

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	James Baker to John Dowling. Subject: RE: Helms Request for the "Christmas Warning." (6 pages)	09/17/1998	P1/b(1)
002. email	Mona Sutphen to Donald Bandler, Susan Braden, Keirn Brown et al. Subject: RE: Helms Request for the "Christmas Warning." (4 pages)	09/18/1998	P1/b(1)
003. email	Gregory Schulte to John Dowling. Subject: RE: Helms Request for the "Christmas Warning." (4 pages)	09/25/1998	P1/b(1)
004. email	Fulton Armstrong to Theodore Piccone and Gerard Gallucci. Subject: Visa Denial Proposal. (3 pages)	09/24/1998	P1/b(1)
005. email	Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley to Fulton Armstrong. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (3 pages)	09/28/1998	P1/b(1)
006. email	Erica Barks-Ruggles to Gayle Smith, Pat Battenfield, Dorothy Shea et al. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (3 pages)	09/28/1998	P1/b(1)
007. email	Robin Sanders to Gayle Smith, Pat Battenfield, Dorothy Shea et al. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (3 pages)	09/28/1998	P1/b(1)
008. email	Carlos Pascual to Fulton Armstrong. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (4 pages)	10/09/1998	P1/b(1)
009. email	Fulton Armstrong to Carlos Pascual. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (4 pages)	10/12/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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	James Baker to John Dowling. Subject: RE: Helms Request for the "Christmas Warning." (6 pages)	09/17/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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 9/18/98 12:39:42 PM
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT September 18 Berger Press Briefing on UNGA/NYU/Bilaterals [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J.
Leavy, David C.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
@SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Press Briefing
September 18 Berger Press Briefing on UNGA/NYU/Bilaterals

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

srb0918 unga press briefing.doc
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release September 18, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING BY

NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR SANDY BERGER

The Briefing Room

9:59 A.M. EDT

COLONEL CROWLEY: Good morning. A very impressive turnout for a relatively early hour for the White House press corps.

Q Some of them perhaps.

COLONEL CROWLEY: Perhaps most of you just got off the press plane early this morning and came to straight to the office --very commendable of you.

The President on Sunday travels to New York for a speech on Monday to open the U.N. General Assembly.

Q What time?

COLONEL CROWLEY: Patience, Helen. He will also have the opportunity to have some bilateral meetings that really go to the heart of our U.S. national interests around the world: stabilizing the economic situation around the world, advancing the cause of nonproliferation, preventing regional conflict.

Here to give you a preview of the President's activity on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, will be the National Security Advisor Sandy Berger.

Q The speech is Monday, on Rosh Hashanah, is it?

MR. BERGER: That's a good question, Sam.

Q Well, seriously.

MR. BERGER: We did not set the schedule.

First of all, I want to totally disassociate myself from that gratuitous attack on the press by Colonel Crowley. (Laughter.) He's on his own. I've always seen you here early. I stand behind my people.

If it's September, it must be UNGA, and I'd like to spend a few moments with you this morning talking about the President's visit to New York for the 53rd U.N. General Assembly, which begins on Monday, which is Rosh Hashanah -- a decision the U.N. made, not us.

Let me take a few moments to highlight the President's schedule, his objectives, including his speech on Monday, his bilateral meetings with Italian Prime Minister Prodi, Pakistani Prime Minister Sharif, Japanese Prime Minister Obuchi. And I also want to briefly mention the NYU conference the President will attend on Monday afternoon, and then take your questions.

We leave for New York on Sunday afternoon. The President will meet with Prime Minister Prodi sometime late in the afternoon, early in the evening Sunday in New York. I expect the discussion with the Prime Minister will be fairly far ranging but will focus especially on the problems in Kosovo and in Albania, where the Italians obviously are critical partners to us in seeking to restore some peace and stability.

I also expect that they will be talking more broadly about the economic situation and the situation in Russia and the President's impressions following his visit and following the selection of Prime Minister Primakov.

On Monday the President begins his day with a call on Secretary General Annan and General Assembly President Opertti, who is the foreign minister of Uruguay. It's a rotating position each year. We will focus in that meeting, I think, especially on Iraq, on Kosovo. I'm sure there will be some discussion in that meeting of U.N. reform and other related issues.

Then the President will address the U.N. General Assembly. As usual, the President of the United States is the first speaker to the General Assembly, after the President of the UNGA. This is the ninth time the President will have addressed the United Nations -- sixth in terms of the annual meetings, but also

in special sessions that they have held on drugs, environment, and on the occasion of the U.N.'s 50th anniversary.

And the President will talk about terrorism and the common obligations of the international community to fight it. In recent months, as you know, for example at the Naval Academy, and in recent weeks in the wake of the bombings of our embassies in Africa and our strikes in Sudan and in Afghanistan, the President has spoken about this issue quite frequently. But he has done so often, particularly, for example, in the Naval Academy speech, in programmatic terms: here's what the international community must do together to fight terrorism. We have to have better money-laundering legislation. We have to have better cooperative mechanisms.

I expect in this speech for him to address the question more broadly and speak to the international community about why the fight against terrorism has become one that has to be at or near the top of our world agenda. He will point out that with the spread of information technology and the potential spread of weapons of mass destruction, the technology of terror has become more lethal and more available, and therefore there is a greater degree of common responsibility to deal with this issue together.

He wants to make it clear to the international community that the fight against terrorism is not a clash of civilizations or cultures. The dividing line is between those who practice, support, and tolerate terror, and those who understand that terrorism is plain and simple murder. And he wants to press his case that the only way to succeed in the combat against terrorism is working together and understanding our common obligations to deal with this increasingly serious problem.

Following the speech, the President will meet with Prime Minister Sharif of Pakistan. As you know, we've had a close relationship with Pakistan for many years and we hope to work with Pakistan in the years to come. That has obviously been complicated, as is the case with India, by their nuclear tests.

