

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Dwiht Bemisderfer to Malcolm Lee. Subject: Action Memorandum for NSC. (7 pages)	02/09/1998	P1/b(1)
002. email	Gerald Epstein to Bruce MacDonald. Subject: RE: Landmines. (2 pages)	02/09/1998	P1/b(1)
003. email	Gerald Epstein to Bruce MacDonald and Gerald Kiernan. Subject: Gottemoeller-Kislyak Meeting in Moscow. (15 pages)	03/03/1998	P1/b(1)
004. email	Mara Rudman to Sharon Storey, Robert Malley, Glyn Davies et al. Subject: Wellstone call to SRB. (3 pages)	03/09/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1998-03/10/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5652

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Dwiht Bemisderfer to Malcolm Lee. Subject: Action Memorandum for NSC. (7 pages)	02/09/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1998-03/10/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5652

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Gerald Epstein to Bruce MacDonald. Subject: RE: Landmines. (2 pages)	02/09/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1998-03/10/1998]

2006-1363-F
vz5652

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 2/10/98 5:00:37 PM

FROM Hawley, Leonard R.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: Foreign Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Rudman, Mara E.
Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY Hawley, Leonard R.

TEXT_BODY Mara--here is the issue paper I propose we send to Berger in response to Rob Malley's request. Need to send to Malley COB tonight. Len

-----Original Message-----
From: Malley, Robert
Sent: Tuesday,
February 10, 1998 12:12 PM
To: @ALLNSC - NSC Staff
Subject: Foreign
Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please provide topics and points
by COB.

FYI, am told that Richardson will raise his trip to China
and Japan; development in China regarding human rights, and UN
arrears.
Could relevant offices coordinate points on those?

Thanks

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT SRB Issue Paper UNArrears Legislation.doc
February 10, 1998

SUBJECT: UN Arrears Legislative Approach-Foreign Policy

Breakfast.

Issue: How should the Administration craft a revised legislative package on Helms-Biden that will close the gap between what we can get from the Hill and what we can sell at the UN in June?

Background: Amb Richardson will make the case for shaping a new UN arrears legislative package rather than re-cooking Helms-Biden. He believes the old Helms-Biden package will fail at the UN, with blame falling on the Administration. This week, State needs to come to closure on the proposed package to send to the Hill. The key issue is how to deal with the 56 benchmarks in Helms-Biden: should we clean out many of them, or should we accept a "Helms-Biden Lite" version. In addition, Richardson will press for a POTUS meeting with Hill leaders in mid-February to lead the charge on UN arrears.

Secretary Albright has indicated she prefers "Helms-Biden Medium." USUN, State-IO, and State-H are trying to resolve their differences so shape a package that both the UN and the Hill will accept.

Discussion: "Helms-Biden Medium" is achievable and desirable. It gives Senator Helms a way to move forward without sacrificing the essence of Helms-Biden. Dick Sklar has developed a suitable "Medium" option for Amb Pickering that includes all 56 benchmarks outlined in Helms-Biden. However, Sklar's option puts 26 benchmarks in the annual Appropriation Bill since they belong there, 12 more benchmarks in the revised arrears legislation, and the remaining 18 in a new Management Reform policy initiative that could be folded into the new package. Sklar's option keeps the 56 benchmarks in play in a way that reduces the possibility of offending Member States at the UN.

How should the President lead the battle on UN arrears? If the new

legislative
package will have any chance of success this Spring, many believe the
President
must lead our effort with a meeting with the Hill leadership. Mara
Rudman and
Len Hawley are working a Scheduling Proposal for your approval to
accomplish that
end. In addition, SYG Kofi Annan is planning to visit Washington 2-4
March to
press for action on UN arrears. It would be useful for the President to
have
engaged with the Hill prior to SYG Annan's visit.

1

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/11/98 6:02:58 AM
FROM Hawley, Leonard R.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: HELP--Foreign Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rudman, Mara E.
Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY Hawley, Leonard R.

TEXT_BODY Mara--e-mail sent yesterday afternoon requesting your chop on the attached paper. Again, request your chop before 0700 this morning on this paper called for by Rob Malley. Len

-----Original
Message-----
From: Hawley, Leonard R.
Sent: Tuesday, February
10, 1998 5:01 PM
To: Rudman, Mara E.; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Cc: Hawley,
Leonard R.
Subject: FW: Foreign Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]

Mara--here
is the issue paper I propose we send to Berger in response to Rob
Malley's request. Need to send to Malley COB tonight. Len

-----Original
Message-----
From: Malley, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, February 10,
1998 12:12 PM
To: @ALLNSC - NSC Staff
Subject: Foreign Policy Breakfast
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Please provide topics and points by COB.

FYI,
am told that Richardson will raise his trip to China and Japan;
development
in China regarding human rights, and UN arrears. Could relevant
offices
coordinate points on those?

Thanks

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT SRB Issue Paper UNArrears Legislation.doc
February 10, 1998

SUBJECT: UN Arrears Legislative Approach-Foreign Policy
Breakfast.

Issue: How should the Administration craft a revised legislative
package on
Helms-Biden that will close the gap between what we can get from
the Hill and
what we can sell at the UN in June?

Background: Amb Richardson will make the case for shaping a new
UN arrears
legislative package rather than reworking Helms-Biden. He believes
the old
Helms-Biden package will fail at the UN, with blame falling on the
Administration. This week, State needs to come to closure on the
proposed
package to send to the Hill. The key issue is how to deal with the 56
benchmarks
in Helms-Biden: should we clean out many of them, or should we
accept a
"Helms-Biden Lite" version. In addition, Richardson will press for a
POTUS
meeting with Hill leaders in mid-February to lead the charge on UN
arrears.

Secretary Albright has indicated she prefers "Helms-Biden Medium."
USUN,
State-IO, and State-H are trying to resolve their differences so shape a
package
that both the UN and the Hill will accept.

Discussion: "Helms-Biden Medium" is achievable and desirable. It
gives

Senator Helms a way to move forward without sacrificing the essence of Helms-Biden. Dick Sklar has developed a suitable "Medium" option for Amb Pickering that includes all 56 benchmarks outlined in Helms-Biden. However, Sklar's option puts 26 benchmarks in the annual Appropriation Bill since they belong there, 12 more benchmarks in the revised arrears legislation, and the remaining 18 in a new Management Reform policy initiative that could be folded into the new package. Sklar's option keeps the 56 benchmarks in play in a way that reduces the possibility of offending Member States at the UN.

How should the President lead the battle on UN arrears? If the new legislative package will have any chance of success this Spring, many believe the President must lead our effort with a meeting with the Hill leadership. Mara Rudman and Len Hawley are working a Scheduling Proposal for your approval to accomplish that end. In addition, SYG Kofi Annan is planning to visit Washington 2-4 March to press for action on UN arrears. It would be useful for the President to have engaged with the Hill prior to SYG Annan's visit.

1

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT SRB Issue Paper UNArrears Legislation.doc
February 10, 1998

SUBJECT: UN Arrears Legislative Approach-Foreign Policy
Breakfast.

Issue: How should the Administration craft a revised legislative package on Helms-Biden that will close the gap between what we can get from the Hill and what we can sell at the UN in June?

Background: Amb Richardson will make the case for shaping a new UN arrears legislative package rather than re-cooking Helms-Biden. He believes the old Helms-Biden package will fail at the UN, with blame falling on the Administration. This week, State needs to come to closure on the proposed package to send to the Hill. The key issue is how to deal with the 56 benchmarks in Helms-Biden: should we clean out many of them, or should we accept a "Helms-Biden Lite" version. In addition, Richardson will press for a POTUS meeting with Hill leaders in mid-February to lead the charge on UN arrears.

Secretary Albright has indicated she prefers "Helms-Biden Medium." USUN, State-IO, and State-H are trying to resolve their differences so shape a package that both the UN and the Hill will accept.

Discussion: "Helms-Biden Medium" is achievable and desirable. It gives Senator Helms a way to move forward without sacrificing the essence of Helms-Biden. Dick Sklar has developed a suitable "Medium" option for Amb Pickering that includes all 56 benchmarks outlined in Helms-Biden. However, Sklar's option puts 26 benchmarks in the annual Appropriation Bill since they belong there, 12 more benchmarks in the revised arrears legislation, and the remaining 18 in a new Management Reform policy initiative that could be folded into the new package. Sklar's option keeps the 56 benchmarks in play in a way that reduces the possibility of offending Member States at the UN.

