in front of a press conference to make news that maybe, if the President wants to make, he would choose to make. I mean, I think that's kind of self-evident.

Q But is he going to do it on Monday? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: No, because I don't believe you're as dense as you're acting. (Laughter.)

Q You're the only one carrying the ball.

Q This afternoon's meeting with the Asian Americans -- what kind of --

MR. MCCURRY: He is doing -- he's going to meet with leaders of the Asian American community as one of his continuing series of outreach meetings. We've had a number of these now, and it's an opportunity for the President to talk about issues that arise sometimes in the context of his Race Initiative, but also other issues that are important to some of the community leaders that he's been meeting with. He's got a budget --

Q Like what?

Q Bill Lann Lee?

MR. MCCURRY: Bill Lann Lee, that could very well be one.

Q Why not have coverage of it then?

MR. MCCURRY: There is, there is. You've got a pooler in there.

Q Oh, but wait a minute. It's just a print pooler. (Laughter.)

Q Hey, hey! (Laughter.) Bite your tongue.

MR. MCCURRY: We're trying something -- without opening these up for coverage, which I think would change the nature of the very good dialogue we have, we're going to try opening it up for some coverage and see if it works. The President has sort of insisted that we do that.

Q Mike -- if he was non-Chinese do you think the nomination would have gone through?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that's a question better put to members of the Senate who are blocking his nomination.

Q Is there a meeting here today on WTO on the financial agreement --

MR. MCCURRY: We have been following the negotiations closely, and so there have been a lot of conference calls and some discussions here reflecting on what's happening in Geneva, and then discussions with our counterparts at other

agencies.

Q You started to mention the budget. Are there meetings on the budget today?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is having some meetings on the budget. He has met with his foreign policy team today. He will have lunch with the Vice President. And then he hosts holiday receptions tonight -- since I didn't gaggle today.

Q Henry Cisneros troubles are the latest in a string of investigations, indictments, convictions. Does the President think that he still has the most ethical administration in history, as he said he was going to try to have at the outset of the administration?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes.

Okay, anything else?

Q You don't think that these reflect badly on that?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that the climate in Washington has clearly changed, and the standards that are used by some may have changed as well.

Q -- Cisneros is just a victim of --

Q -- should not be the standard? What do you mean?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'm aware of one conviction -- am I missing one?

Q I'm sorry, I meant indictments.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I hope you're not equating indictments and convictions.

Q Mike, I'd like to take a stab at that question from the opposite angle. The prosecutor looking into Cisneros has indicted the brother-in-law of Henry Cisneros's mistress, and now two aides who he brought to Texas with him. Does the President have any misgivings about the special counsel statute that he signed?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think it would be proper for me to say anything on that subject. I accept the wisdom of The Washington Post editorial advice to me the other day.

Anything else?

Q Radio address, week ahead.

MR. MCCURRY: Week ahead? Ready for the week ahead, no last questions? Okay.

The live radio address tomorrow, the subject will be Medicare fraud and abuse. Saturday night the President will attend an Arkansas DNC related dinner with a lot of his friends and supporters; Sunday evening the annual performance of Christmas in Washington at the National Building Museum. Monday he meets with Prime Minister Ahern of Ireland in the morning, and then our press conference in the afternoon and the receptions in the evening.

Tuesday, National Medal of Science and the National Medal of Technology awards that the President will make to a number of people. The list of winners was released back in April, so we've got that if you need it. Actually, that address will have some substantive things the President will say on science and technology. It will be up to judge newsworthiness. I don't think he's announcing any major new proposals, but I think it will be a fairly substantive address on the role that science and technology plays in some of the overall strategies that the President has for dealing with economic change and the changes the world is undergoing as we think ahead to the next century.

Wednesday, the President will confer the Congressional Space Medal of Honor posthumously on the two Apollo I astronauts who died in 1967 who were never so honored. Gus Grissom had been honored by Jimmy Carter in 1978, but Lt. Colonel Ed White and Roger Chaffee will receive that special designation on Wednesday. That will be at 11:30 a.m. -- oh, I'm sorry, 10:00 a.m., not 11:30 a.m. -- 10:00 a.m.

On Thursday, the President will read The Christmas Story to the kids, the way he does every year. And on Friday the President will award the Malcolm Baldrige

Quality awards at 11:00 a.m. at the Sheraton Washington Hotel and then will conduct the meeting with conservative voices on the subject of affirmative action that we talked about earlier in the afternoon. He'll also have a working visit with Prime Minister Yilmaz of Turkey that day.

Q Will there be a transcript?

Q Any working visit with the dog?

MR. MCCURRY: The dog -- I don't have a dog update.

Q What kind of coverage is of the conservative voices?

MR. MCCURRY: I think we're going to see about having a print pooler there.

Q On affirmative action --

MR. MCCURRY: Barry does point out these are people who have been outspoken in the debate, not necessarily people who have argued a particular perspective on affirmative action. As you've seen from the list, there's kind of a wide range of viewpoints there.

Q Would it be possible even to consider a photo op at the top, for a few minutes at the top?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll consider that, sure.

Q Any other participants yet?

MR. MCCURRY: Have we put out the list? I thought we put out the list.

MR. TOIV: We can give you the list.

Q Of congressional?

MR. TOIV: Not congressional yet. We're still working on that.

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't heard anything further about others.

Q Mike, I'm still not sure, will you have a transcript of the remarks at the affirmative action meeting?

MR. MCCURRY: We'll have a print pooler there. I don't believe we've planned to do a full transcript of it.

Q And will the print pooler be allowed there for the entire duration?

MR. MCCURRY: That's my understanding.

Q So why not put out a transcript?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll think about that.

Q Tomorrow, is the President announcing new regulatory action in the Medicare fraud area?

MR. MCCURRY: He's got announcements related to Medicare fraud, correct. I had not heard -- you may want to check with Barry on that. I hadn't heard that there was any new major news coming in that.

Q Where are we on Medicare chairman?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't heard. Still working it, but not anywhere closer, Leo.

Thanks.

END

2:12 P.M. EST

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/12/97 3:53:24 PM

FROM Luzzatto, Anne R.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT 4pm draft of POTUS Q&A for Monday [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Cicio, Kristen K.
Davies, Glyn T.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Quinn, Mary E.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

CARBON_COPY Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

TEXT_BODY This version should replace prior version sent to you this morning at 7:30. We will need SRB approval/edits as soon as possible. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT prez1212.doc
12/12/97 4PM DRAFT

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS GUIDANCE
FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1997

IRAQ

MIDDLE EAST

KYOTO

BOSNIA

NATO EXPANSION

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

ISLAMIC CONFERENCE IN TEHERAN

IRAQ

Butler is in Baghdad today - what is he telling the Iraqis?

* He is there to ensure that the UN inspectors have unconditional, unrestricted access to all facilities in Iraq, including those declared by Iraq to be "sensitive".

* He has my full support.

Is this the first time Butler has asked for access to these so-called "sensitive sites"? I don't remember hearing about this particular kind of Iraqi foot dragging before.

* No. Over the last six years, Chairman Butler has pressed repeatedly, with US support, for access to all sites that the inspectors have deemed critical to their mission. The record of the Iraqis for noncompliance is well known - each standoff has been reported to the Security Council, and, at the end of the day, each time, Iraq has been forced, grudgingly, to reveal more and more about its weapons of mass destruction.

But he apparently hasn't asked for access to sensitive sites during this current crisis, or since the teams went back in three weeks ago - why not?