Since that time, there have been ongoing discussions between the Indians and the United States, between the Pakistanis and the United States, on measures and steps that the two governments could take that would move them more firmly back

into the nonproliferation regime. These relate to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. They relate to how they develop and deploy their missiles. They relate to moratoriums on fissile material and direct dialogue on some of the fundamental issues that divide them, particularly Kashmir. And the President will be talking to Prime Minister Sharif on each of these and hope that we can get -- encourage him to take some steps in this direction, as we have with the Indians.

Following the meeting with Prime Minister Sharif, there will be a luncheon hosted by Secretary General Annan, a traditional lunch for all of the heads of delegation, that will take place there. Obviously there will be some discussion of our financial relationship with the U.N. We are in the paradoxical position of being the world's largest contributor to the U.N. as well as the world's largest debtor to the U.N. And we are continuing to work with Congress to deal particularly with the latter of those two problems.

Finally, late in the afternoon of Monday, the President will join a number of leaders, the First Lady as well, at a conference sponsored by NYU on strengthening democracy in the global economy. This will be an all-day conference; the President will join it in the afternoon. I think the First Lady will attend it throughout the day.

The President's participation will include a roundtable discussion with Prime Minister Blair of Great Britain, Prime Minister Prodi, President Stoyanov of Bulgaria, and Prime Minister Persson of Sweden. And this should be a fairly free-flowing conversation among the leaders about their practical experience in devising new methods of governance to deal with promoting democracy, civil society, in the global economy.

Q The President of Bulgaria, did say?

MR. BERGER: Stoyanov, S-t-o-y-a-n-o-v. He can spell your name, though. On Tuesday the President will have a bilateral meeting with Prime Minister Obuchi. This will be the first meeting between the new prime minister of Japan and the President. It will take place the Rockefeller estate at Tarrytown, so it will get away from the hurly-burly of New York. This is, I think, an important meeting.

First, the President and the Prime Minister, I believe, will want to reaffirm the extreme importance of our relationship and of our security relationship. This remains our most important relationship in Asia, and a partnership that is the foundation of stability in the Asian Pacific region. And with all of the economic and other turmoil in the region, I think it is especially important to make clear that that security relationship rests on a rock-solid foundation.

Now, at the same time, the President will obviously want to discuss, and I'm sure the Prime Minister will want to discuss, the international economic situation, the financial decisions and policies of the government of Japan, and our sense of urgency that it is important that Japan move forward to stimulate its economy through fiscal policies, that it deal with its banking crisis -- I take it that in the last 24 hours there has been some movement in the Diet on that -- and that it deal with -- continue to deal with deregulation and market access. Because the fact that this is an economy that has been in recession for almost seven years and now is heading into a period of negative growth is a tremendous drag on the overall Asian financial situation and we really cannot, I think in our judgment, see a reversal of the general Asian financial prospects without a significant upturn in Japan.

We obviously have a lot of other issues to talk about with Japan, particularly involving Korea, maintaining the agreed framework that freezes their program to produce nuclear material, at the same time dealing with our upcoming talks with the Koreans on their missile program. The launch of the Taepo Dong missile over Japan on August 31 obviously has been troubling both to us and to the Japanese.

And sometime in mid-afternoon on Tuesday, we shall return.

Q Obuchi has, apparently under some pressure, agreed to some limited form of banking reform. In the judgment of the U.S. government, is this enough? What do you think of the measures?

MR. BERGER: I have not seen, Sam, the specific measures that were approved yesterday, so I think I'll withhold comment. I think, clearly, it is very important that they deal in a quite bold way with their banking problem, but I can't really make a judgment on a set of measures I haven't seen yet.

Q In connection with your meeting with Prime Minister Sharif, is the United States encouraged or discouraged by what's happening in India and Pakistan? And where do you stand in terms of the trip to India and Pakistan? When is the decision?

MR. BERGER: Well, let me answer the second part and then the first part. You all know these trips have a certain lead time so that advance work can be done, security work can be done. I think we have to make a decision on this sometime in the next few weeks. We have discussed with the Indians, and with the Pakistanis, the steps that we think need to be taken to put them back on track, as I say, more firmly back on track in the nonproliferation regime. I think there has been some movement, but I think so far it's been insufficient.

Q Are we absolutely sure that this pharmaceutical plant in Sudan was producing nerve gas, because President Carter has said, if we're not sure and not positive in view of our aftermath investigation, that we should apologize and make amends?

MR. BERGER: Well, I have a high level of confidence that the pharmaceutical plant in Sudan was associated with chemical weapons, that a chemical called EMPTA, which is essentially the penultimate precursor to VX gas -- there are very few steps, maybe even only one step, between EMPTA and VX nerve gas -- had been present at the plant. I believe we have a high level of confidence that that is true, number one.

Number two, we know that Bin Ladin is seeking chemical weapons.

Number three, we know that he has had a long association with the Sudanese government, which harbors a number of his associates, and particularly in association with the Sudanese government and an interest in working with them on chemical weapons production.

Number four, we know that he was a major financier of what is called the Military Industrial Corporation in Sudan, of which this plant is a part.

So, putting all that together, I think we had overwhelming grounds to strike this facility, and in fact I would put the question the other way: knowing what we knew, that there was a plant in Sudan that had an association with Bin Ladin,

who seeks chemical weapons and that that --

Q I don't see that would give you absolute --

MR. BERGER: Let me finish my point, Helen. What I was saying was, I think the answer -- the question was just the opposite: knowing what we knew, that this plant was associated with chemical weapons, number one; number two, that Ben Laden was associated with the Military Industrial Corporation of which this was a part; number three, that he seeks chemical weapons for the purpose of using them against Americans and others -- for us to have not struck that plant, I think, would have been irresponsible.

Q You say you had a high level of confidence that it was making this chemical precursor, but you didn't seem to know that it was apparently also making legitimate pharmaceuticals?

MR. BERGER: That's not true. Read my briefing on the day of the -- on the day I came out here to brief -- I happened to reread it last night actually -- I said that this plant was making other things as well as this.