How should the President lead the battle on UN arrears? If the new legislative package will have any chance of success this Spring, many believe the President must lead our effort with a meeting with the Hill leadership. Mara Rudman and Len Hawley are working a Scheduling Proposal for your approval to accomplish that end. In addition, SYG Kofi Annan is planning to visit Washington 2-4

March to
press for action on UN arrears. It would be useful for the President to
have
engaged with the Hill prior to SYG Annan's visit.

1

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/11/98 8:16:56 AM
FROM Rudman, Mara E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: HELP--Foreign Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Hawley, Leonard R.

CARBON_COPY Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Rudman, Mara E.

TEXT_BODY Len, please see changes.

Wish you had alerted me that this was in my email bin when you came by yesterday afternoon. as you probably could tell, i was crashing on iraq and bosnia consults -- i had NO opportunity to review any of my emails from mid afternoon on that were unrelated to those two issues. in the future when you have something urgent, please call and flag it for me and/or let gina or someone here know by means other than email. thanks.

when
gina arrives, let's find a time to get together this morning. we clearly have some issues we need to discuss.

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

From: Hawley,
Leonard R.
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 1998 6:03 AM
To: Rudman,
Mara E.; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Cc: Hawley, Leonard R.
Subject: FW:
HELP--Foreign Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]

Mara--e-mail sent
yesterday afternoon requesting your chop on the attached paper.
Again, request your chop before 0700 this morning on this paper
called
for by Rob Malley. Len

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

From: Hawley,
Leonard R.
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 1998 5:01 PM
To: Rudman,
Mara E.; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Cc: Hawley, Leonard R.
Subject: FW:
Foreign Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]

Mara--here is the issue
paper I propose we send to Berger in response to Rob Malley's
request.
Need to send to Malley COB tonight. Len

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

From: Malley,
Robert
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 1998 12:12 PM
To: @ALLNSC -
NSC Staff
Subject: Foreign Policy Breakfast [UNCLASSIFIED]

Please
provide topics and points by COB.

FYI, am told that Richardson
will raise his trip to China and Japan; development in China regarding
human rights, and UN arrears. Could relevant offices coordinate
points
on those?

Thanks

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

SRB Issue Paper UNArrears Legislation.doc
February 10, 1998

SUBJECT: UN Arrears Legislative Approach-Foreign Policy
Breakfast.

Issue: How should the Administration craft a revised legislative
package on
Helms-Biden that will close the gap between what we can get from

the Hill and
what we can sell at the UN in June?

Background: Amb Richardson will make the case for shaping a new UN arrears legislative package rather than reworking Helms-Biden. He believes the old Helms-Biden package will fail at the UN, with blame falling on the Administration. This week, State needs to come to closure on the proposed package to send to the Hill. The key issue is how to deal with the 56 benchmarks in Helms-Biden: should we clean out many of them, or should we accept a "Helms-Biden Lite" version. In addition, Richardson will press for a POTUS meeting with Hill leaders in mid-February to lead the charge on UN arrears.

Secretary Albright has indicated she prefers "Helms-Biden Medium." USUN, State-IO, and State-H are trying to resolve their differences to shape a package that both the UN and the Hill will accept.

Discussion: "Helms-Biden Medium" is achievable and desirable. It gives Senator Helms a way to move forward without sacrificing the essence of Helms-Biden. Dick Sklar has developed a suitable "Medium" option for Amb Pickering that, in totality, includes all 56 benchmarks outlined in Helms-Biden. However, Sklar's option would put 26 benchmarks in the annual authorization/appropriation context, place 12 more benchmarks in the revised arrears legislative package and combine it with the remaining 18 which would be revamped in a new Management Reform policy initiative.. Sklar's option keeps the 56 benchmarks in play in a way that reduces the possibility of offending Member States at the UN.

How should the President lead the battle on UN arrears? If the new legislative package will have any chance of success this Spring, many believe the President must lead our effort with a meeting with the Hill leadership. Legislative affairs is working with Global to develop a legislative plan that would

include a
POTUS meeting which we will get to you shortly. In addition, SYG
Kofi Annan is
planning to visit Washington 2-4 March to press for action on UN
arrears. It
would be useful for the President to have engaged with the Hill prior
to SYG
Annan's visit.

1

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT SRB Issue Paper UNArrears Legislation.doc
February 10, 1998

SUBJECT: UN Arrears Legislative Approach-Foreign Policy
Breakfast.

Issue: How should the Administration craft a revised legislative
package on
Helms-Biden that will close the gap between what we can get from
the Hill and
what we can sell at the UN in June?

Background: Amb Richardson will make the case for shaping a new
UN arrears
legislative package rather than re-cooking Helms-Biden. He believes
the old
Helms-Biden package will fail at the UN, with blame falling on the
Administration. This week, State needs to come to closure on the
proposed
package to send to the Hill. The key issue is how to deal with the 56
benchmarks
in Helms-Biden: should we clean out many of them, or should we
accept a
"Helms-Biden Lite" version. In addition, Richardson will press for a
POTUS
meeting with Hill leaders in mid-February to lead the charge on UN
arrears.

Secretary Albright has indicated she prefers "Helms-Biden Medium."
USUN,
State-IO, and State-H are trying to resolve their differences so shape a
package

that both the UN and the Hill will accept.

Discussion: "Helms-Biden Medium" is achievable and desirable. It gives Senator Helms a way to move forward without sacrificing the essence of Helms-Biden. Dick Sklar has developed a suitable "Medium" option for Amb Pickering that includes all 56 benchmarks outlined in Helms-Biden. However, Sklar's option puts 26 benchmarks in the annual Appropriation Bill since they belong there, 12 more benchmarks in the revised arrears legislation, and the remaining 18 in a new Management Reform policy initiative that could be folded into the new package. Sklar's option keeps the 56 benchmarks in play in a way that reduces the possibility of offending Member States at the UN.

How should the President lead the battle on UN arrears? If the new legislative package will have any chance of success this Spring, many believe the President must lead our effort with a meeting with the Hill leadership. Mara Rudman and Len Hawley are working a Scheduling Proposal for your approval to accomplish that end. In addition, SYG Kofi Annan is planning to visit Washington 2-4 March to press for action on UN arrears. It would be useful for the President to have engaged with the Hill prior to SYG Annan's visit.

1

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/11/98 10:42:23 AM
FROM Rubin, Eric S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Stoyanov guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Dehqanzada, Yahya A.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

NW: Please add the following:

Did Stoyanov and POTUS discuss Iraq?

* No,
not in any detail.

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

From: Braden,
Susan R.
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 1998 10:32 AM
To: Rubin,
Eric S.
Subject: RE: Urgent guidance requests from McCurry [UNCLASSIFIED]

No,
not in any detail.

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

From: Rubin,
Eric S.
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 1998 10:10 AM
To: @CEE -
Central/Eastern Europe; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Cc: @PRESS
- Public Affairs
Subject: Urgent guidance requests from McCurry
[UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Following guidance (based on

questions from McCurry's 0930 session with reporters) needed ASAP to @PRESS:

CEE: Did Stoyanov and POTUS discuss Iraq?

LEGIS:

Response to Senator Helms vow to block foreign affairs legislation over family planning issue

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/12/98 2:21:05 PM
FROM Bell, Robert G.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Baker, James E.
Witkowski, Anne A.

CARBON_COPY Leary, William H.
Baker, James E.
DeRosa, Mary B.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Davies, Glyn T.

TEXT_BODY amen, brother.

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

From: Baker, James
E.

Sent: Thursday, February 12, 1998 2:16 PM

To: Witkowski, Anne
A.

Cc: Bell, Robert G.; Leary, William H.; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;
Davies, Glyn T.

Subject: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]

DELIBERATIVE

Anne:

Minority staff on the Hill have asked you for a copy of a draft PDD on land mines, which all indications suggest has been leaked to Sen. Helms. You asked for our view on how we should respond.

After discussing with Bill Leary, I am of the view that we should not provide the staff with a copy of the draft PDD. They are, of course, free to try and obtain one from Sen. Helms's staff.

1.

There are few classes of document more deliberative than a draft

statement of Presidential policy. We should not adopt a standard or practice that suggests that if one copy leaks everybody gets it. That is a lowest common denominator approach to presidential prerogatives. (Bill Gertz has it so so should we.)