* It's up to Chairman Butler and to UNSCOM to decide where and when its inspection teams go.

* I have every confidence that Chairman Butler is doing what he needs to do to get the job done and to get it done well.

What are you prepared to do if Saddam Hussein doesn't let UNSCOM have access to these sites?

* The Security Council has made very clear that UNSCOM has the right to go anywhere it needs to do its mission.

* Any Iraqi attempt to prevent UNSCOM from carrying out its UN mandate would be a serious mistake.

Would you take military action?

* I will not rule out any options.

What about reports Saddam has mass murdered political prisoners recently?

* We are checking on those reports.

* They are very plausible given Saddam's track record.

Will you make concessions to Saddam by expanding the oil for food program next year and allowing him to sell more oil for food?

* First, let's be clear that all the sanctions must remain in place until Iraq complies with all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. There will be no compromise, no concessions, no carrots.

* It has always been our position that humanitarian assistance should be provided to the Iraqi people - this is why we sponsored Resolution 986, which permits the sale of oil for the purchase of food and humanitarian relief under strict U.N. control and supervision.

* We have consistently expressed our support for extending this resolution. Saddam rejected that proposal for well over a year - a clear indication this is not a concession to him but rather help for the people

* So let us be clear about who is at fault for the suffering of the Iraqi people

-- Saddam Hussein, who has spent billions of dollars on building outrageous presidential palaces and Saddam Hussein, who will use his own people for human shields. So let us be clear for where the blame lies for the suffering of the Iraqi people.

Critics of your Iraq policy say you have no Arab support for the use of force, and that the Saudis and the Turks have refused to let us use their territory for strikes against Iraq. How do you respond?

* The conversations Secretary Albright and Secretary Cohen have had with their counterparts in the region show a very good understanding of the threat posed by Iraq and of the need to contain that threat.

* We have been granted everything we have asked for. Any discussions as to the use of force remain hypothetical.

MIDDLE EAST

What does Albright hope to accomplish in her meetings this week with Bibi and Arafat?

* She'll be following up on her recent meetings with both leaders - this is a continuing effort to push the peace process forward and to reinforce the urgency with which both sides must approach the process.

The Israeli press is reporting that Arafat and Netanyahu will meet with each other in London. Is this true?

* To our knowledge , no such meeting is scheduled. Ask them.

What about a three-way meeting with Arafat, Netanyahu and Albright?

* Albright will hold separate follow up discussions tomorrow and Wednesday with the two leaders. What's important is that the parties make progress on the four-part agenda as soon as possible. This is what we have to be

focused on.

Did Secretary Albright set a deadline of December 17 for Netanyahu to present a plan for redeployment?

* We have repeatedly stressed the need to move forward in the process as quickly as possible. She urged movement as soon as possible.

The State Department has suggested that if there is no progress this month with the talks, the US may have to go public with its own "plan" - are you getting close to tabling your own proposal?

* It is no secret that I attach a very high priority to moving forward quickly on the talks - and have since 1993, but I'm not going to be specific about our diplomacy at this point.

* We're involved in a serious process. And we are working with the parties to overcome their differences. That is where our focus is.

What is the US view on the Israelis barring a Palestinian census in East Jerusalem?

* Jerusalem remains the most sensitive of the permanent status issues.

* We have repeatedly asked both sides to refrain from actions which could be considered provocative by the other side, and which might predetermine the outcome of issues that need to be decided in permanent status negotiations.

There is a press report that Hamas has again threatened Israel and that a top Israeli terrorist expert has said that a bomb could go off "today or tomorrow." Any comment?

* Terrorism is still a real threat -- both to Israeli citizens and to the Peace Process itself.

* We are working very closely with the Palestinians urging them to

enhance their efforts to fight terrorist threats, and specifically to continue with both unilateral efforts and cooperation with Israel on fighting terrorism.

There are persistent reports that Israel is planning to continue to build settlements and that, in fact, settlement construction is accelerating. This is hardly the "time out" we have called for. What is your reaction?

* Our view on settlements is well known to the parties - we have made it clear that there must be a timeout from unilateral acts.

Why won't you commit to seeing Netanyahu? It seems so obvious that you are snubbing him.

* We are working to find a mutually convenient date for us to meet.

You received a letter from the leadership of the Major Jewish Organizations - they set out their positions on the peace process and the US-Israel relationship - will you respond?

* I appreciated receiving the letter -- it supports our efforts to bring peace to the region, and I am in broad agreement with the positions it takes. I will be sending a reply.

KYOTO

It looks like you're going to face an uphill battle in the Congress - how do you expect to get this treaty ratified if the Senate Republicans are calling it DOA?

* First, let me say again that this is a historic agreement, one that is environmentally strong and will enhance our growth and provide us new opportunities for technology.

* Kyoto was a good first step. But this will be a long process - it involves extremely complicated issues.

* But, as I have said all along, I will not submit this agreement for ratification until key developing nations participate meaningfully in this

effort. This is a global problem, it requires a global solution.

* We will continue to work closely with these countries to secure their meaningful participation in this agreement.

BOSNIA

The NATO Defense Ministers met in Brussels - what have they decided to do about Bosnia?

* Secretary Cohen and his NATO counterparts have asked NATO to study a range of possible security options after June 1998.

* I think starting to look at a useful range of options is the right approach at this point.

* The study of options will be ready for nations to review by early next year.

* We have provided some preliminary thoughts on how the study could be shaped to ensure a good range of options, reflecting our consultations with the Congress earlier this fall. No decisions have been made about a possible NATO mission or what role the US would play, if any.

In terms of a possible follow on force, what kinds of numbers do you expect the military authorities will come up with, and how long would another mission last?

* NATO has only discussed broad political guidance at this point. That is what the study of options is for - to develop specifics on questions such as this.

Aren't we running out of time --- shouldn't you have made up your mind by now?
Why the delay? It doesn't seem as if you've really been very actively consulting with Congress. I don't detect any sense of urgency.

* I have said all along that it is important that we reach a decision this winter - in time to permit the necessary planning, one way or the other. I still

believe that a decision will be made in this time frame.

* We need to continue to deliberate with Congress and with our allies, and to carefully consider our interests as we reach our decision.

* I am immensely proud of the progress we have made in Bosnia -- after 46 months of war, 23 months of implementing peace have helped change conditions: we have ended the fighting and bloodshed, we are rebuilding the economy, we are building the institutions for self governance by holding peaceful elections. Things are not perfect in Bosnia, but they are on the right track.

* In some areas where the peace has not fully taken root, we still need to make greater progress -- in refugee return, in reform of local police and media, and in building real economic and political cooperation among the parties.

* Again, I have not made any final decisions about a US military presence in a post-SFOR mission, but I believe there is a strong consensus emerging on the importance of having some kind international presence there after June 1998. The emerging consensus among our allies is that some sort of security presence will be needed after SFOR. And in my discussions with members of Congress, many have expressed their support for a continued U.S. role in Bosnia.

* America has abiding interest in peace and stability in Bosnia and a compelling interest in implementation of Dayton because Europe's stability and America's security are linked.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

There are so many differing assessments of the cost of NATO enlargement, and Jesse Helms is warning that unless Europe pays its fair share we may never see Senate approval? How will you get all this confusion sorted out and expansion approved?

* I believe the Congress will ratify NATO enlargement because it is the right decision -- strategically, politically, and morally. The bottom line is that NATO enlargement will make Europe a safer place, and that serves our security interests.