Q Not to belabor this point, but the way you turned the question around could be legitimate -- you could say, knowing what we knew, we did the right thing. But knowing what you know now -- you seem to be couching it a little bit. You said, "associated with."

MR. BERGER: I don't mean to couch anything. I have no less certainty about this, in fact I have even more certainty about this, than I did at the time that we struck it, based upon subsequent information. But this is a facility -- we have physical evidence that this facility -- of the presence there of a chemical that can, as far as we know, can only be used in chemical weapons, it is part of a Military Industrial Corporation of which Usama Bin Ladin is associated. He seeks chemical weapons for the purpose of using them for terrorist action. I think the case is very strong.

Q Well, at the time these two installations in the Sudan and Afghanistan --

MR. BERGER: And let me just say one last thing, the Sudanese government here --

the compassion for the humanitarian instincts of the Sudanese government here is a little bit disingenuous. This is a government that is one of the principal state sponsors of terrorism in the world, number one; number two, there are somewhere between 1.5 million people starving in southern and western Sudan -- and we have plenty of food to get to those people, but we can't get that food to those people because the government will not let us have access to those people. This is a government who harbored Carlos; this is a government who harbored the people who tried to kill President Mubarak.

So I'm sure that they're deeply concerned about the penicillin that they may have lost in this plant, but I think you've got to put it in perspective here in terms of the nature of this regime. This plant was, in my judgment, a legitimate target, and had we not struck it I don't know how we could have faced the American people and said, we had every reason to believe that there was a chemical weapons-related facility here, associated with Usama Bin Ladin, who has said he wants to kill Americans, but we decided not to attack it.

Q That really leads into what I was trying to ask you, in the sense that when the time the U.S. struck Sudan and Afghanistan, U.S. officials warned that there would be other strikes, this wasn't it. Where are the other strikes? Are there plants still going now that the American people will discover -- you should have struck, you didn't strike?

MR. BERGER: I'm certainly not going to announce ahead of time what are plans are. We have been very proactive, as some of the arrests indicate. And we will continue to be proactive across a broad range of areas.

Q Speaking of other strikes -- moving on?

MR. BERGER: Yes.

Q In your conversations with the Secretary General about Iraq, what will you propose that the U.N. do if Iraq pulls out its weapons -- kicks out the U.N. weapons inspectors altogether?

MR. BERGER: Well, I think the Security Council and the Secretary General, back in I guess February, made it very clear that Iraq had an obligation to give

inspectors access and to permit UNSCOM to operate. This is extremely important.

Since Saddam Hussein has restricted the activity of the inspectors, we have gone back to the Security Council, put the burden there in the first instance. And as a result of that they have voted unanimously to suspend any review of sanctions until there is compliance. So essentially sanctions now are a permanent feature of the landscape, unless there is compliance.

If Saddam Hussein takes the further step of expelling the UNSCOM inspectors in the first instance, I believe the U.N. Security Council ought to act to gain compliance. If they fail to do that, we will obviously have to face a number of decisions.

Q What sorts of things are you going to explore? I mean, you put Iraq on the agenda, what are you going to talk about that you haven't already talked about at length?

MR. BERGER: Well, the first instance, the Security Council has passed resolutions saying there has to be access for the UNSCOM inspectors. If that access is denied in the first instance, it is for the Security Council to secure compliance, in our judgment. If they fail to do that, then we will have to obviously consider other steps.

Q But it has been denied -- the access has been denied now for a period of time.

MR. BERGER: Well, the access has been restricted and the Security Council has taken one important step, which is to say to Iraq there will be no review of sanctions relief as long as this situation remains.

Now, what we seek here is not simply a restricted UNSCOM; we seek an UNSCOM that can operate and we seek Iraqi compliance. But I think, as I say, in the first instance I think it is an obligation of the Secretary General, it's an obligation of the Security Council.

Q Is the President worried that despite his public advice in Moscow -- and I suppose private advice -- Primakov and company seem to be moving Russia back toward statism, back toward state-control of the economy, and maybe back toward

Communism?

MR. BERGER: Well, what we found in Russia was an economic crisis wrapped in a political crisis. There was a serious economic crumbling, but an absolute inability to even have a government to deal with it.

Now Russia has a government. We intend to remain engaged with that government. We believe that it needs to understand the laws of gravity, so to speak, of the international economy, in terms of basic steps that it needs to take. There are many ways to get there, but steps that, for example, ignite hyper-inflation or steps that move back from privatization toward re-nationalization are not likely to solve Russia's economic program.

So I think it's too early to make a final judgment on this. There was a meeting of the G-7 deputy foreign ministers, as you know, on Monday in London. The Russians were present -- I guess it's the G-8. And the finance ministers and political directors spoke very candidly and frankly to the Russians about the kinds of policies we believe are necessary to get them back on a track of gaining confidence.

Q Is it clear that the IMF is not going to release the expected September tranche of money?

MR. BERGER: Well, I think the circumstances under which the IMF negotiated that obviously are different than they are today. I think there would have to be a level of confidence on the part of the IMF that Russia was taking steps that moved in the right direction. And I know there is an IMF team in Moscow today.

Q Sandy, the President was fairly emphatic on Wednesday about the scandal and the Starr report and all that not impacting his ability to lead, especially in regard to foreign policy. Let me pose two questions. Are you concerned that it might embolden foreign governments, like, for example, particularly Saddam Hussein, to act in a way that he might otherwise not act because he thinks that the American President is distracted, whether that belief is correct or incorrect?

And number two, does it impact your ability to get things done in Congress with

Congress focused on the scandal? Does it impact your ability to get things done like UN dues or IMF money?

MR. BERGER: Well, on the first question, David, I think it would be a grave mistake for any foreign leader or any group to believe that if the United States interests are threatened, the United States will not respond in a firm and united way. When our embassies were attacked in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, you recall this is when the President was on Martha's Vineyard -- there were a few other things going on. That did not stop us from responding. We had strong bipartisan support for doing that.

And I believe that it is true that when America's interests are at issue, that Republicans and Democrats generally come together to do the things that have to be done. That certainly has been our experience so far and I expect it to continue to be our experience. I think it would be -- anybody who made that calculation would make a grave miscalculation.