2. Such an approach increases incentives for policy discontents to leak documents.

3. Moreover, the draft that leaks may be a different iteration from the current version and sending up an official copy gives a draft an imprimatur a leaked version may not have, i.e., a leaked draft is not necessarily something we need to respond to in an authoritative manner -- it is a draft, it may reflect no more than the musings of the current pen.

I also considered whether we should be prepared, as a fall-back, to allow the democratic staff to read the document that Helms has. I do not favor such an approach for the reasons stated above. Moreover, while we can always say we are not setting a precedent, the reality is we are establishing a political expectation that we may not be prepared to deal with in a different context.

Thanks for raising. Hope this helps.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/12/98 2:53:11 PM
FROM Leary, William H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Baker, James E.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

Very well said. I particularly like your point # 3.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Baker, James E.

Sent: Thursday, February 12,
1998 2:16 PM

To: Witkowsky, Anne A.

Cc: Bell, Robert G.; Leary,

William H.; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; Davies, Glyn T.

Subject: Leaked

Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]

DELIBERATIVE

Anne:

Minority staff

on the Hill have asked you for a copy of a draft PDD on land mines, which all indications suggest has been leaked to Sen. Helms. You asked for our view on how we should respond.

After discussing

with Bill Leary, I am of the view that we should not provide the staff with a copy of the draft PDD. They are, of course, free to try and obtain one from Sen. Helms's staff.

1. There are few

classes of document more deliberative than a draft statement of Presidential policy. We should not adopt a standard or practice that suggests that if one copy leaks everybody gets it. That is a lowest common denominator approach to presidential prerogatives. (Bill Gertz has it so so should we.)

2. Such an approach increases incentives

for policy discontents to leak documents.

3. Moreover, the draft that leaks may be a different iteration from the current version and sending up an official copy gives a draft an imprimatur a leaked version may not have, i.e., a leaked draft is not necessarily something we need to respond to in an authoritative manner -- it is a draft, it may reflect no more than the musings of the current pen.

I also considered whether we should be prepared, as a fall-back, to allow the democratic staff to read the document that Helms has. I do not favor such an approach for the reasons stated above. Moreover, while we can always say we are not setting a precedent, the reality is we are establishing a political expectation that we may not be prepared to deal with in a different context.

Thanks for raising. Hope this helps.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/12/98 3:55:17 PM
FROM Farrar, Jay C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Witkowsky, Anne A.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

Wow,

Can Jamie make a case, or what!?

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

From: Witkowsky,
Anne A.
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 1998 3:56 PM
To: Farrar,
Jay C.
Cc: Baker, James E.
Subject: FW: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]

Since
you will be attending the briefing on CCW tomorrow where staff may
try to corner you, I thought you should see this as well.

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

From: Baker, James E.
Sent: Thursday, February 12,
1998 2:16 PM
To: Witkowsky, Anne A.
Cc: Bell, Robert G.; Leary,
William H.; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; Davies, Glyn T.
Subject: Leaked
Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]

DELIBERATIVE

Anne:

Minority staff
on the Hill have asked you for a copy of a draft PDD on land mines,
which all indications suggest has been leaked to Sen. Helms. You

asked for our view on how we should respond.

After discussing with Bill Leary, I am of the view that we should not provide the staff with a copy of the draft PDD. They are, of course, free to try and obtain one from Sen. Helms's staff.

1. There are few classes of document more deliberative than a draft statement of Presidential policy. We should not adopt a standard or practice that suggests that if one copy leaks everybody gets it. That is a lowest common denominator approach to presidential prerogatives. (Bill Gertz has it so so should we.)

2. Such an approach increases incentives for policy discontents to leak documents.

3. Moreover, the draft that leaks may be a different iteration from the current version and sending up an official copy gives a draft an imprimatur a leaked version may not have, i.e., a leaked draft is not necessarily something we need to respond to in an authoritative manner -- it is a draft, it may reflect no more than the musings of the current pen.

I also considered whether we should be prepared, as a fall-back, to allow the democratic staff to read the document that Helms has. I do not favor such an approach for the reasons stated above. Moreover, while we can always say we are not setting a precedent, the reality is we are establishing a political expectation that we may not be prepared to deal with in a different context.

Thanks for raising. Hope this helps.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/12/98 4:08:18 PM
FROM Witkowsky, Anne A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bell, Robert G.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Call has taken place. Matheson will do what he can to avoid questions on other than CCW. On draft PDD he will say he cannot discuss, but emphasize it is just a draft.

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

From: Witkowsky,
Anne A.
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 1998 2:46 PM
To: Bell, Robert
G.
Subject: FW: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

FOR
ACTION/RESPONSE

Bob:

On a related matter, I will speak at 3:00 today on a conference call with Matheson and Dodgen in preparation for their staff briefing tomorrow. At the larger meeting this morning that Matheson chaired, he took the view that it would be best, even if pressed, to avoid any discussion of the mixed munitions issue, taking the (correct) view that CCW and alternatives research are not related.

Even reciting the Inderfurth statement would then begin to take him down a road of questioning that could be problematic (especially since my sense is that DoD is going to play hardball on the PDD), though if pressed he should use it (it's public after all). He can of course, reiterate POTUS policy of September 17 and remind the assembled that we were not prepared to sign a treaty that put our forces at risk.

Do you agree?

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

From: Bell,
Robert G.
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 1998 2:21 PM
To: Baker,
James E.; Witkowsky, Anne A.
Cc: Leary, William H.; @LEGAL - Legal
Advisor; Davies, Glyn T.
Subject: RE: Leaked Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]

amen,
brother.

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

From: Baker, James E.
Sent: Thursday,
February 12, 1998 2:16 PM
To: Witkowsky, Anne A.
Cc: Bell, Robert
G.; Leary, William H.; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; Davies, Glyn T.
Subject: Leaked
Draft PDD [UNCLASSIFIED]

DELIBERATIVE

Anne:

Minority staff
on the Hill have asked you for a copy of a draft PDD on land mines,
which all indications suggest has been leaked to Sen. Helms. You
asked for our view on how we should respond.

After discussing
with Bill Leary, I am of the view that we should not provide the
staff with a copy of the draft PDD. They are, of course, free to
try and obtain one from Sen. Helms's staff.

1. There are few
classes of document more deliberative than a draft statement of Presidential
policy. We should not adopt a standard or practice that suggests
that if one copy leaks everybody gets it. That is a lowest common
denominator approach to presidential prerogatives. (Bill Gertz has
it so so should we.)
2. Such an approach increases incentives
for policy discontents to leak documents.
3. Moreover, the draft
that leaks may be a different iteration from the current version

and sending up an official copy gives a draft an imprimatur a leaked version may not have, i.e., a leaked draft is not necessarily something we need to respond to in an authoritative manner -- it is a draft, it may reflect no more than the musings of the current pen.

I also considered whether we should be prepared, as a fall-back, to allow the democratic staff to read the document that Helms has. I do not favor such an approach for the reasons stated above. Moreover, while we can always say we are not setting a precedent, the reality is we are establishing a political expectation that we may not be prepared to deal with in a different context.

Thanks for
raising. Hope this helps.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/12/98 8:18:00 PM
FROM Witkowsky, Anne A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT SFRC Q and A [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bell, Robert G.
Farrar, Jay C.

CARBON_COPY Baker, James E.

TEXT_BODY Attached, for your information, is the Q and A for use tomorrow at the SFRC brief.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Q and A for SFRC Brief.doc
Q and A for SFRC Brief

Q: What is your view of the policy laid out in the Draft PDD? Is it in fact the Administration's policy to seek Ottawa-treaty compliant alternatives to our mixed munitions?

* You are referring to a document that is internal and in draft form. It is common in the executive branch to use a draft PDD as a means to develop an Administration position within the interagency on policy issues.

* With regard to the basic policy question concerning alternatives to mixed munitions, I would note that Senator Helms has written to Mr. Holum on this matter. Mr. Holum will be responding to the letter. That response will reflect the Administration position on this question.

If pressed:

* I cannot comment on an internal draft document. Mr. Holum will be

responding
to Senator Helms' letter.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/17/98 8:52:44 PM
FROM Rudman, Mara E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: CEDAW [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Busby, Scott W.
Letts, Kelly J.
Malley, Robert
Ragan, Richard F.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Schwartz, Eric P.