* Instead of tossing around competing estimates, we need to focus on what's really important. I have always said the cost of enlargement will be real but manageable. These costs will be shared fairly among allies -- new and old alike. Think we can all agree that enlargement is far cheaper and smarter than an unstable situation with the risk of conflict.

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

In view of the fall of the Gujral Government in India and the elections projected for late February, are you still planning to visit South Asia early next year?
What other countries will be on your itinerary?

* I intend to visit South Asia next year.

* The visit dates and itinerary, to include deciding which countries we'll be visiting, have not been set.

Given the weak government in India and the recent political crisis in Pakistan, what do you hope to accomplish during this trip? Is there really a reason to go at this time?

* South Asia is a region of growing importance to the United States.

* It is the home to over one-fifth of the world's population and a growing market for U.S. businesses.

* Our relationships with many of the countries of South Asia are complicated by difficult issues, which require resolution.

* For these reasons, I believe it important to engage with these governments.

* My trip will seek to broaden and deepen our engagement in this increasingly important region.

ISLAMIC CONFERENCE IN TEHERAN

Despite criticism of Israel, the declaration from the conference seemed to be somewhat moderate in tone and in its condemnation of terrorism. Is it time to rethink your Iran policy?

On the basis of what I have seen, I would give it a cautious welcome - especially its condemnation of terrorism and its call for cooperation, positive dialogue and understanding among cultures and religions, and its rejection of the ideology of confrontation.

A number of our close friends in the Islamic world contributed to this generally moderate tone - and I welcome that.

But, with respect to Iran, we will need to see action, not just hear words. As long as Iran sponsors terrorism, continues to develop weapons of mass

destruction, and obstructs the Middle East peace process, Iran cannot be viewed as a regular member of the international community.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/15/97 8:59:01 AM

FROM Cicio, Kristen K.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: THIS MORNING'S q&a WITH srb EDITS [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY Cicio, Kristen K.
Davies, Glyn T.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Quinn, Mary E.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

TEXT_BODY The latest.

-----Original Message-----
From: Luzzatto, Anne R.

Sent: Monday, December 15, 1997 8:16 AM
To: @NSA - Natl Security
Advisor
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: THIS MORNING'S q&a
WITH srb EDITS [UNCLASSIFIED]

ROB, please give this to SRB for
his pool spray prep for Ahearn this morning. His edits on the Khatami
section are included.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT prez1215.doc
12/15/97 8am DRAFT

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS GUIDANCE

FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1997

IRAQ

MIDDLE EAST

KYOTO AND THE SENATE

BOSNIA

NATO EXPANSION

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

KHATAMI DIALOGUE REMARKS

IRAQ

Butler is in Baghdad today - what is he telling the Iraqis?

* He is there to ensure that the UN inspectors have unconditional, unrestricted access to all facilities in Iraq, including those declared by Iraq to be "sensitive".

* He has my full support.

Is this the first time Butler has asked for access to these so-called "sensitive sites"? I don't remember hearing about this particular kind of Iraqi foot dragging before.

* No. Over the last six years, Chairman Butler has pressed repeatedly, with US support, for access to all sites that the inspectors have deemed critical to their mission. The record of the Iraqis for noncompliance is well known - each standoff has been reported to the Security Council, and, at the end of the day, each time, Iraq has been forced, grudgingly, to reveal more and more about its weapons of mass destruction.

But he apparently hasn't asked for access to sensitive sites during this

current
crisis, or since the teams went back in three weeks ago - why not?

* It's up to Chairman Butler and to UNSCOM to decide where and when its inspection teams go.

* I have every confidence that Chairman Butler is doing what he needs to do to get the job done and to get it done well.

What are you prepared to do if Saddam Hussein doesn't let UNSCOM have access to these sites?

* The Security Council has made very clear that UNSCOM has the right to go anywhere it needs to do its mission.

* Any Iraqi attempt to prevent UNSCOM from carrying out its UN mandate would be a serious mistake.

Would you take military action?

* I will not rule out any options.

What about reports Saddam has mass murdered political prisoners recently?

* We are checking on those reports.

* They are very plausible given Saddam's track record.

Will you make concessions to Saddam by expanding the oil for food program next year and allowing him to sell more oil for food?

* First, let's be clear that all the sanctions must remain in place until Iraq complies with all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. There will be no compromise, no concessions, no carrots.

* It has always been our position that humanitarian assistance should be provided to the Iraqi people - this is why we sponsored Resolution 986, which permits the sale of oil for the purchase of food and humanitarian relief under strict

U.N.
control and supervision.

* We have consistently expressed our support for extending this resolution.
Saddam rejected that proposal for well over a year - a clear indication this is not a concession to him but rather help for the people

* So let us be clear about who is at fault for the suffering of the Iraqi people
-- Saddam Hussein, who has spent billions of dollars on building outrageous presidential palaces and Saddam Hussein, who will use his own people for human shields. So let us be clear for where the blame lies for the suffering of the Iraqi people.

Critics of your Iraq policy say you have no Arab support for the use of force, and that the Saudis and the Turks have refused to let us use their territory for strikes against Iraq. How do you respond?

* The conversations Secretary Albright and Secretary Cohen have had with their counterparts in the region show a very good understanding of the threat posed by Iraq and of the need to contain that threat.

* We have been granted everything we have asked for. Any discussions as to the use of force remain hypothetical.

MIDDLE EAST

What does Albright hope to accomplish in her meetings this week with Bibi and Arafat?

* She'll be following up on her recent meetings with both leaders - this is a continuing effort to push the peace process forward and to reinforce the urgency with which both sides must approach the process.

The Israeli press is reporting that Arafat and Netanyahu will meet with each other in London. Is this true?

* To our knowledge , no such meeting is scheduled. Ask them.

What about a three-way meeting with Arafat, Netanyahu and Albright?

* Albright will hold separate follow up discussions tomorrow and Wednesday with the two leaders. What's important is that the parties make progress on the four-part agenda as soon as possible. This is what we have to be focused on.

The Israeli cabinet seems far from ready to announce any redeployment numbers - didn't Secretary Albright set a deadline of December 17 for Netanyahu to present a plan for redeployment?

* We have repeatedly stressed the need to move forward in the process as quickly as possible. She urged movement as soon as possible.

The State Department has suggested that if there is no progress this month with the talks, the US may have to go public with its own "plan" - are you getting close to tabling your own proposal?

* It is no secret that I attach a very high priority to moving forward quickly on the talks - and have since 1993, but I'm not going to be specific about our diplomacy at this point.

* We're involved in a serious process. And we are working with the parties to overcome their differences. That is where our focus is.

What is the US view on the Israelis barring a Palestinian census in East Jerusalem?

* Jerusalem remains the most sensitive of the permanent status issues.

* We have repeatedly asked both sides to refrain from actions which could be considered provocative by the other side, and which might predetermine the outcome of issues that need to be decided in permanent status

negotiations.

There is a press report that Hamas has again threatened Israel and that a top

Israeli terrorist expert has said that a bomb could go off "today or tomorrow."

Any comment?

* Terrorism is still a real threat -- both to Israeli citizens and to the Peace Process itself.

* We are working very closely with the Palestinians urging them to enhance their efforts to fight terrorist threats, and specifically to continue with both unilateral efforts and cooperation with Israel on fighting terrorism.