In terms of working with Congress -- these issues have been contentious for three years. The UN arrears problem has been a difficult problem for us for several years. We didn't just get to be in this position overnight, and it continues to be. I remain hopeful that we'll make some progress on that in this session. And I remain hopeful that we'll make progress on IMF money.

Q On these Japan bilaterals, I know that you can't speak specifically on the latest banking reform measures and so on, but generally speaking is the Administration satisfied with what's in train in terms of stimulus measures, or will the President be calling for further reforms? And also, just logistically, will you be briefing before you go back to Washington on Tuesday?

MR. BERGER: Well, on your first question, I think we have a strong sense of urgency that the Japanese government move as quickly as possible to stimulate its economy, to restore growth, to deal with its banking problem, to open its markets, to deregulate. And I think that the President will be encouraging the Prime Minister to work with all elements of the Japanese political leadership to move boldly and to move forward very promptly. If that down-drag continues from Japan, it will have quite a devastating effect on not only the economies of Asia, but the security of Asia.

Now, in terms of briefing, I am sure that -- Mr. Leavy tells me that we will be briefing. And if he says so, it must be true.

Q Will the reports of the President's conversations with the world leaders include a message that: I'm not distracted, that the matters in the United States are not affecting me?

MR. BERGER: No, I don't think so. It doesn't come up in these meetings.

Q Will he bring it up?

MR. BERGER: No, because I don't think there's a need to. The President has enormous support from leaders around the world, he has great stature, which you saw as we moved through Africa, as we moved into China, as we've traveled in Latin America, as we went to Northern Ireland. I think the leaders of the world are prepared to -- look very much to the United States for leadership. They want and expect the United States to lead, and I think they very much look to the President to lead, and we intend to continue to do that.

Q Sandy, you just said that if Japan doesn't fix its economic situation, it will have a devastating effect on its political security as well as its economic security. I mean, the United States --

MR. BERGER: No, that's not what I said. I said that if Japan does not reverse its situation and begin to grow and begin to deal with these problems it will have -- and I may have used the word "devastating" -- certainly a serious effect throughout Asia on the economies of other countries in Asia that depend -- the two big economies in the world, as you know, are the United States and Japan.

Q Not just economy, but you said also their political --

MR. BERGER: Well, I think, you know, if you look at Indonesia for example, I would say that there's a higher degree of social disruption in Indonesia today than there was before the economic crisis. We don't want to see that pattern, obviously, replicated elsewhere.

Q Thank you very much.

Q Holbrooke's dead, do you agree?

MR. BERGER: No.

Q Seriously, Senator Helms said he isn't going to act on it even if you send it up this year.

MR. BERGER: Well, I'm glad you asked me that question. I do not believe that Ambassador Holbrooke's nomination, by any means, is dead. It is a nomination that the President and I think the rest of us feel very strongly is in the national interest. We very much want and look forward to having Dick as part of the foreign policy team. There are matters as you know that are under review at the Justice Department. We would hope that those matters would be handled expeditiously and we would be able to submit his name, if not before Congress leaves this session, but when it comes back.

I would say one other thing, Sam, off the New York Times editorial today. We have enormous confidence in Ambassador Burleigh. Ambassador Burleigh has been the number two to Ambassador Richardson. He is a career ambassador. He is a man of enormous distinction and talent. I would remind people that Ambassador Pickering, as a career ambassador, was one of our most distinguished U.N. ambassadors.

So I think in the period while these matters are resolved with Dick, we're in good hands.

Q Could you do a recess appointment?

MR. BERGER: I don't know that that's contemplated.

Q Do you know it's not contemplated?

MR. BERGER: I have not heard it discussed.

END

10:30 A.M. EDT

13

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Mona Sutphen to Donald Bandler, Susan Braden, Keirn Brown et al. Subject: RE: Helms Request for the "Christmas Warning." (4 pages)	09/18/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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 9/23/98 7:07:24 PM
FROM Farrar, Jay C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Update on Law of the Sea Ratification Effort [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bouchard, Joseph F.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

What a reversal! Wish this wasn't e-mail, I'd say more.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Bouchard, Joseph F.

Sent: Wednesday, September

23, 1998 7:04 PM

To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;
@LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @ENVIRON - Environmental

Subject: Update

on Law of the Sea Ratification Effort [UNCLASSIFIED]

*

* Senator

Helms told Secretary Cohen earlier this week that he would not hold hearings on the Law of the Sea Treaty during this session of Congress. This was a reversal of a previous Helms statement that he would hold hearings on the treaty. Helms' stated to Cohen: "Why should I hold a hearing on something I'm not going to report out?"

* After

that conversation, Secretary Cohen stated that he would not engage on the LOS Treaty again this year. State has also decided that it has higher priority issues that need to be addressed in the remainder of this session of Congress.

* The Ocean Policy IWG is now formulating a strategy to gain ratification in the next session of Congress. Further efforts directed toward gaining ratification this year have been halted.

* Impact:

* U.S. will continue to experience credibility problems dealing with ocean issues in which we attempt to cite the LOS Treaty as grounds for opposing excessive maritime

claims by other nations. This is already a problem, as in our negotiations with Mexico over maritime claims in the Gulf of Mexico. This forewarns that the U.S. may experience a gradual erosion of its influence in the ocean policy arena the longer we go without ratifying the LOS Treaty.

* U.S. loses its provisional seat on the UN Seabed Authority in November. The Seabed Authority regulates exploitation of seabed minerals in international waters (beyond national exclusive economic zones). This will have very little immediate economic impact because very little exploitation of seabed minerals takes place beyond national exclusive economic zones due to high cost and immature technology. Over long term, however, not having a seat on the Seabed Authority will become a serious problem for the U.S. as seabed mining becomes economically viable.