CARBON_COPY Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Rudman, Mara E.
Bandler, Donald K.
Covey, James P.
Dowling, John N. (Nick)
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Quinn, Mary E.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.

TEXT_BODY Eric, (1) some small suggested changes in tone. I do not think "Challenging" members/senators to act will make them more likely to. Ratification is theirs to do or not do, so we need to be asking/requesting rather than laying down a gauntlet, regardless of how meritorious or politically appealing the issue; (2) my copy didn't have march-june, it was just blank. Is that where you ended the memo? (3) I have some reservations about Albright calling Helms and making a big pitch on CEDAW around Feb 20, depending on where we are/are not on the

Mexico City/UN arrears/IMF knot -- and given Helms comments on "women's issues" in a pull aside with Albright and Sandy last week following the Iraq consult. So bottom line: I'd like to discuss a bit more with you tomorrow before this gets sent in anywhere. Thanks.

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

From: Schwartz, Eric P.

Sent: Tuesday, February 17,
1998 12:44 PM

To: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat
Plan & Comm

Cc: @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs

Subject: CEDAW [UNCLASSIFIED]

Mara,
Tony, Dave:

Would appreciate your comments/concurrence ASAP, given March 8 date. The First Lady's COS is pushing for a meeting, but I don't want to do one until we get SRB's sign-off.

Mara, my
head count is based primarily on a memo I saw to the Secretary from State/H on this issue.

Eric

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

cedaw.doc

Background: Last year, the Administration renewed its efforts to have the Senate

Foreign Relations Committee consider the Convention on the Elimination of All

Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). We have included it as a top

priority in our Treaty Priority List, and the President and First Lady have all

made public appeals to the Senate to consider the Treaty. The Treaty, with the

Administration's recommended reservations package, was approved by the SFRC in

1994, but did not receive Senate consent (as a Unanimous Consent request failed

as the Session came to an end before the 1994 elections).

Public Support for the Treaty: A wide coalition of national

organizations has endorsed CEDAW, including the AARP, the ABA, the American Federation of Teachers and the NEA, the American Jewish Committee, the American Veterans Committee, B'nai B'rith, the Episcopal Church, the League of Women Voters, the YWCA and dozens of others. At the present time, we are unaware of substantial opposition to CEDAW.

Congressional Support for CEDAW: According to State/H as well as the NGO community, some 53 Senators have indicated support for the Treaty, though several (3-5) are less than solid. According to NGOs that have inquired with Members, six Senators have come out against CEDAW, with another five listed as "leaning against." The remaining 36 are undecided.

A critical factor, of course, is the attitude of Senator Helms. He voted against the Treaty when it was considered in Committee in 1994, but there are some indications he is less than adamantly opposed. He did not mount a vigorous opposition to the Treaty in 1994, and his correspondence with constituents on CEDAW simply restates his opposition and notes that "treaties must be considered very carefully." Finally, a letter to Secretary Albright concerning our treaty priorities expressed strong opposition to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the letter did not express opposition to CEDAW.

NGO Strategy for Ratification: Prior human rights treaties passed through the Senate in a low-profile manner, as it was generally assumed that very strong opposition by even a minority of Senators would make ratification very difficult if not impossible. CEDAW, however, is the first human rights treaty pending before the SFRC linked to an important constituency - and where opposition to the treaty may come at political costs to opponents.

As a result, the NGO community is organizing assiduously on this

issue. To be sure, they maintain that ratification should not become a partisan issue, but they are increasingly prepared to paint those who are reluctant to support the treaty as hostile (or at least unresponsive) on women's rights issue. White House offices, dealing with women's and domestic issues, seem to believe this approach has merit.

NGOs are now polling Senators, urging them to sign on to support of the treaty before March 8, International Women's Day. They intend to mount public campaigns (op eds, etc.) in the lead-up to March 8.

Administration Strategy for Ratification: Mindful of the NGO effort, we recommend an Administration strategy that involves both quiet and public efforts.

The Public Side:

There are three important dates to consider: March 8, International Women's Day; mid-July, the Sequentennial Celebration of the first American Women's Conference at Seneca Falls (where the First Lady and the Secretary of State are expected); and the September - November end of congressional session.

Lead-up to March 8: The President and other senior Administration officials ask members of Congress to express their support for CEDAW by March 8.

March 8: Senior Administration officials make statements of support for CEDAW, ask those Senators who have not yet committed to endorse the Treaty to do so. President makes statement requesting that the Senate to act on this Treaty by the time of the Seneca Falls Convention.

July: If Treaty has not been acted upon, senior Administration officials use the Seneca Falls event to criticize lack of Senate action, and to challenge Senate to

move in the period prior to the end of the session.

The Private Side:

In the lead-up to March 8, senior Administration officials would speak to the Congressional leadership, emphasizing our desire to avoid making this a partisan issue, but indicating our determination to fight hard for the Treaty.

Time-line of activities:

February 20: Secretary Albright calls Senator Helms, expresses Administration's strong desire to move on this treaty and desire to avoid a confrontation. Stresses that she understands his discomfort with the Treaty, but asks that he permit it at least to be considered in a timely manner - and, in any event - prior to the Seneca Falls Conference. Emphasizes that this could be done quickly, with or without hearings.

February 20: Chief of Staff Bowles makes similar call to Majority Leader Lott, with the same request, asks that Senator Lott speak to Senator Helms about moving the Treaty.

February 20-March 8: Other senior Administration officials make calls as appropriate.

February 20-March 8: State briefings of uncommitted Senate offices, emphasizing Administration effort to obtain commitment prior to March 8. Lead: Theresa Loar.

February 25: Letter from the President to all Members of the Senate, requesting commitments of support by March 8, as well as commitment to move Treaty by the Seneca Falls Conference - launched the suffrage movement.

March 11: President hosts White House event, thanks those members who have endorsed the Treaty, challenges others to come on board and to move the Treaty to ratification prior to July Conference.

Tactics: March - July:

3

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/20/98 6:14:30 PM
FROM Malley, Robert
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Talking Points On Law of the Sea for ABC Lunch [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Malley, Robert

CARBON_COPY
TEXT_BODY

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

From: Bell, Robert G.
Sent: Thursday,
February 05, 1998 6:37 PM
To: Helweg, M. Diana
Cc: @UP - APNSA
Special Assistants
Subject: FW: Talking Points On Law of the Sea
for ABC Lunch [UNCLASSIFIED]

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

From: Bouchard,
Joseph F.
Sent: Friday, January 30, 1998 4:58 PM
To: @NSA - Natl
Security Advisor
Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @EXECSEC - Executive
Secretary; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: Talking
Points On Law of the Sea for ABC Lunch [UNCLASSIFIED]

Summary

There are important national security, economic and environmental grounds for ratifying the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea; and an interagency consensus that the Administration should attempt to gain Senate advice and consent to ratification in 1998. Ratification of the Convention would be a significant Presidential legacy to national security and to the rule of law on the high seas. Secretary Cohen will seek agreement from you and Secretary Albright on a legislative strategy that emphasizes

national security grounds for ratifying the treaty and gives DoD the lead in the ratification effort. I recommend that you support that strategy with the qualification that efforts to gain Senate advice and consent to ratification in 1998 must not conflict with other urgent treaty ratification efforts.

Points to be Made

- * The

NSC supports the ratification effort being coordinated by the Sub-Group on Ocean Policy, but with the important qualification that efforts to gain Senate advice and consent to ratification in 1998 must not conflict with higher priority treaty ratification efforts, specifically, NATO enlargement, CTBT and the ABM agreements.

- * The NSC supports

the legislative strategy of focusing on the national security grounds for ratification and on correcting the lingering misperceptions on deep seabed mining.

Background

The UN Convention on the Law

of the Sea was signed in 1982. Need for the Convention arose from the breakdown of customary international law as more and more nations unilaterally declared ever larger territorial seas and other claims over ocean resources. Unfortunately, Part XI of the Convention on deep seabed mining contained provisions to which several industrialized nations, including the U.S., objected. In 1994 an Agreement on Implementation of PART XI was signed that eliminated the objectionable provisions on deep seabed mining. On October 7, 1994, President Clinton submitted the Convention and the Seabed Mining Agreement to the Senate for advise and consent to ratification. The SFRC held an initial round of hearings on the Convention and Agreement, but no action has been taken by the SFRC on them since 1994. PDD-36 set ratification of the Convention as the Administration's top ocean policy objective. Given that it was President Clinton who submitted the Convention to the Senate after it had languished for twelve years, it is entirely appropriate that ratification of the Convention be a legacy of his Presidency.