There are persistent reports that Israel is planning to continue to build settlements and that, in fact, settlement construction is accelerating.

This is

hardly the "time out" we have called for. What is your reaction?

* Our view on settlements is well known to the parties - we have made it clear that there must be a timeout from unilateral acts.

Why won't you commit to seeing Netanyahu? It seems so obvious that you are snubbing him.

* We are working to find a mutually convenient date for us to meet.

You received a letter from the leadership of the Major Jewish Organizations -

they set out their positions on the peace process and the US-Israel relationship

- will you respond?

* I appreciated receiving the letter -- it supports our efforts to bring peace to the region, and I am in broad agreement with the positions it takes. I will be sending a reply.

KYOTO

It looks like you're going to face an uphill battle in the Congress - how do you

expect to get this treaty ratified if the Senate Republicans are calling it DOA?

* First, let me say again that this is a historic agreement, one that is environmentally strong and will enhance our growth and provide us new opportunities for technology.

* Kyoto was a good first step. But this will be a long process - it involves extremely complicated issues.

* But, as I have said all along, I will not submit this agreement for ratification until key developing nations participate meaningfully in this effort. This is a global problem, it requires a global solution.

* We will continue to work closely with these countries to secure their meaningful participation in this agreement.

BOSNIA

Why are you going to Bosnia?

* Going to visit troops and meet with Bosnian officials. Thank them at Christmas.

* Not made a decision on U.S. participation in any Follow on Force (FOF).

* U.S. has strong national interest in successful peace in Bosnia. NATO looking at options.

In terms of a possible follow on force, what kinds of numbers do you expect the military authorities will come up with, and how long would another mission last?

* NATO has only discussed broad political guidance at this point. That is what the study of options is for - to develop specifics on questions such as this.

Aren't we running out of time --- shouldn't you have made up your mind by now?
Why the delay? It doesn't seem as if you've really been very actively consulting

with Congress. I don't detect any sense of urgency.

* I have said all along that it is important that we reach a decision this winter

- in time to permit the necessary planning, one way or the other. I still believe that a decision will be made in this time frame.

* We need to continue to deliberate with Congress and with our allies, and to carefully consider our interests as we reach our decision.

* I am immensely proud of the progress we have made in Bosnia -- after 46 months of war, 23 months of implementing peace have helped change conditions: we have ended the fighting and bloodshed, we are rebuilding the economy, we are building the institutions for self governance by holding peaceful elections. Things are not perfect in Bosnia, but they are on the right track.

* In some areas where the peace has not fully taken root, we still need to make greater progress -- in refugee return, in reform of local police and media, and in building real economic and political cooperation among the parties.

* Again, I have not made any final decisions about a US military presence in a post-SFOR mission, but I believe there is a strong consensus emerging on the importance of having some kind international presence there after June 1998. The emerging consensus among our allies is that some sort of security presence will be needed after SFOR. And in my discussions with members of Congress, many have expressed their support for a continued U.S. role in Bosnia.

* America has abiding interest in peace and stability in Bosnia and a compelling interest in implementation of Dayton because Europe's stability and America's security are linked.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

There are so many differing assessments of the cost of NATO enlargement, and Jesse Helms is warning that unless Europe pays its fair share we may

never see

Senate approval? How will you get all this confusion sorted out and expansion approved?

* I believe the Congress will ratify NATO enlargement because it is the right decision -- strategically, politically, and morally. The bottom line is that NATO enlargement will make Europe a safer place, and that serves our security interests.

* Instead of tossing around competing estimates, we need to focus on what's really important. I have always said the cost of enlargement will be real but manageable. These costs will be shared fairly among allies -- new and old alike. Think we can all agree that enlargement is far cheaper and smarter than an unstable situation with the risk of conflict.

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

In view of the fall of the Gujral Government in India and the elections projected for late February, are you still planning to visit South Asia early next year? What other countries will be on your itinerary?

* I intend to visit South Asia next year.

* The visit dates and itinerary, to include deciding which countries we'll be visiting, have not been set.

Given the weak government in India and the recent political crisis in Pakistan, what do you hope to accomplish during this trip? Is there really a reason to go at this time?

* South Asia is a region of growing importance to the United States.

* It is the home to over one-fifth of the world's population and a growing market for U.S. businesses.

* Our relationships with many of the countries of South Asia are

complicated by
difficult issues, which require resolution.

* For these reasons, I believe it important to engage with these governments.

* My trip will seek to broaden and deepen our engagement in this increasingly
important region.

KHATAMI DIALOGUE REMARKS

Khatami made some moderating remarks yesterday - what is your reaction to his
call for dialogue with the US?

* I welcome the new tone we are hearing from the President of Iran - this is a
positive statement.

* We have long favored a dialogue between the US and Iran as long as all issues
are on the table.

* Of course, what we want to see is not just a change in Iranian statements, but
in Iranian actions. As we have often said, any dialogue would need to address
all issues, including our concerns about Iranian support for terrorism, sponsorship of violent opposition to the peace process and efforts to acquire
weapons of mass destruction.

Will you be prepared to have US diplomats met with Iranians?

* As I said, it has long been the policy of the US government to favor an
authoritative dialogue between our two governments. That policy actually began
under President Bush.

Does this mean you are softening your policy on Iran?

* No, we remain deeply concerned about Iran's behavior in those areas I
mentioned.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/15/97 10:05:04 AM
FROM Luzzatto, Anne R.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT latest version [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Natalie, can you pls put this on a disk and ask Yahya to walk it down to Darby ASAP.

Also, would you do me a favor? Can you pls clear in (or ask Yahya to) Gordon N. Litwin, SS# 007 26 6185, DOB 10/13/29 for 6:pm tonight. The can you E'mail this same info to Lori Anderson? Thanks!

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

prez1215a.doc
12/15/97 8am DRAFT

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS GUIDANCE
FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1997

IRAQ

MIDDLE EAST

KYOTO AND THE SENATE

BOSNIA

NATO EXPANSION

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

KHATAMI DIALOGUE REMARKS

IRAQ

Butler is in Baghdad today - what is he telling the Iraqis?

* He is there to ensure that the UN inspectors have unconditional, unrestricted access to all facilities in Iraq, including those declared by Iraq to be "sensitive".

* He has my full support.

Is this the first time Butler has asked for access to these so-called "sensitive sites"? I don't remember hearing about this particular kind of Iraqi foot dragging before.

* No. Over the last six years, Chairman Butler has pressed repeatedly, with US support, for access to all sites that the inspectors have deemed critical to their mission. The record of the Iraqis for noncompliance is well known - each standoff has been reported to the Security Council, and, at the end of the day, each time, Iraq has been forced, grudgingly, to reveal more and more about its weapons of mass destruction.

But he apparently hasn't asked for access to sensitive sites during this current crisis, or since the teams went back in three weeks ago - why not?

* It's up to Chairman Butler and to UNSCOM to decide where and when its inspection teams go.

* I have every confidence that Chairman Butler is doing what he needs to do to get the job done and to get it done well.

What are you prepared to do if Saddam Hussein doesn't let UNSCOM have access to these sites?

* The Security Council has made very clear that UNSCOM has the right to go anywhere it needs to do its mission.

* Any Iraqi attempt to prevent UNSCOM from carrying out its UN mandate would be a serious mistake.

Would you take military action?

* I will not rule out any options.

What about reports Saddam has mass murdered political prisoners recently?

* We are checking on those reports.

* They are very plausible given Saddam's track record.