* The Ocean Policy IWG also discussed the possibility that an effort to gain Senate advice and consent to ratification of the LOS Treaty in the next session of Congress may be futile and therefor not worth the effort. Some participants suggested that either a Republican President or Democratic Senate may be needed to gain ratification. Given that the U.S. will soon miss the deadline for retaining its seat on the Seabed Authority, an argument could be made to put the LOS Treaty on hold until more favorable circumstances arise. The IWG decided to continue planning for another ratification effort in the next session unless/until it becomes clear the effort would be hopeless.

* In the course of the conversation, the rep from State Leg Affairs noted that in the next session of Congress they would be pressing for Senate action on a backlog of treaties needing the advice and consent of the Senate -- treaties that had not been pushed in the Senate this year in order to pursue high priority ratification efforts. NSC probably needs to be involved in setting priorities for gaining Senate action on this backlog of treaties.

Joe
Bouchard

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Gregory Schulte to John Dowling. Subject: RE: Helms Request for the "Christmas Warning." (4 pages)	09/25/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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
004. email	Fulton Armstrong to Theodore Piccone and Gerard Gallucci. Subject: Visa Denial Proposal. (3 pages)	09/24/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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 9/26/98 2:10:09 PM

FROM Rudman, Mara E.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: KEDO memo to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Samore, Gary S.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Yes, OK. See addition just pointing out to him where Livingston is.

Also, before leaving today I will outline and send to you what I see as the legislative plan on KEDO for next couple of weeks, with eye toward getting it to SRB first thing on Monday.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Samore, Gary S.

Sent: Saturday, September 26,
1998 2:06 PM

To: Rudman, Mara E.

Subject: KEDO memo to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Mara, Please take a quick look. I think we owe it to Sandy to explain how we intend to deal with Helms and Gilman reaction.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

6607.doc

September 26, 1998

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

FROM: GARY SAMORE

SUBJECT: Presidential Determination on U.S. Assistance to the

Korean Peninsula
Energy Organization (KEDO)

The attached memo to the President recommends that he exercise his 614 waiver authority to provide \$15 million to KEDO to resume heavy fuel oil shipments to North Korea. Although Senator Helms and Congressman Gilman have objected to the 614 waiver, Congressman Livingston has somewhat grudgingly removed his objection to the 614 and State believes (and we agree) that our September 18 agreement with the North is likely to fall apart if KEDO does not resume oil shipments in the near future. In particular, North Korea may refuse to resume the spent fuel canning operation and cancel the upcoming missile talks. If possible, the Presidential 614 Determination should be approved on Monday, September 28 so that KEDO can sign contracts for oil shipments and inform the DPRK immediately that oil shipments will resume in late October. This will clear the way for the North Korean delegation to leave for the October 1-2 missile talks in New York.

Issuing the 614 waiver over the objections of Helms and Gilman risks complicating our efforts to reach agreement with Congress on amounts and conditions for the FY99 contribution to KEDO. We will seek to mollify the Congressional reaction in two ways. First, in response to objections from both the authorizers and appropriators, State is reconsidering its intended use of the 451 waiver to provide additional FY98 funds to KEDO. Second, State is prepared to negotiate a set of Presidential certification conditions for the FY99 KEDO contribution. (The PC meeting will need to address what conditions are acceptable and realistic.)

Concurrence by: Jack Pritchard, Mara Rudman, Mary DeRosa

RECOMMENDATION

That you forward the attached memo to the President.

Attachment

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Presidential Determination

Tab B Incoming Correspondence

2

6607

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 9/26/98 2:31:26 PM

FROM DeRosa, Mary B.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: KEDO 614 Memo [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Highsmith, Newell L.

CARBON_COPY Allen, Charles A.
Baker, James E.
DeRosa, Mary B.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.

TEXT_BODY Newell -- I cleared this. I told Gary to add a sentence (at the end of the first paragraph in the background) about how the Executive Branch practice has been not to go forward with a 614 waiver if chairmen of authorizing or appropriating committees object.

-----Original
Message-----
From: Samore, Gary S.
Sent: Saturday, September 26,
1998 1:14 PM
To: Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.; Highsmith, Newell
L.; Rudman, Mara E.
Cc: @ASIA - Asian Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor
Subject: KEDO
614 Memo [UNCLASSIFIED]

NEED URGENT CLEARANCE. I have to
put this into the system this afternoon.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 6607A.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Presidential Determination on U.S. Assistance to the
Korean Peninsula
Energy Development Organization (KEDO)

Purpose

To invoke Presidential waiver authority under Section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act in order to provide \$15 million in FDY98 funds to KEDO.

Background

On September 11, 1998, you authorized the Department of State to consult with, and provide written justification to, the appropriate committees of Congress on your intent to use 614 waiver authority to provide \$15 million in FY98 funds to KEDO for heavy fuel oil purchases for North Korea. On September 26, 1998, the Department of State notified the NSC that these Congressional consultations have identified opposition from several members, especially Senator Helms and Congressman Gilman, to the use of the 614 waiver for this purpose (Tab B).

Nonetheless, Madeline recommends, and I agree, that you exercise your 614 waiver authority because KEDO urgently needs funds to resume heavy fuel oil shipments to North Korea, which we agreed to provide as part of the September 18 New York agreement with North Korea. If oil shipments are not resumed at this time, North Korea may back out of its end of the bargain, including canning of the remaining spent fuel rods and holding missile talks with us on October 1-2. At

these
talks, we will seek North Korean restraint in both missile exports and
indigenous
missile development and testing.

Although some members oppose this use of 614 waiver authority, we
will attempt to
address some Congressional concerns in the course of negotiating
conditions
governing KEDO funding for FY 1999.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the Presidential Determination at Tab A.

Attachment
Tab A Presidential 614 Determination
Tab B Incoming Correspondence

2

6607

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
005. email	Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley to Fulton Armstrong. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (3 pages)	09/28/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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
006. email	Erica Barks-Ruggles to Gayle Smith, Pat Battenfield, Dorothy Shea et al. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (3 pages)	09/28/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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
007. email	Robin Sanders to Gayle Smith, Pat Battenfield, Dorothy Shea et al. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (3 pages)	09/28/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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 10/5/98 9:52:38 AM
FROM Naplan, Steven J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Nickles Bill UPDATE Memo to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Naplan, Steven J.