There are critically important national security, economic and environmental grounds for ratifying the treaty, and pressure is growing within and outside the U.S. government to ratify the Convention. DoD is leading the effort within the Administration due to the strategic importance of the Convention in ensuring freedom of navigation and limiting territorial waters claims. To illustrate, Oman recently challenged the right of U.S. Navy warships to transit the Strait of Hormuz under the provisions of international strait passage (which exempts warships from restrictions they otherwise

would have to observe in territorial waters) on the grounds that the U.S. has not ratified the Convention. Although that particular challenge is not a serious problem, DoD and the Navy believe that it illustrates the type of challenges U.S. forces will face increasingly often in the years ahead if we do not ratify the Convention.

There

are two specific arguments for ratifying the convention in 1998 rather than later: First, the United States will lose its provisional seat on the International Seabed Authority if it has not ratified the treaty by October 31. That would have serious long term negative consequences for U.S. competitiveness in the seabed mining industry. Second, 1998 is the UN Year of the Ocean and on January 28 the President proclaimed 1998 the Year of the Ocean. Ratifying the Convention would be by far the most significant action the U.S. could take to recognize the Year of the Oceans.

The Global Environmental Affairs

IWG's Sub-Group on Oceans (established by PDD-36) is coordinating ratification efforts. Efforts that have been taken this year to support ratification of the Convention include:

- * Since November

1997, DOD and Navy briefers (including CNO and key highly-regarded retired admirals) have briefed Helms' Chief of Staff (Bud Nance), the staffs of key Republican Senators (Lott, Stevens, Lugar, McCain, Warner) and Senate Democrats' staffs. All went very well. Nance told the retired Navy admirals who met with him that he is willing to support ratification of the convention, but does not think that he alone can persuade Senator Helms to move it forward.

- * On November

14, SECDEF signed a letter to Sen. Helms urging ratification on national security grounds.

- * Feedback from the DOD/Navy briefings indicated

there is a lot of confusion over the 1994 Agreement and whether or not we are satisfied that it corrected the deep seabed mining problems. In December 1997, a joint State/NOAA/Navy briefing team began a series of briefings to staffs of key Senators and Committees (Energy, Commerce, SASC) on national security and economic reasons for ratification, making the point that the deep seabed mining provisions were fixed by the 1994 agreement. That series of briefings is still in progress, focusing on the staffs of Republican Senators. Feedback has been very positive.

- * State and DOD prepared a legislative strategy that was approved by the Sub-Group on Oceans. It focuses attention on convincing Sen. Helms to support the Convention on national security grounds, giving DOD the lead in the ratification effort. Other departments and agencies play a supporting role, covering other key Senators and committees (the Commerce, Environment and Energy committees, in particular).

- * White House involvement in the ratification effort

is deliberately kept low key to avoid conflict with other urgent treaty ratification efforts and because it will be easier to sell Senator Helms on the Convention without a White House role initially. At the right moment in the next couple of months, a letter from Mr. Berger to Senator Helms endorsing Secretary Cohen's letter would be helpful.

* The draft legislative strategy sets June 1998 as the goal for gaining Senate advice and consent to ratification. This deadline is driven by (a) completing the effort before election campaigning reaches full swing, and (b) trying to achieve ratification prior to the U.S. National Day at the Expo in Lisbon on June 14 (the theme of the Expo is the UN Year of the Ocean and U.S. ocean efforts will be the theme of the U.S. National Day program).

Joe Bouchard

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/24/98 6:57:08 PM

FROM Kerrick, Donald L.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT RE: SRB Decision--SYG Annan Trip to DC [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Hawley, Leonard R.
Malley, Robert
Rice, Edward A.
Bartlett, L. June
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.
Poole, Jennifer C.
Rice, Edward A.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.
Dejban, Donna D.
Elkon, Nicole L.
Hurwitz, Marc I.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

CARBON_COPY Baldwin, Kenneth
Benjamin, Daniel
Bobbitt, Philip C.
Clarke, Richard A.
Dollar, Carolyn J.
Fung, Mark T.
Gordon-Hagerty, Lisa E.

Hawley, Leonard R.
Klein, Brian P.
McCarthy, Mary O.
Metzl, Jamie F.
Mulligan, George D.
Rosa, Frederick M.
Roundtree, Beverly
Schwartz, Eric P.
Simon, Steven N.
Wechsler, William F.
Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Rudman, Mara E.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.
Busby, Scott W.
Letts, Kelly J.
Malley, Robert
Ragan, Richard F.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Crowley, Philip J.
Dehqanzada, Yahya A.
Luzzatto, Anne R.
Rubin, Eric S.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Babcock, Douglas W.
Bolan, Christopher J.
Boulton, Darrien D.
Davidson, Leslie K.
Elkind, Jonathan H.
Evans, Peter O.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Hamel, Michael A.
Harding, Bruce D.
Hilty, Joanne M.
Jordan, Donald L.
Norris, John J.
Orfini, Michael H.
Roberts, Michael W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Woolston, Ann E.

Amiri, Rukhsana N.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Countryman, Thomas M.
Deutsch, Robert S.
Greer, Jason H.
Grummon, Stephen R.
Marty, Joseph H.
Riedel, Bruce O.
Ryu, Rexon Y.
Todd, Gwenyth E.

TEXT_BODY

Len;

Couple of things.. First we have a WH scheduling meeting tomorrow and will need to address it there... A SP tonight would be very helpful.. Or, secondly, redo the SP on the heroes event and expand it to include a meeting.

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

From: Hawley,
Leonard R.

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 1998 6:48 PM

To: Malley,

Robert; Rice, Edward A.; Steinberg, James; @KERRICK; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor

Cc: @GLOBAL - Global Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters; @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs;

@PRESS - Public Affairs; @VP - VP Natl Security Affairs; @NESASIA - NE/South Asia

Subject: SRB Decision--SYG Annan Trip to DC [UNCLASSIFIED]

Rob-Request

you seek Sandy Berger's approval of the SYG Kofi Annan visit tonight:

Sandy-

* The

purpose of this note is to get your decision regarding SYG Annan's planned three-day visit to Washington next week, March 2-4.

* Background:

SYG Kofi Annan had planned to visit Washington for several months now. We have delayed gaining your final approval pending a favorable outcome to his negotiations in Baghdad. The UN has confirmed Annan's willingness to come to Washington next week. Now, State recommends that Annan's visit proceed as planned.

* The aim of Annan's visit

is to press the Hill for passage of UN arrears legislation and to

meet with senior USG officials concerning UN reform and related matters. The planned schedule includes a full set of meetings with White House, State, and Defense officials, Congressional leaders, Press, Editorial Boards of the Post and the Times, a CFR luncheon, and a small White House event.

* In a phone call with the President this afternoon, SYG Annan indicated he would be in Washington next week and asked for a 1:1 private meeting with the President, aside from any media event. President Clinton said: "That's fine. Call Sandy Berger and ask him to find time for us to meet on Monday." The SYG's office called me to communicate this conversation to you and ask that this meeting be included in the schedule. We will take appropriate action.

* Sandy, we ask you to decide three issues relatively quickly:

1) Should SYG Annan's trip go forward as planned? USUN, State, NSC-NESA and Global support Annan's visit next week. Here is a tentative itinerary:

Monday March 2, 1998
AM Arrive
National Airport
Press Event-Visit DC High School
WH Event-"UN
Heroes Day" / SYG meeting with the President
PM Lunch at White
House w/ Sandy Berger
SecDef Cohen (T)
Washington Post Editorial
Board
Washington Times Editorial Board
EV Dinner w/ SecState
Albright

Tuesday March 3, 1998
AM Senator Stevens
Senator
Grams
Congressman Gilman
Senator Biden
PM Lunch w/ Hill Leaders

Senator Helms
Foreign Relations Cmte
House Leadership
EV Dinner
hosted by Canadians

Wednesday March 4, 1998
 AM Congressional
 "Blue Dogs"
 Congressional Human Rights Caucus
 Democratic Caucus
 "Wednesday
 Group"
 PM Lunch w/ Council on Foreign Relations
 SecState Albright
 U/S
 Pickering and State A/S
 Press Conference-National Press Club
 Democratic
 House Leadership

Recommendation: That you approve moving
 ahead with SYG Kofi Annan's visit.