Will you make concessions to Saddam by expanding the oil for food program next year and allowing him to sell more oil for food?

* First, let's be clear that all the sanctions must remain in place until Iraq complies with all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions. There will be no compromise, no concessions, no carrots.

* It has always been our position that humanitarian assistance should be provided to the Iraqi people - this is why we sponsored Resolution 986, which permits the sale of oil for the purchase of food and humanitarian relief under strict U.N. control and supervision.

* We have consistently expressed our support for extending this resolution. Saddam rejected that proposal for well over a year - a clear indication this is not a concession to him but rather help for the people

* So let us be clear about who is at fault for the suffering of the Iraqi people -- Saddam Hussein, who has spent billions of dollars on building outrageous presidential palaces and Saddam Hussein, who will use his own people for human shields. So let us be clear for where the blame lies for the suffering of the Iraqi people.

Critics of your Iraq policy say you have no Arab support for the use of force,
and that the Saudis and the Turks have refused to let us use their territory for strikes against Iraq. How do you respond?

* The conversations Secretary Albright and Secretary Cohen have had with their counterparts in the region show a very good understanding of the threat posed by Iraq and of the need to contain that threat.

* We have been granted everything we have asked for. Any discussions as to the use of force remain hypothetical.

MIDDLE EAST

What does Albright hope to accomplish in her meetings this week with Bibi and Arafat?

* She'll be following up on her recent meetings with both leaders - this is a continuing effort to push the peace process forward and to reinforce the urgency with which both sides must approach the process.

The Israeli press is reporting that Arafat and Netanyahu will meet with each other in London. Is this true?

* To our knowledge , no such meeting is scheduled. Ask them.

What about a three-way meeting with Arafat, Netanyahu and Albright?

* Albright will hold separate follow up discussions tomorrow and Wednesday with the two leaders. What's important is that the parties make progress on the four-part agenda as soon as possible. This is what we have to be focused on.

The Israeli cabinet seems far from ready to announce any redeployment numbers - didn't Secretary Albright set a deadline of December 17 for Netanyahu to present a plan for redeployment?

* We have repeatedly stressed the need to move forward in the process as quickly as possible. She urged movement as soon as possible.

The State Department has suggested that if there is no progress this month with the talks, the US may have to go public with its own "plan" - are you getting close to tabling your own proposal?

* It is no secret that I attach a very high priority to moving forward quickly on the talks - and have since 1993, but I'm not going to be specific about our diplomacy at this point.

* We're involved in a serious process. And we are working with the parties to overcome their differences. That is where our focus is.

What is the US view on the Israelis barring a Palestinian census in East Jerusalem?

* Jerusalem remains the most sensitive of the permanent status issues.

* We have repeatedly asked both sides to refrain from actions which could be considered provocative by the other side, and which might predetermine the outcome of issues that need to be decided in permanent status negotiations.

There is a press report that Hamas has again threatened Israel and that a top Israeli terrorist expert has said that a bomb could go off "today or tomorrow."
Any comment?

* Terrorism is still a real threat -- both to Israeli citizens and to the Peace Process itself.

* We are working very closely with the Palestinians urging them to enhance their efforts to fight terrorist threats, and specifically to continue with both unilateral efforts and cooperation with Israel on fighting terrorism.

There are persistent reports that Israel is planning to continue to build settlements and that, in fact, settlement construction is accelerating.

This is
hardly the "time out" we have called for. What is your reaction?

* Our view on settlements is well known to the parties - we have
made it clear
that there must be a timeout from unilateral acts.

Why won't you commit to seeing Netanyahu? It seems so obvious that
you are
snubbing him.

* We are working to find a mutually convenient date for us to meet.

You received a letter from the leadership of the Major Jewish
Organizations -
they set out their positions on the peace process and the US-Israel
relationship
- will you respond?

* I appreciated receiving the letter -- it supports our efforts to bring
peace to
the region, and I am in broad agreement with the positions it takes. I
will be
sending a reply.

KYOTO

It looks like you're going to face an uphill battle in the Congress - how
do you
expect to get this treaty ratified if the Senate Republicans are calling it
DOA?

* First, let me say again that this is a historic agreement, one that is
environmentally strong and will enhance our growth and provide us
new
opportunities for technology.

* Kyoto was a good first step. But this will be a long process - it
involves
extremely complicated issues.

* But, as I have said all along, I will not submit this agreement for
ratification until key developing nations participate meaningfully in
this
effort. This is a global problem, it requires a global solution.

* We will continue to work closely with these countries to secure their
meaningful participation in this agreement.

BOSNIA

Why are you going to Bosnia?

* Going to visit troops and meet with Bosnian officials. Thank them at Christmas.

* Not made a decision on U.S. participation in any Follow on Force (FOF).

* U.S. has strong national interest in successful peace in Bosnia. NATO looking at options.

In terms of a possible follow on force, what kinds of numbers do you expect the military authorities will come up with, and how long would another mission last?

* NATO has only discussed broad political guidance at this point. That is what the study of options is for - to develop specifics on questions such as this.

Aren't we running out of time --- shouldn't you have made up your mind by now?
Why the delay? It doesn't seem as if you've really been very actively consulting with Congress. I don't detect any sense of urgency.

* I have said all along that it is important that we reach a decision this winter - in time to permit the necessary planning, one way or the other. I still believe that a decision will be made in this time frame.

* We need to continue to deliberate with Congress and with our allies, and to carefully consider our interests as we reach our decision.

* I am immensely proud of the progress we have made in Bosnia -- after 46 months of war, 23 months of implementing peace have helped change conditions: we have ended the fighting and bloodshed, we are rebuilding the economy, we are building the institutions for self governance by holding peaceful elections. Things are

not perfect in Bosnia, but they are on the right track.

* In some areas where the peace has not fully taken root, we still need to make greater progress -- in refugee return, in reform of local police and media, and in building real economic and political cooperation among the parties.

* Again, I have not made any final decisions about a US military presence in a post-SFOR mission, but I believe there is a strong consensus emerging on the importance of having some kind international presence there after June 1998. The emerging consensus among our allies is that some sort of security presence will be needed after SFOR. And in my discussions with members of Congress, many have expressed their support for a continued U.S. role in Bosnia.

* America has abiding interest in peace and stability in Bosnia and a compelling interest in implementation of Dayton because Europe's stability and America's security are linked.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

There are so many differing assessments of the cost of NATO enlargement, and Jesse Helms is warning that unless Europe pays its fair share we may never see Senate approval? How will you get all this confusion sorted out and expansion approved?

* I believe the Congress will ratify NATO enlargement because it is the right decision -- strategically, politically, and morally. The bottom line is that NATO enlargement will make Europe a safer place, and that serves our security interests.

* Instead of tossing around competing estimates, we need to focus on what's really important. I have always said the cost of enlargement will be real but manageable. These costs will be shared fairly among allies -- new and old alike.

Think we can all agree that enlargement is far cheaper and smarter than an unstable situation with the risk of conflict.

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

In view of the fall of the Gujral Government in India and the elections projected for late February, are you still planning to visit South Asia early next year?
What other countries will be on your itinerary?

* I intend to visit South Asia next year.

* The visit dates and itinerary, to include deciding which countries we'll be visiting, have not been set.

Given the weak government in India and the recent political crisis in Pakistan, what do you hope to accomplish during this trip? Is there really a reason to go at this time?

* South Asia is a region of growing importance to the United States.