CARBON_COPY
TEXT_BODY

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

From: Rudman, Mara E.
Sent: Tuesday,
July 21, 1998 8:30 PM
To: Naplan, Steven J.; Schwartz, Eric P.
Subject: FW:
Nickles Bill UPDATE Memo to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

includes
language re Biden

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

From: Rudman, Mara
E.
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 1998 3:10 PM
To: Malley, Robert
Subject: FW:
Nickles Bill UPDATE Memo to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Rob--

I
made changes we discussed and some additional ones based on
information
I just gained from Biden's staff about a proposed substitute. Also
added a little formatting in the end to (I hope) break up our text
some and make our purpose in sending the memo a little more clear.
(I would also love to change type face to CG Times because I think
that would make it both more readable and shorter -- but I leave
that to your discretion...)

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

From: Naplan,
Steven J.
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 1998 11:55 AM
To: @NSA - Natl
Security Advisor
Cc: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @MULTILAT
- Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs
Subject: Nickles Bill UPDATE
Memo to SRB [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

ROB MALLEY: this
is the memo Mara and Eric had promised. Please pass to Sandy.

thanks.

SN

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT Nickles Bill UPDATE memo.doc

July 21, 1998

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: MARA RUDMAN/ERIC SCHWARTZ

FROM: STEVEN NAPLAN

SUBJECT: Nickles Bill on International Religious Freedom

This memorandum describes the state of play on the revised religious freedom legislation sponsored by Senator Nickles, and offers recommendations on how we should proceed.

Background to the Legislation: On March 26, Senator Nickles, along with six cosponsors (notably including Senator Lieberman), introduced the International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) of 1998. Senator Helms is also a cosponsor. The IRFA is an alternative to the Wolf-Specter bill. The Wolf-Specter bill

passed
overwhelmingly in the House (375-41) on May 14 despite an
Administration veto
threat. Wolf-Specter contains a number of troubling provisions, most
notably
broad automatic economic sanctions. The Nickles bill, which provides
greater
flexibility to the Executive Branch, but still contains problems, is
scheduled
for mark-up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this Thursday,
July 23.

Politics of the Legislation: Senate Majority Leader Lott has promised
that some
form of international religious freedom legislation will be voted on in
the
Senate this summer. We believe that the House and Senate will
conference
Wolf-Specter with whatever the Senate acts upon and will send
legislation to the
President in this session on religious freedom. The legislation will
likely be
approved by veto override margins.

The Nickles bill reflects an effort by a number of Senators to craft
legislation
that permits the Administration greater flexibility than does Wolf-
Specter, while
still credibly (from the perspective of religious groups) addressing the
religious persecution issue. Senator Helms has indicated his desire to
move
Nickles quickly, so that it - rather than Wolf-Specter - becomes the
focus of
attention on the Hill. There is a real chance that, should Nickles falter
in the
Senate (due to Administration opposition and/or lack of Democratic
votes),
Senator Lott could bring Wolf-Specter to the floor instead, or that
Wolf-Specter-like "strengthening" amendments to the Nickles bill
could be
adopted.

Senate passage of Wolf-Specter, or a Nickles bill that is amended to
include much
of Wolf-Specter, would in all likelihood result in a veto-proof
conference report
of legislation that is most objectionable to the Administration. Thus,
as
problematic as Nickles may be in its current form (see below), there
remain

strong reasons for us not to reject it out of hand.

KEY ELEMENTS OF THE NICKLES LEGISLATION

General Points: The staff group behind the Nickles legislation has worked in good faith to modify their bill in order to accommodate many (but not all) of the important changes requested by the Administration. For example, they have changed "shalls" to "shoulds" in many places; ensured that the Ambassador at Large for Religious Freedom position does not usurp the authority of the Secretary of State or the Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor; and made some structural changes related to disapproval resolutions that help the Executive Branch slow down such resolutions.

The negotiations have not, however, yielded significant changes to the most onerous requirement of an annual list of "serious offenders" of religious freedom, including those countries with "particular severe" track records. The countries listed as "serious offender" states would be subject to punitive sanctions (from executive actions to economic sanctions), though the Nickles bill does afford extensive flexibility to the President which would largely provide ways to avoid imposing the sanctions in question.

New Positions Established by Nickles: The IRFA establishes an Ambassador-at-Large for Religious Liberty under the Secretary of State as well as a nine member, bipartisan Commission on International Religious Freedom that would investigate violations and make policy recommendations. (Both of these mandates are similar to existing State Department initiatives.) Additionally, the IRFA urges (through a Sense of the Congress clause) the establishment at NSC of a Special Advisor on Religious Persecution. (At the request of the Administration, sponsors have expanded the flexibility permitted to the Administration in how such provisions

would be interpreted and implemented.)

Training and Contacts: The legislation requires training for foreign service officers to aid them in recognizing religious persecution, and high-level Embassy contacts with imprisoned religious leaders abroad. The bill grants to U.S. citizens abroad equal access to U.S. embassies for religious activities and directs the State Department to maintain country-specific lists of religious prisoners.

Reporting and Sanctions: These are the critical sections of the legislation, and at the Administration's urging, some parts have been improved upon. Others remain problematic, but still better than Wolf-Specter, as they permit far greater Administration flexibility.

Reporting: The Nickles bill has been modified to require several reports.

May 1: An Annual Report to Congress on worldwide international religious freedom would provide information on the religious freedom practices of foreign governments that engage in or tolerate acts of religious persecution, as well as U.S. actions to address violations. (We think we may have the latitude to interpret this provision as allowing a report on all nations, violators and not.)

June 1: The President must determine whether any of the countries described in the annual report "have engaged in or tolerated systematic, widespread, and ongoing patterns of particularly severe violations of the right to religious freedom."

August 1: The Advisory Commission on International Religious Freedom would review the May 1 Annual Report, as well as the President's June 1 determinations and then publicly report on its own policy recommendations.