Approve _____
 Disapprove _____

2) Would you like to host SYG Annan
 for lunch on Monday? We have scheduled a possible lunch with you
 and the Secretary-General at noon on Monday after his POTUS meeting.
 This would be an opportunity for you to discuss your views on Hill
 acceptance of UN arrears legislation and other matters.

Recommendation:
 That you have lunch with SYG Annan on Monday, March 2nd.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

3) Do you approve of
 the POTUS Event "UN Heroes Day"? You currently have a scheduling
 proposal for a POTUS Event in the Roosevelt Room called "UN Heroes
 Day". Tony Blinken's view is to "put a human face on the UN." In
 the event, Annan and the President would recognize an American peacekeeper,
 a civilian police monitor, a UNICEF child, widows of CIVPOL who died
 in Bosnia helo crash, an UNSCOM employee, an Ebola doctor, and a
 demining expert. In this small group, the President can kick off
 Annan's visit and make comments for U.S. engagement with the UN.

If you choose not to do the "UN Heroes Day" event, we will adjust Annan's schedule to start Monday's activities with a visit with the President followed by lunch with you.

Recommendation:

That you approve the scheduling proposal for "UN Heroes Day".

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

* Based on your decisions, Global will provide you with further information on the visit.

Len Hawley

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/26/98 12:32:12 PM
FROM Epstein, Gerald L.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT President's letter to Sen. Helms on CTBT [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreasen, Steven P.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Steve - has the President sent a reply yet to Senator Helm's letter on the CTBT ratification schedule? If so, has the text been publicly released? I have a request for the President's reply from an NGO working for CTBT ratification (the American Physical Society).

Also,
do we have anything available for release from the lab directors supporting CTBT, other than the blast fax that quotes their support?

Jerry

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/26/98 6:44:41 PM
FROM Schwartz, Eric P.
CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(d)
DATECLASSIFIEDON 02/26/1998
DECLASSIFYON 02/26/2008
SUBJECT cedaw ~~[CONFIDENTIAL]~~
TO Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Rudman, Mara E.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 5/16/2017
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By 12 NARA, Date 2/7/2019
2006-1363-7 (3)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY CONCURRENCE PLEASE. MUST GO FORWARD PRIOR TO MY
MEETING WITH COS
FOR FLOTUS TOMORROW AM.

INCLUDED POINTS DISCUSSED WITH MARA.

ERIC

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

cedaw1.doc

February 26, 1997

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

FROM: ERIC SCHWARTZ

SUBJECT: International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)

Background: Adopted in 1979 and signed by the United States in 1980, CEDAW sets out basic standards of non-discrimination and equal rights for women. It would have no domestic legal effect, but would have a powerful impact on our effort to encourage better treatment of women around the world. We have included it as a top priority in our Treaty Priority List, and the President and First Lady have made public appeals to the Senate to consider the Treaty. CEDAW was approved by the SFRC in 1994, but did not receive Senate consent.

The First Lady is eager to make a commitment to CEDAW a cornerstone of a March 11 International Women's Day event which is now on the President's schedule.

Public Support for the Treaty: A wide coalition of national organizations has endorsed CEDAW, from AARP to B'nai Brith to the League of Women Voters. At the present time, we are unaware of substantial opposition to CEDAW.

Congress: Some 53 Senators have indicated support for the Treaty, though several (3-5) are less than solid. Six Senators have come out against CEDAW, with another five listed as "leaning against." The remaining 36 are undecided.

A critical factor, of course, is the attitude of Senator Helms. He voted against the Treaty when it was considered in Committee in 1994, and Mara points out that we are already pushing uphill with him on CTBT. Moreover, in a conversation with you and Madeleine, Sen. Helms criticized advocacy groups working on family

planning issues, which he may link with CEDAW. On the other hand, there are some indications the Senator is less than adamantly opposed to CEDAW. He did not mount a vigorous opposition to the Treaty in 1994, and his correspondence with constituents on CEDAW simply restates his opposition and notes that "treaties must be considered very carefully." Finally, while a letter he sent to Madeleine on our treaty priorities expressed strong opposition to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, it did not express opposition to CEDAW.

NGO Strategy for Ratification: CEDAW is the first human rights treaty pending before the SFRC linked to an important constituency - and where opposition to the treaty may come at political costs to opponents. Thus, NGOs are increasingly prepared to paint those who are reluctant to support the Treaty as unresponsive on women's rights issues, and have been engaged in constituency efforts to urge Senators to endorse CEDAW prior to International Women's Day on March 8.

Administration Strategy for Ratification: We recommend an Administration strategy that involves both quiet and public efforts.

The Public Side: There are three important dates to consider: March 8, International Women's Day; mid-July, when the First Lady and/or the Secretary of State are expected at the Sesquicentennial Celebration of the first American Women's Conference at Seneca Falls (which launched the suffrage movement); and the September - November end of congressional session.

Lead-up to March 8: The President and other senior Administration officials encourage members of Congress to express their support for CEDAW by March 8.

March 8 (White House event March 11): Senior Administration officials make statements of support for CEDAW, urge those Senators who have not yet committed

to endorse the Treaty to do so. President makes statement encouraging the Senate to act on this Treaty by the time of the Seneca Falls Convention.

July: If Treaty has not been acted upon, senior Administration officials use the Seneca Falls event to criticize lack of Senate action, and to urge Senate to move in the period prior to the end of the session.

The Private Side: In the lead-up to March 8, senior Administration officials speak to the Congressional leadership, emphasizing our desire to avoid making this a partisan issue, but indicating our determination to work hard for ratification.

Activities up to and including March 8-11: The attached timeline would take us through March 11, International Women's Day, at which point we would reassess and plan activities leading toward the Spring-Summer.

End of February: Secretary Albright calls Senator Helms, expresses Administration's strong desire to move on this Treaty and desire to avoid a confrontation. Stresses that she understands his discomfort with the Treaty, but asks that he permit it at least to be considered prior to the Seneca Falls

Conference. Emphasizes that this could be done quickly, with or without hearings. Chief of Staff or APNSA makes similar call to Majority Leader Lott, with the same request, asks that Senator Lott speak to Senator Helms about moving the Treaty. Other senior Administration officials make calls as appropriate.

End of February - March 8: State briefings of uncommitted Senate offices, emphasizing Administration effort to obtain commitment prior to March 8.

March 3-4: Letter from the President to all Members of the Senate, requesting commitments of support by March 8, as well as commitment to move Treaty by the Seneca Falls Conference - launched the suffrage movement.

March 11: President hosts White House event, thanks those members who have endorsed the Treaty, encourages others to come on board and to move the Treaty to ratification prior to July Conference.

Concurrence by: Mara Rudman, Tony Blinken

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve the strategy described above; that you raise this issue with the Chief of Staff; and that, before the March 11 event, you hold a meeting on this issue that includes the Offices of the First Lady, the Chief of Staff and Legislative Affairs.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/26/98 7:51:43 PM

FROM Klein, Brian P.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT TP's on Helms from State [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Crowley, Philip J.

CARBON_COPY Hawley, Leonard R.

TEXT_BODY Re: Helms Letter to Lott on UN Arrears

* The Administration worked closely last year with Senators Helms and Biden, and many other member of the House and Senate, to put together a UN arrears/reform package. We greatly appreciate the time and energy put into crafting the agreement by Senator Helms and his staff, as well as the broad, bi-partisan support the agreement enjoys.

* Unfortunately, a small group of House members blocked final passage of the UN arrears/reform package last November. The U.S. has paid a price for the failure to get UN arrears signed into law. We lost an opportunity last December to lower the U.S. assessment rate at the UN, American credibility was tarnished, and our ability to positively influence UN budgetary and reform matters was reduced.

* In light of these negative ramifications of Congress' failure to act last November, the Administration has proposed some modifications to last year's UN arrears/reform package. These changes are designed to ensure that whatever reforms are contained in the package are achievable in New York.

* The Administration continues to stick by the vast majority of provisions in the UN arrears/reform package.

* We look forward to working with Senator Helms and other members of the House and Senate to deal with these difficult issues.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/2/98 4:25:31 PM
FROM Bouchard, Joseph F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Talking Points On Law of the Sea for ABC Lunch [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Allen, Charles A.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Chuck, This is the background and talking points on UNCLOS ratification that SRB used for today's ABC.