* It is the home to over one-fifth of the world's population and a growing market for U.S. businesses.

* Our relationships with many of the countries of South Asia are complicated by difficult issues, which require resolution.

* For these reasons, I believe it important to engage with these governments.

* My trip will seek to broaden and deepen our engagement in this increasingly important region.

KHATAMI DIALOGUE REMARKS

Khatami made some moderating remarks yesterday - what is your reaction to his call for dialogue with the US?

* I welcome the new tone we are hearing from the President of Iran - this is a positive statement.

* We have long favored a serious dialogue between the US and Iran as long as all issues are on the table.

* Of course, what we want to see is not just a change in Iranian statements, but in Iranian actions. As we have often said, any dialogue would need to address all issues, including our concerns about Iranian support for terrorism, sponsorship of violent opposition to the peace process and efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction.

Will you be prepared to have US diplomats met with Iranians?

* As I said, it has long been the policy of the US government to favor an authoritative dialogue between our two governments. That policy actually began under President Bush.

Does this mean you are softening your policy on Iran?

* No, we remain deeply concerned about Iran's behavior in those areas I mentioned.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/16/97 10:19:52 AM
FROM Luzzatto, Anne R.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: fINAL q&a FOR resending to State and traveling party
[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Johnson, David T.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Natalie -- can you please fax this down to McCurry and over to Jim
Foley at State. Many thanks.

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

From: Luzzatto,
Anne R.
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 1997 10:14 AM
To: @WHSR -
WH Situation Room
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: fINAL q&a
FOR resending to State and traveling party [UNCLASSIFIED]

The
change is in the fourth Bosnia Q -- bullet #4 has been changed and
merged with bullet #5.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

POTUS1216.doc
12/16/97 9am DRAFT

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS GUIDANCE
FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1997

IRAQ

MIDDLE EAST

KYOTO AND THE SENATE

BOSNIA

NATO EXPANSION

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

KHATAMI DIALOGUE REMARKS

ANTHRAX VACCINE

MIXED GENDER TRAINING - MILITARY SERVICES

AFRICA

IRAQ

Butler has been in Baghdad - but he appears to have received a negative message from the Iraqis. What next?

* Chairman Butler went to Iraq to ensure that the UN inspectors have unconditional, unrestricted access to all facilities, including those declared by Iraq to be "sensitive".

* He has my full support.

* We will want to hear Chairman Butler's report to the Security Council before we judge the outcome.

* But Iraq cannot pick and choose where it will allow UNSCOM to inspect. To be effective, UNSCOM must have access, and we will demand full access.

Is this the first time Butler has asked for access to these so-called "sensitive sites"? I don't remember hearing about this particular kind of Iraqi foot dragging before.

* No. Over the last six years, UNSCOM has pressed repeatedly, with US support, for access to all sites that the inspectors have deemed critical to their mission. The record of the Iraqis for noncompliance is well known - each

standoff has been reported to the Security Council, and, at the end of the day
Iraq has always been forced, grudgingly, to reveal more and more about its
weapons of mass destruction.

But he apparently hadn't asked for access to sensitive sites during this current
crisis, or since the teams went back in three weeks ago - why not?

* It's up to Chairman Butler and to UNSCOM to decide where and when its
inspection teams go.

* I have every confidence that Chairman Butler is doing what he needs to do to
get the job done and to get it done well.

What are you prepared to do if Saddam Hussein doesn't let UNSCOM have access to
these sites?

* Any obstruction by the Iraqis would be a challenge to the Security Council's
demands, restated as lately as just prior to Butler's trip.
UNSCOM/IAEA need
full access.

* Our objective is to prevent him from retaining his WMD. The best way to do
that is keeping UNSCOM and IAEA in Iraq, on the ground, with full access, to find
Iraq's remaining WMD articles and prevent regeneration.

* We will pursue this first through a joint UNSC response to any Iraqi
obstruction.

* But we have not ruled out any options and obviously have the forces available
to take whatever action is required.

* The Council's resolutions - and the entire Council - are on the side of an
effective UNSCOM and IAEA.

* The UN Security Council Resolutions make very clear that UNSCOM has the right
to go anywhere it needs to do its mission.

* Any Iraqi attempt to prevent UNSCOM from carrying out its UN mandate would be a serious matter.

Would you take military action?

* As in previous instances, the issue would go back to the Security Council in the first instance.

* I will not rule out any options.

What about reports Saddam has mass murdered political prisoners recently?

* We are checking on those reports.

* They are very plausible given Saddam's track record.

Will you make concessions to Saddam by expanding the oil for food program next year and allowing him to sell more oil for food?

* First, let's be clear that all the sanctions must remain in place until Iraq complies with relevant UN Security Council resolutions. There will be no compromise or concessions on this.

* It has always been our position that humanitarian assistance should be provided to the Iraqi people - this is why we sponsored Resolution 986, which permits the sale of oil for the purchase of food and humanitarian relief under strict UN control and supervision.

* We have consistently expressed our support for extending this resolution. Saddam rejected that proposal for well over a year - a clear indication this is not a concession to him but rather help for the people

* So let us be clear about who is at fault for the suffering of the Iraqi people -- Saddam Hussein, who has spent billions of dollars on building outrageous presidential palaces and who will use his own people for human shields.

Critics of your Iraq policy say you have no Arab support for the use of force, and that the Saudis and the Turks have refused to let us use their territory for strikes against Iraq. How do you respond?

* The conversations Secretary Albright and Secretary Cohen have had with their counterparts in the region show a very good understanding of the threat posed by Iraq and of the need to contain that threat.

* We have been granted everything we have asked for. Any discussions as to the use of force remain hypothetical.

MIDDLE EAST

The Israeli press reports that Bibi won't have a proposal on further redeployment to make to Albright. What will there be for them to discuss?

* I would note that there are a number of conflicting reports in the Israeli press about what Prime Minister Netanyahu will not bring to Paris. Secretary Albright will let the Prime Minister speak for himself on what Israel is prepared to do on this issue.

* The purpose of her meetings is to help reduce gaps on this and other issues in the peace process.

* She'll be following up on her recent meetings with both leaders - this is a continuing effort to push the peace process forward and to reinforce the urgency with which both sides must approach the process.

What about a three-way meeting with Arafat, Netanyahu and Albright?

* Albright will hold separate follow up discussions tomorrow and Wednesday with the two leaders. What's important is that the parties make progress on the four-part agenda as soon as possible. This is what we have to be focused on.

The Israeli cabinet seems far from ready to announce any redeployment numbers - didn't Secretary Albright set a deadline of December 17 for Netanyahu to present a plan for redeployment?

* We have repeatedly stressed the need to move forward in the process as quickly as possible. She urged movement as soon as possible.

The State Department has suggested that if there is no progress this month with the talks, the US may have to go public with its own "plan" - are you getting close to tabling your own proposal?

* It is no secret that I attach a very high priority to moving forward quickly on the talks.

* There are no artificial deadlines, but there is real urgency for the parties to move forward.

* We're involved in a serious process. And we are working with the parties to overcome their differences. That is where our focus is.

What is the US view on the Israelis barring a Palestinian census in East Jerusalem?

* Jerusalem remains the most sensitive of the permanent status issues.

* We have repeatedly asked both sides to refrain from actions which could be considered provocative by the other side, and which might predetermine the outcome of issues that need to be decided in permanent status negotiations.