Joe Bouchard

-----Original

Message-----

From: Bouchard, Joseph F.

Sent: Friday, January 30,
1998 4:58 PM

To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor

Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense

Policy; @EXECSEC - Executive Secretary; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;

@LEGISLAT

- Legislative Affairs

Subject: Talking Points On Law of the Sea
for ABC Lunch [UNCLASSIFIED]

Summary

There are important national security, economic and environmental grounds for ratifying the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea; and an interagency consensus that the Administration should attempt to gain Senate advice and consent to ratification in 1998. Ratification of the Convention would be a significant Presidential legacy to national security and to the rule of law on the high seas. Secretary Cohen will seek agreement from you and Secretary Albright on a legislative strategy that emphasizes national security grounds for ratifying the treaty and gives DoD the lead in the ratification effort. I recommend that you support that strategy with the qualification that efforts to gain Senate advice and consent to ratification in 1998 must not conflict with other urgent treaty ratification efforts.

Points to be Made

* The

NSC supports the ratification effort being coordinated by the Sub-Group on Ocean Policy, but with the important qualification that efforts to gain Senate advice and consent to ratification in 1998 must not conflict with higher priority treaty ratification efforts, specifically, NATO enlargement, CTBT and the ABM agreements.

* The NSC supports

the legislative strategy of focusing on the national security grounds for ratification and on correcting the lingering misperceptions on deep seabed mining.

Background

The UN Convention on the Law

of the Sea was signed in 1982. Need for the Convention arose from the breakdown of customary international law as more and more nations unilaterally declared ever larger territorial seas and other claims over ocean resources. Unfortunately, Part XI of the Convention on deep seabed mining contained provisions to which several industrialized nations, including the U.S., objected. In 1994 an Agreement on Implementation of PART XI was signed that eliminated the objectionable provisions on deep seabed mining. On October 7, 1994, President Clinton submitted the Convention and the Seabed Mining Agreement to the Senate for advise and consent to ratification. The SFRC held an initial round of hearings on the Convention and Agreement, but no action has been taken by the SFRC on them since 1994. PDD-36 set ratification of the Convention as the Administration's top ocean policy objective. Given that it was President Clinton who submitted the Convention to the Senate after it had languished for twelve years, it is entirely appropriate that ratification of the Convention be a legacy of his Presidency.

There are critically important national security, economic and environmental grounds for ratifying the treaty, and pressure is growing within and outside the U.S. government to ratify the Convention. DoD is leading the effort within the Administration due to the strategic importance of the Convention in ensuring freedom of navigation and limiting territorial waters claims. To illustrate, Oman recently challenged the right of U.S. Navy warships to transit the Strait of Hormuz under the provisions of international strait passage (which exempts warships from restrictions they otherwise would have to observe in territorial waters) on the grounds that the U.S. has not ratified the Convention. Although that particular challenge is not a serious problem, DoD and the Navy believe that it illustrates the type of challenges U.S. forces will face increasingly often in the years ahead if we do not ratify the Convention.

There

are two specific arguments for ratifying the convention in 1998 rather than later: First, the United States will lose its provisional seat on the International Seabed Authority if it has not ratified the treaty by October 31. That would have serious long term negative consequences for U.S. competitiveness in the seabed mining industry. Second, 1998 is the UN Year of the Ocean and on January 28 the President proclaimed 1998 the Year of the Ocean. Ratifying the Convention would be by far the most significant action the U.S. could take to recognize the Year of the Oceans.

The Global Environmental Affairs

IWG's Sub-Group on Oceans (established by PDD-36) is coordinating ratification efforts. Recent efforts that have been taken to support ratification of the Convention include:

- * Since November 1997, DOD

and Navy briefers (including CNO and key highly-regarded retired admirals) have briefed Helms' Chief of Staff (Bud Nance), the staffs of key Republican Senators (Lott, Stevens, Lugar, McCain, Warner) and Senate Democrats' staffs. All went very well. Nance told the retired Navy admirals who met with him that he is willing to support ratification of the convention, but does not think that he alone can persuade Senator Helms to move it forward.

- * On November 14,

SECDEF signed a letter to Sen. Helms urging ratification on national security grounds.

- * Feedback from the DOD/Navy briefings indicated

there is a lot of confusion over the 1994 Agreement and whether or not we are satisfied that it corrected the deep seabed mining problems. In December 1997, a joint State/NOAA/Navy briefing team began a series of briefings to staffs of key Senators and Committees (Energy, Commerce, SASC) on national security and economic reasons for ratification, making the point that the deep seabed mining provisions were fixed by the 1994 agreement. That series of briefings is still in progress, focusing on the staffs of Republican Senators. Feedback has been very positive.

- * State and DOD prepared a legislative strategy that

was approved by the Sub-Group on Oceans. It focuses attention on convincing Sen. Helms to support the Convention on national security grounds, giving DOD the lead in the ratification effort. Other departments and agencies play a supporting role, covering other key Senators and committees (the Commerce, Environment and Energy committees, in particular).

- * White House involvement in the ratification effort

is deliberately kept low key to avoid conflict with other urgent treaty ratification efforts and because it will be easier to sell Senator Helms on the Convention without a White House role initially. At the right moment in the next couple of months, a letter from Mr. Berger to Senator Helms endorsing Secretary Cohen's letter would be helpful.

- * The draft legislative strategy sets June 1998 as the

goal for gaining Senate advice and consent to ratification. This deadline is driven by (a) completing the effort before election campaigning reaches full swing, and (b) trying to achieve ratification prior to the U.S. National Day at the Expo in Lisbon on June 14 (the theme of the Expo is the UN Year of the Ocean and U.S. ocean efforts will be the theme of the U.S. National Day program).

Joe Bouchard

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Gerald Epstein to Bruce MacDonald and Gerald Kiernan. Subject: Gottemoeller-Kislyak Meeting in Moscow. (15 pages)	03/03/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1998-03/10/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5652

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 3/4/98 8:39:07 PM

FROM Naplan, Steven J.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT DRAFT POTUS reply to Helms letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Busby, Scott W.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Letts, Kelly J.
Malley, Robert
Naplan, Steven J.
Ragan, Richard F.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Schwartz, Eric P.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY DRAFT POTUS reply to Helms letter advocating aggressive U.S.
sponsorship
of a China resolution at Geneva.

Guys, I'd like an internal chop
on this thing before I put a package together for @Asia and @Leg
concurrences. Thanks.

SN

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT DRAFT Helms letter.doc

DRAFT 3/4/98 8:30p

Dear Senator Helms:

Thank you for your letter of January 12 favoring United States

support for a
human rights resolution on China at this year's meeting of the United
Nations
Commission on Human Rights in Geneva.

Your unyielding leadership for the promotion of human rights the
world over, and
in China specifically, has brought honor to the American people and
strength to
those Chinese citizens who look to our great nation as a leading light
for
democracy and freedom.

I know that you share my longstanding conviction that vigorous
support for human
rights must continue to be a key element of our relationship with the
People's
Republic China. Indeed, human rights was a focal point of the
discussions held
during our recent Washington summit with the Chinese, both in
formal diplomatic
exchanges and repeatedly in my private conversations with President
Jiang.

While we have seen positive steps by China over the past year,
including their
signing of the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, as
well as the
release of Wei Jingsheng, more needs to be done. Our views on this
are very well
known to the Chinese and we will reassert the same in our
consultations on a
resolution with the other members of the Human Rights Commission.

Any and all efforts we make on a resolution will be informed entirely
by concrete
Chinese actions taken in advance of the Geneva conference. I have
directed my
staff to keep you and your colleagues abreast of the status of these
consultations at Geneva.

Sincerely,

[Name/Title in Initial Caps]
[Title/Senate/House in Initial Caps]
[Organization/Position - Initial Caps]
[Address - Initial Caps]

1

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/9/98 2:30:34 PM
FROM Kristoff, Sandra J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Bonior and Wellstone calls to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Gagnon, James M.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

jim---note the jackson vanik point. looks like maybe it will go down to the hill tonight. sjk

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

From: Rudman,
Mara E.

Sent: Monday, March 09, 1998 1:55 PM

To: Storey, Sharon

V.; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor; @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs;

@ASIA - Asian Affairs; @BOSNIA - Bosnian Affairs

Cc: @LEGISLAT -

Legislative Affairs

Subject: Bonior and Wellstone calls to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Sharon
et al.--

1. Wellstone. As your message indicated, he is calling to ask why we are not supporting his resolution on China and UNHCR resolution. I think Jeff probably needs to draft points for the return call.

2. Bonior. Calling to discuss Brzcko (sp?) agreement. Met with Ganic on Thursday last week. Ganic concerned that decision due from arbitration panel by March 16 will go toward giving RS control of Brzcko. Bonior wants to make pitch for what other arrangements might be possible. (Jock thinks Ganic had a particular pitch in mind.) Jock/Nick need to draft points for return call.

3. Kerry.
Not sure why he's calling. Could be Jackson-vanik waiver for Vietnam (awaiting signature from President; Kerry may be concerned that package needs to be out and down to the Hill before Sen. Helms hearing tomorrow ... I have repeatedly transmitted that concern to ExecSec since Wed

of last week.); Could be Iraq policy generally; Could also be NATO-E. If it is the latter, the points prepared for Sandy to talk with Kerry pre-SFRC mark up still work. Kerry voted for NATO-E in Committee, but raised reservations indicating he might want to support the Warner pause amendment. I would say no additional points needed at this time to return call.

4. Bryan. No one on his staff has ANY IDEA why he is calling. (We really went through everyone.)

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. email	Mara Rudman to Sharon Storey, Robert Malley, Glyn Davies et al. Subject: Wellstone call to SRB. (3 pages)	03/09/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1998-03/10/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5652

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 3/9/98 5:42:53 PM
FROM Covey, James P.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Bonior and Wellstone calls to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

Alpha Centauri is our closest inter-galactic neighbor, five or 10 light years away. Pretty remote, but not as remote as the chances of the American Arbitrator (Roberts Owen) awarding Brcko to the Serbs.

to recap, there are really four theoretical outcomes to the arbitration:

Award to Republica Srpska: no way
Award to Federation:
Some (e.g. Holbrooke) favor this, but it is not going to happen
Create
a Special District, jointly governed by RS and Federation: Serious people can differ on the feasibility and it might happen some day, but not this year.
Defer final award for another year: the most likely outcome.

Jock

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

From: Rudman,
Mara E.
Sent: Monday, March 09, 1998 5:33 PM
To: Covey, James
P.
Subject: RE: Bonior and Wellstone calls to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]

alpha
centauri? OK, yet another reminder of just how ignorant I am on a wide variety of issues. Feel free to explain what that means when you have a chance. (Try to pick a moment when I don't seem completely overwhelmed and perplexed by all the issues on which I really don't know enough. That may not leave you with many openings, I realize.)

-----Original

Message-----

From: Covey, James P.

Sent: Monday, March 09, 1998

5:02 PM

To: Dowling, John N. (Nick)

Cc: Rudman, Mara E.

Subject: FW:

Bonior and Wellstone calls to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Nick:

Could

you take a quick first cut at points for SRB to use with Bonior (e: Ganic's pitch on Brcko). Would be pretty easy to deal with if Ganic really said his fear was that Brcko would be given to the RS.

For

Sandy's background, we can say that Robts Owen is now clearly inclined to defer a final award, and to continue the current arrangement for another year. While Sandy should try to avoid prejudging the outcome of the arbitration process, he should be able to assure Bonior that the possibility of Brcko being awarded to the RS is about as remote as Alpha Centauri.

Jock

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

From: Rudman,

Mara E.

Sent: Monday, March 09, 1998 1:55 PM

To: Storey, Sharon

V.; @NSA - Natl Security Advisor; @DEMOCRACY - Dem/Human Affairs;

@ASIA - Asian Affairs; @BOSNIA - Bosnian Affairs

Cc: @LEGISLAT -

Legislative Affairs

Subject: Bonior and Wellstone calls to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Sharon

et al.--

1. Wellstone. As your message indicated, he is calling to ask why we are not supporting his resolution on China and UNHCR resolution. I think Jeff probably needs to draft points for the return call.

2. Bonior. Calling to discuss Brzcko (sp?) agreement. Met with Ganic on Thursday last week. Ganic concerned that decision

due from arbitration panel by March 16 will go toward giving RS control of Brzcko. Bonior wants to make pitch for what other arrangements might be possible. (Jock thinks Ganic had a particular pitch in mind.) Jock/Nick need to draft points for return call.

3. Kerry.

Not sure why he's calling. Could be Jackson-vanik waiver for Vietnam (awaiting signature from President; Kerry may be concerned that package needs to be out and down to the Hill before Sen. Helms hearing tomorrow ... I have repeatedly transmitted that concern to ExecSec since Wed of last week.); Could be Iraq policy generally; Could also be NATO-E. If it is the latter, the points prepared for Sandy to talk with Kerry pre-SFRC mark up still work. Kerry voted for NATO-E in Committee, but raised reservations indicating he might want to support the Warner pause amendment. I would say no additional points needed at this time to return call.

4. Bryan. No one on his staff has ANY IDEA why he is calling. (We really went through everyone.)

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/10/98 1:07:46 PM
FROM Naplan, Steven J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT China UNHRC language [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bader, Jeffrey A.
Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY Busby, Scott W.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Letts, Kelly J.
Malley, Robert
Naplan, Steven J.
Ragan, Richard F.
Rossi, Christopher R.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Albert, Ronda A.
Bader, Jeffrey A.
Gagnon, James M.
Kristoff, Sandra J.
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Rudman, Mara E.

TEXT_BODY

seeking @Asia and @Leg clearance on the attached China UNHRC language.

The
policy language (inclusive of @Asia's and @Leg's eventual edits)
in the Helms attachment (below) will be also used in POTUS replies
to the following individuals:

Sens Helms, Thomas, Feingold, Robb,
Wellstone, Mack and Brownback

Reps Gephardt, Bonior, Pelosi

Bill
Schultz of Amnesty Intl., Gay McDougall of the Intl HR Law Group,
Felice Gaer of Blaustein Inst, Jack Rendler of Minnesota Advocates

for HR, James Silk of RFK Ctr for HR, Ken Roth of HRW, Catherine Fitzpatrick of Intl League for HR, Michael Posner of Lawyers Cmtee for HR, Leonard Rubenstein of Physicians for HR

seeking edits
by COB today. Thanks.

SN

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Helms letter.doc
Dear Senator Helms:

Thank you for your letter of January 12 regarding a China resolution at this year's meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva.

I share your view that vigorous support for human rights must continue to be a key element of our relationship with the People's Republic China. Indeed, human rights were a focal point of my discussions with President Jiang during the Washington Summit in October, both in formal exchanges and private conversations. And while we have been encouraged by some positive steps by China over the past year, including the signing of the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights and the release of Wei Jingsheng, much more needs to be done.

As you know, we have sought to use the Geneva process as a means to encourage further progress on human rights. In this respect, we have indicated to the Chinese that our decision on sponsorship of a resolution will be determined by Chinese actions prior to the consideration of country-specific items in Geneva.

I have directed my staff to stay in contact with your office as this issue evolves.

[Name/Title in Initial Caps]
[Title/Senate/House in Initial Caps]

[Organization/Position - Initial Caps]
[Address - Initial Caps]

1

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/10/98 1:51:41 PM
FROM Ryu, Rexon Y.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: For Clearance: Two POTUS replies to Congressional letters on Iraq [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Farrar, Jay C.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Jay could you re-send the email and attach the files? Many thanks...you have time in your busy schedule over there to grab lunch some time?

-----Original
Message-----
From: Farrar, Jay C.
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 1998
1:49 PM
To: Ryu, Rexon Y.
Subject: RE: For Clearance: Two POTUS
replies to Congressional letters on Iraq [UNCLASSIFIED]

Rexon,

Minor
changes - otherwise, fine effort - concur.

-----Original Message-----
From: Ryu,
Rexon Y.
Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 1998 9:26 AM
To: Rudman,
Mara E.
Cc: @NESASIA - NE/South Asia; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: For
Clearance: Two POTUS replies to Congressional letters on Iraq
[UNCLASSIFIED]

988
- Letter Rep. Dellums
986 - Letter to Senator Helms

Both on Iraq.

<< File: 0986bc.doc >> << File: 0986ltr.doc >> << File: 0988bc.doc
>> << File: 0988ltr.doc >>