There is a press report that Hamas has again threatened Israel and that a top Israeli terrorist expert has said that a bomb could go off "today or tomorrow." Any comment?

* Terrorism is still a real threat -- both to Israeli citizens and to the Peace Process itself.

* We are working very closely with the Palestinians urging them to enhance their efforts to fight terrorist threats, and specifically to continue with both unilateral efforts and cooperation with Israel on fighting terrorism.

There are persistent reports that Israel is planning to continue to build settlements and that, in fact, settlement construction is accelerating. This is hardly the "time out" we have called for. What is your reaction?

* Our view on settlements is well known to the parties - we have made it clear that there must be a timeout from unilateral acts.

Why won't you commit to seeing Netanyahu? It seems so obvious that you are snubbing him.

* I have met with Prime Minister Netanyahu five times since he was elected in May of 1996.

* I'm sure we'll meet again after the first of the year.

You received a letter from the leadership of the Major Jewish Organizations - they set out their positions on the peace process and the US-Israel relationship - will you respond?

* I appreciated receiving the letter -- it supports our efforts to bring peace to the region, and I am in broad agreement with the positions it takes. I will be sending a reply.

KYOTO

It looks like you're going to face an uphill battle in the Congress - how do you expect to get this treaty ratified if the Senate Republicans are calling it DOA?

* First, let me say again that this is a historic agreement, one that is environmentally strong and will enhance our growth and provide us new opportunities for technology.

* Kyoto was a good first step. But this will be a long process - it

involves
extremely complicated issues.

* But, as I have said all along, I will not submit this agreement for ratification until key developing nations participate meaningfully in this effort. This is a global problem; it requires a global solution.

* We will continue to work closely with these countries to secure their meaningful participation in this agreement.

BOSNIA

Why are you going to Bosnia?

* Going to visit troops and meet with Bosnian officials. Thank them at Christmas.

Have you decided that US forces must stay after June, 1998?

* I'm reviewing those issues now. I met with my foreign policy team yesterday.
I've not yet made a decision on U.S. participation in any Follow on Force (FOF).

* U.S. has strong national interest in successful peace in Bosnia.
NATO looking
at options.

In terms of a possible follow on force, what kinds of numbers do you expect the military authorities will come up with, and how long would another mission last?

* NATO has only discussed broad political guidance at this point.
That is what
the study of options is for - to develop specifics on questions such as this.

Aren't we running out of time --- shouldn't you have made up your mind by now?
Why the delay? It doesn't seem as if you've really been very actively consulting
with Congress. I don't detect any sense of urgency.

* I have said all along that it is important that we reach a decision this winter
- in time to permit the necessary planning, one way or the other. I still

believe that a decision will be made in this time frame.

* We need to continue to deliberate with Congress and with our allies, and to carefully consider our interests as we reach our decision.

* I am immensely proud of the progress we have made in Bosnia -- after 46 months of war, 23 months of implementing peace have helped change conditions: we have ended the fighting and bloodshed, we are rebuilding the economy, we are building the institutions for self governance by holding peaceful elections. Things are not perfect in Bosnia, but they are on the right track.

* In some areas where the peace has not fully taken root, we still need to make greater progress -- in refugee return, in reform of local police and media, and in building real economic and political cooperation among the parties.

* Again, I have not made any final decisions about a US military presence in a post-SFOR mission, but I believe America has abiding interest in peace and stability in Bosnia and a compelling interest in implementation of Dayton because Europe's stability and America's security are linked.

An assistance package is on its way to the Serb Republic - both from the World Bank and direct US assistance to the tune of \$18 million and \$22 million, respectively. Why aren't we withholding this aid until they turn over their indicted war criminals?

* First, these are carefully targeted assistance funds - so they will go to the very kinds of civilian implementation projects that are helping democracy and economic growth take root.

* I think it's very important for those who support the Dayton Accords and implementation of the peace to know that there are benefits from doing so.

* We are taking every measure possible to ensure that this money

does not go to,
or benefit in any way, persons indicted for war crimes.

The French appear to be refusing to allow their military officials to testify
against indicted war criminals being tried in The Hague. And the Tribunal's
Chief Prosecutor has said that war criminals in the French zone in Bosnia feel
"perfectly safe." What is your reaction to these reports?

* This is a NATO operation, and the NATO rules of engagement are clear - SFOR
will detain indicted war criminals it encounters in the course of its regular
duties if the tactical situation permits.

* These were the circumstances in which the war criminals in Prijedor were
detained. War criminals in any sector of Bosnia would be subject to detention
under such circumstances.

* We do everything we can to help the ICTY with its investigations and
prosecutions - and I urge other nations to do the same.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

There are so many differing assessments of the cost of NATO enlargement, and
Jesse Helms is warning that unless Europe pays its fair share we may never see
Senate approval? How will you get all this confusion sorted out and expansion
approved?

* I believe the Congress will ratify NATO enlargement because it is the right
decision -- strategically, politically, and morally. The bottom line is that
NATO enlargement will make Europe a safer place, and that serves our security
interests.

* Instead of tossing around competing estimates, we need to focus on what's
really important. I have always said the cost of enlargement will be real but
manageable. These costs will be shared fairly among allies -- new and

old alike.

Think we can all agree that enlargement is far cheaper and smarter than an unstable situation with the risk of conflict.

SOUTH ASIA TRIP

In view of the fall of the Gujral Government in India and the elections projected

for late February, are you still planning to visit South Asia early next year?

What other countries will be on your itinerary?

* I intend to visit South Asia next year.

* The visit dates and itinerary, to include deciding which countries we'll be visiting, have not been set.

Given the weak government in India and the recent political crisis in Pakistan,

what do you hope to accomplish during this trip? Is there really a reason to go at this time?

* South Asia is a region of growing importance to the United States.

* It is the home to over one-fifth of the world's population and a growing market for U.S. businesses.

* Our relationships with many of the countries of South Asia are complicated by difficult issues, which require resolution.

* For these reasons, I believe it important to engage with these governments.

* My trip will seek to broaden and deepen our engagement in this increasingly important region.

KHATAMI DIALOGUE REMARKS

Khatami made some moderating remarks yesterday - what is your reaction to his call for dialogue with the US?

* I welcome the new tone we are hearing from the President of Iran - this is a positive statement.

* We have long favored a serious dialogue between the US and Iran as long as all issues are on the table.

* Of course, what we want to see is not just a change in Iranian statements, but in Iranian actions. As we have often said, any dialogue would need to address all issues, including our concerns about Iranian support for terrorism, sponsorship of violent opposition to the peace process and efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction.

Why don't you change your Iran policy...end containment?

* We have serious problems with Iran's support for terrorism, violent opposition to the peace process and WMD programs.

* We seek to build a strong international consensus against these activities, which threaten the stability of the region.

* But I have said from the beginning that I would welcome a serious dialogue with Iran, including on these issues.

Are you going to accept Khatami's offer?

* I believe a serious dialogue with all issues on the table could be useful, but at the end of the day what matters is Iran's actions.

Will you be prepared to have US diplomats meet with Iranians?

* As I said, it has long been the policy of the US government to favor an authoritative dialogue between our two governments if all the issues are on the table. That policy actually began under President Bush.

Why not conduct a policy review?

* We are continually looking at the best ways to achieve our objectives.

Are the press reports true that secret discussions took place between the US and Iran after Khatami was elected?

* The reports are false.

What about apparent splits in the Iranian leadership?

* I'm not going to comment on any internal policy debate which may be taking place in Iran.

* We are listening carefully to everything that is being said; more importantly, to what is being done.

When do you expect to announce your Total decision - hasn't this dragged on for a long time?

* The Total matter, and whether there is sanctionable activity under the ILSA, is being investigated by the State Department - this is a complex investment and a complicated law, and we need to let the analysis proceed.

* That said, I will enforce the law.

ANTHRAX VACCINE

The Pentagon is going to spend \$130M to vaccinate the entire military against anthrax, even though there is no evidence any country has ever used anthrax as a biological weapon. Do you agree with the military's decision?

* Yes. The current situation in Iraq, where UN inspectors continue to press Saddam Hussein to come clean with respect to his biological weapons program, reminds us of the dangers to our forces posed by rogue states or groups.

* Last month, I directed the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs to initiate a "Force Health Protection Program" to increase protection for our troops against biological or chemical threats before they deploy to danger zones

around the world. This is consistent with my pledge to anticipate medical needs and prevent illness among our men and women in uniform. I support it completely.

MIXED GENDER TRAINING

A short time ago, Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker released a panel report on basic military training ordered by Secretary of Defense Cohen in response to the sexual harassment problems at Aberdeen Proving Grounds. The panel seems to suggest that mixed gender training is more trouble than it's worth and that women ought to train separately. Your Administration has steadily pushed in the opposite direction. Are you going to instruct the military to do an about face based on this report?

* The report was just provided to Secretary Cohen today. He will review it along with the military services and then will brief me on the panel's conclusions and his recommendations.

* I don't think the panel recommended an end to gender-integrated training, only changes in living arrangements and unit organization.

* For five years, I have worked hard to keep the military the best trained, best equipped, most ready force in the world. Men and women in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines prove this every day in places like Bosnia and the Persian Gulf. I will support any effort to increase the effectiveness of our mixed gender military training.

AFRICA

You have made a commitment to visit Africa in 1998. The Secretary of State just finished a trip to Africa and has been criticized for visiting some countries that have yet to fully embrace democracy. While she was in Rwanda, Hutu rebels massacred more than 200 Tutsi refugees. When and where will you go

in Africa and
what will you hope to accomplish?

* I do hope to visit Africa some time next year. The specific details on my trip will depend in part on the report I get from Secretary Albright when she returns.

* This is a moment of tremendous promise for Africa. There is still tremendous instability caused by ethnic rivalries, political upheaval and mass migration. The United States is committed to help promote economic growth and social and political reform.

* The African trade initiative I announced earlier this year will encourage greater access for African exports to our markets and increase private investment. I look forward to following up on these efforts during the course of my trip.

The West has been pressing Laurent Kabila for greater human rights and democratic progress since the overthrow of Mobutu. Yet he seemed to mock Secretary Albright during her visit to the Congo. Have we allowed one demagogue to replace another?

* In the post-Mobutu era, Congo faces a long struggle to rebuild its economy and society. We want to help in ways that are consistent with our values and policy goals. The way to do that is to engage with Kabila, honestly and openly.

* In doing so, we have made it very clear that we are not going to pull any punches in criticizing human rights abuses or failure to cooperate with UN investigators.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 12/18/97 4:52:29 PM
FROM Harris, Elisa D.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: another cwc certification package [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Samore, Gary S.
Sparks, John E.
Rudman, Mara E.
Bell, Robert G.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY here are the certifications which will be at tab A:

-----Original
Message-----
From: Harris, Elisa D.
Sent: Thursday, December 18,
1997 3:41 PM
To: Samore, Gary S.; Sparks, John E.; Rudman, Mara
E.; Bell, Robert G.
Subject: another cwc certification package [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

the
attached cwc certification is a repeat of one which was also required
prior to depositing our instruments in april. commerce is supposed
to be sending over the paperwork tomorrow, but given the holidays,
i thought i'd get the memo cleared and ready to put into the system
quickly. would appreciate your clearance by 4:00 FRIDAY afternoon.
thanks!

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

8513 Jesse Helms.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, I hereby certify that:

In connection with Condition (9), Protection of Advanced Technology, the legitimate commercial activities and interests of chemical, biotechnology, and pharmaceutical firms in the United States are not being significantly harmed by the limitations of the Convention on access to, and production of, those chemicals and toxins listed in Schedule 1 of the Annex on Chemicals.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman, Committee on Foreign
Relations
United State Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, I hereby certify that:

In connection with Condition (9), Protection of Advanced Technology, the legitimate commercial activities and interests of chemical, biotechnology, and pharmaceutical firms in the United States are not being significantly harmed by the limitations of the Convention on access to, and production of, those chemicals and toxins listed in Schedule 1 of the Annex on Chemicals.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the House Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: GRAY SAMORE

FROM: ELISA D. HARRIS

SUBJECT: Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) Certification

At Tab I is a memorandum for the President recommending that he sign the attached certification concerning the impact of the CWC on U.S. industry. The certification was prepared by Commerce and cleared by the relevant agencies. It is due on January 1, 1998.

Concurrence by: John Sparks, Mara Rudman, Bob Bell

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for the President

Tab A Certification

Tab II Incoming from Commerce

1

8513

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 8513a.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
JOHN HILLEY

SUBJECT: Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) Certification

Purpose

To sign a certification to Congress required by the CWC resolution of ratification.

Background

Condition 9 of the Senate resolution giving advice and consent to ratification of the CWC requires you to certify to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Speaker of the House on January 1 of each year that the legitimate commercial activities and interests of chemical, biotechnology and pharmaceutical firms in the United States are not being significantly harmed by the CWC's limitations on Schedule 1 chemicals.

A proposed certification, prepared by the Commerce Department, is at Tab A.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the certification at Tab A.

Attachment
Tab A Proposed Certification

2

8513

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Jeffery DeLaurentis to Mara Rudman, James Baker, and Robert Kyle. Subject: Concurrence on Transmittal Package of Helms-Burton (Title I) Reports. (6 pages)	12/30/1997	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Record (Sept 97-Jan 01) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 620000

FOLDER TITLE:

[11/25/1997-01/06/1998]

2006-1363-F
vz5716

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]

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 1/6/98 9:34:23 AM

FROM Cooper, Kathleen H.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Riedel Interview Request [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Baker, James E.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Blinken, Antony J.

CARBON_COPY Baker, James E.
DeRosa, Mary B.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Sparks, John E.
Crowley, Philip J.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Countryman, Thomas M.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Greer, Jason H.
Marty, Joseph H.
Pedersen, Amy F.
Riedel, Bruce O.
Todd, Gwentyth E.

TEXT_BODY Would appreciate your comments/concurrence on the attached interview request from the Middle East Quarterly for Bruce. Thanks.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 20009gd.doc

January 5, 1998

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR GLYN T. DAVIES

FROM: BRUCE RIEDEL

SUBJECT: Invitation to be Interviewed for Middle East Quarterly

I have been asked to be interviewed for the Middle East Quarterly. Since it is a quarterly, the interview would deal with a longer range perspective on our various policies in the Middle East. They would like to do this sometime between now and March for about an hour in person. They have previously interviewed a broad range of Middle East policymakers and thinkers including Dennis Ross, Charles Krauthammer and Jesse Helms. This would be a good venue to discuss our current thinking on Iran, Iraq and other issues.

Concurrences by: Jamie Baker, Anne Luzzatto, Tony Blinken

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve my participation in this interview.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachment
Tab I Invitation

1

20009