September 1: The President, (informed by the Advisory Commission's August report) would report to Congress the list of "countries of particular concern" as well as his intended actions against them.

Sanctions: For those governments that engage in any violations of religious freedom, the President is required to implement one of sixteen possible "executive measures and/or sanctions" of his choosing that are specified in the legislation, including "a private demarche", "a public demarche," "a public condemnation," "cancellation of scientific exchanges," "cancellation of cultural exchanges," "denial of state visits," and/or eight forms of economic sanctions (described below). He must also report to the Congress on his actions.

For those "countries of particular concern", the President is required to choose one of the eight economic sanctions among the sixteen listed measures. The eight economic sanctions include withdrawals, limitations, or suspensions on development assistance, OPIC and EXIM, security assistance, GSP, IFI loans, export licenses, and USG loans; or he may take "commensurate action;" or he could waive the sanctions completely (see below), if he is prepared to explain which waiver he was using and why.

Flexibility: Beyond the ability of the President to pick and choose among listed measures and sanctions, additional provisions provide the Administration with flexibility in implementation.

* First, in lieu of the sixteen measures and sanctions, the Administration could negotiate "binding agreements" with a foreign government that obligated such government to take measures to cease, or take substantial steps to address and phase out the act, policy, or practice constituting the religious persecution.

* Second, with respect to "countries of particular concern", the

President could substitute any action authorized by law for any of the eight economic sanctions listed in the legislation, so long as he makes the case that such actions are commensurate in effect to a substituted sanction and would serve the purposes of the Act.

* Third, if the President determines and certifies to Congress that negotiations with a government need to continue, the President can gain an additional (one-time) 90 day delay before he reports on what actions he has taken against the particularly severe violator countries (moving from a September to a December report).

Waivers: The President could waive any of the executive measures and sanctions if he determined that such a waiver served the purposes of the Act or was necessary for national security reasons, or if he determined the government in question had ceased violations.

COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

General analysis

While the Nickles bill has been significantly improved, it is far from ideal.

Clearly, we would prefer no legislation in this area. We believe, however, that some version of a religious freedom bill will be sent to the President this year.

We further believe that some in Congress want nothing more than a Presidential veto of a religious freedom bill on which they can force a veto override vote in late September, making it a perfect election issue for marginal seats.

It is clear to us that the Nickles sponsors firmly believe that to maintain credibility with religious groups, the legislation must require some form of an internal determination on or public listing of particularly severe violators of religious freedom. There may be room, however, for an

Administration

interpretation of the listing mandate that would permit the oral public reporting on the countries of particular concern rather than a public list of the worst violators.

Given the political environment we are presented with, and the likelihood of a veto proof majority for any legislation in this area, the prospect of this improved Nickles bill heading into conference, possibly even with an edge over Wolf-Specter in the conference process, may be the best option we have.

Currently, we may have leverage to get some (not likely all) of the necessary changes that would allow the Administration to be able to accept the legislation. Republican Senators Hagel and Gramms have not agreed to support the bill precisely because of the sanctions implications for those countries identified "of particular concern." In addition, Committee Democrats have not yet indicated their support of the bill, and some of them have said their support is contingent on adoption of the Administration's proposed changes. Biden may seek to offer a substitute that addresses many of our concerns. (In reality, we suspect most will fold and support the bill, whatever it contains, when a roll call vote on final passage is demanded.)

Proposed actions

At this point, we seek the flexibility to get to an end result that keeps Democrats together with as many like-minded Republicans as possible and shows broad support for a bill on religious freedom that is in a form at least minimally acceptable to the Administration. We see two routes toward this end:

- (1) Biden gains support for a substitute from all Democrats and pick up support from Hagel and Gramms as well, showing that he has a majority of SFRC votes and leading him either to offer his substitute in committee or extract

changes we seek on key sections of Nickles, or (2) if Biden appears to lack necessary votes, we would seek to get the bill's drafters to accept an oral briefing rather than a written list of "particularly severe" violators, which should address our concern about the automatic condemnation aspect of a list. (It would still force us to use a waiver or find "commensurate action" to apply against the violators if we seek to avoid the otherwise applicable sanctions.)

Even if we cannot get any additional changes, while we concur that our overall foreign policy concerns (not to mention concerns about our credibility on sanctions policy) would mandate that we oppose Nickles without these changes, we believe it would be inadvisable to threaten a veto at this point in the process. Such a threat would likely shut us out of ongoing negotiations as the bill continues through the legislative process, and would engender a great deal of ill will from the Hill and among religious groups. Instead, we could register our concerns and our desire to continue to seek specific changes as the bill moves to the floor of the Senate and to the conference table. We should reserve a veto threat until we see what this bill looks like when the Senate completes its consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve this general course of action as we approach committee action on Thursday, (which puts us on a path to support the Biden substitute and/or offer one more comeback on how to handle the "particularly severe violators" determination and thus be able to ultimately support Nickles assuming it passes with some kind of change in this area), and authorize us to work it in the interagency and with other White House offices.

Approve ____ Disapprove ____

6

6

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
008. email	Carlos Pascual to Fulton Armstrong. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (4 pages)	10/09/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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
009. email	Fulton Armstrong to Carlos Pascual. Subject: RE: Proposal to Deny Visas in Property.... (4 pages)	10/12/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[09/17/1998-10/29/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5659

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 10/28/98 7:09:42 PM
FROM Blinken, Antony J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: SRB remarks for Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
Malinowski, Tomasz P.
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY david - very good job, especially on short notice. Too long. I have some extensive comments and suggestions sprinkled throughout, which of course won't make it any shorter!. Pretty much did not touch last chunk as i think some reordering and reworking is in order (and can be lifted directly from SRB Dartmouth speech). See what you think.

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

From: Halperin, David E.

Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 1998 6:28 PM

To: @PLANNING - Strat

Plan & Comm

Subject: SRB remarks for Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

srb press club 10-98.doc
10/28/98 6:30 pm

SAMUEL R. BERGER
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY
AFFAIRS
OPENING REMARKS AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB
WASHINGTON, D.C.
OCTOBER 30, 1998

Thanks for having me here today.

As journalists, you spend a lot of time chasing the story of the day. Something similar happens at the National Security Council -- a crisis of the day, sometimes two or three crises of the day. But many of you also have strong sense of what you want to accomplish with your journalism over the long term. Similarly, the Clinton Administration's foreign policy effort is guided by a vision of what we would like the world to look like. We are determined not to let what is urgent crowd out what is essential for the long-term security and prosperity of the American people.

I want to take your questions today, but let me first take a few minutes to talk about some of the events of the past few months and try to give you sense of how our actions relate to our long-term goals.

First, Kosovo. During his first trip to Europe as President in early 1994, President Clinton set out a vision of a continent democratic, undivided and at peace for the first time in history -- and we have worked hard to help our European friends achieve that. When you consider the terrible carnage in Europe over many centuries, particularly in the first half of this century, and consider the tense Cold War stand off we had less than a decade ago, it is remarkable how close we are to that vision today. A strengthened European Union is making Europe more prosperous. An expanded NATO, with the addition of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, and strong practical cooperation with Russia and Ukraine, will make Europe more stable. [need to convey notion that U.S./Clinton played lead role in adapting NATO to new missions, getting it to work with new partners and opening the door to new members -- i.e. that we had a plan and realized it, these things didn't just happen]

The biggest obstacle to realizing our vision for Europe now can be summed up in

two words: Slobodan Milosevic. He has been an ethnic supremacist, an enemy of human rights and self-government, an aggressor whose ambitions threaten the fragile stability of the Balkans. But in Bosnia and now in Kosovo, through NATO and the broader international community, we have mobilized the international community in support of ending violence and repression and building a just and durable peace -- using aggressive diplomacy, firmly backed by armed force.

As the President said this week, there is still hard road ahead in Kosovo.. But NATO's resolve has compelled Milosevic to very substantially comply with the demands of the international community. The Serb police and military units deployed to Kosovo to repress the ethnic Albanians have almost all been pulled out or placed in garrison. Roadblocks are down and heavy weapons in cantonment. Tens of thousands of Kosovar Albanians, who just weeks ago faced the mortal peril of a winter without shelter, are returning to their homes, aided by an influx of international relief workers,. Milosevic's effort to strip the Kosovars of their freedoms completely backfired; now Milosevic has agreed to restore the substantial self-government they once had. And now the eyes of the world are on Kosovo, with an intrusive monitoring plan to make sure Milosevic stays in compliance with the commitments he has made -- including unilateral concessions to restore Kosovo's autonomy, to hold internationally supervised democratic elections and to allow the Kosovars to establish their own police force. .

Second, the Middle East. Central to our policy has been our belief that keeping the peace process on track is not only vital to the security of Israelis and Palestinians -- it also radiates hope across the entire region. It energizes moderate Arab states to stand strong for reconciliation and against terrorism --

and against the aggression of Saddam Hussein. Time and again, the President has used the prestige of his office and the power of X to move the process forward [list a few, e.g. South Lawn signing for first interim accords; Israel-Jordan peace; Sharm el Sheik; Hebron] We are under no illusions that the breakthrough at Wye River -- after nine days of tough negotiating led by the President -- will allow us to coast to a final settlement. There will be setbacks, and likely more violence. But there is hope, a clear path to follow -- and we will press forward.

Our involvement in Kosovo and Bosnia, in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, on the border between Peru and Ecuador, is driven by a compelling fact: Drawing not only on our power but also on our diversity and ideals, America can often be the decisive force for peace. We can't be everywhere or do everything. But we should and we must be ready to engage -- with diplomacy and, if necessary, force -- where important interests and values are at stake and we can make a difference.

Third, let me mention Asia. [Need opening sentence about strategic vision of forging Asia Pacific community. Not so long ago, pundits predicted emergence of three rival blocks -- US, Europe and Asia. Instead, we have brought U.S. closer to both regions by being key force for stability in both] We have made our long-standing alliance with Japan and our growing engagement with China the cornerstones of our policy. We all understand the importance of a strong Japan for the long-term stability and prosperity of Asia. And we know the role China plays will have a profound impact on the new century -- [I would do the riff from POTUS National Geographic speech, i.e. "whether good or bad..." for each] on weapons of mass destruction; on crime and drugs; on trade; on regional conflicts in South Asia, Korea and elsewhere; on human rights. So on China we

have stayed
on a steady course: expanding areas of cooperation while dealing
directly with
our differences, as the President did during his visit there last summer.

This approach has brought results, though still far from enough. China
is
becoming more open, not just to commerce but to ideas. Our
engagement is helping
to empower the Chinese people as they seek more freedom. And it has
helped us
advance important American interests. [Need to list concrete progress
on core
interests, again from POTUS China speech -- non-pro; regional
stability; crime
and drugs; environment; trade; human rights] A strategy of
confrontation, by
contrast, would likely push China toward angry isolation. That would
clearly
make the world more dangerous and undermine our hopes for greater
democracy and
human rights across the Asian continent.

Looming over our Asia policy, and indeed all of our policy, is a fourth
issue:
the global financial situation. In dealing with the world economy, we
have,
again, followed a long-term strategy: To break down barriers to trade
and
investment. To build strong economic partnerships and institutions.
And, at the
same time, to work for strong education and training so no one is left
behind.
And to see that development does not lead to environmental peril.

This approach has contributed greatly to our unprecedented sustained
economic
growth. The President rarely fails to mention that one third of this
growth
since 1993 has come from trade with other countries.

Faced with global upheaval, the President has again taken the lead. He
has
proposed and begun to implement aggressive short term steps to
restore
confidence, address the crisis in Asia and keep it from deepening
elsewhere. In
addition, he has launched a pointed discussion about how to reshape
the global

financial architecture to address the challenges of the rapidly moving and rapidly changing marketplace.

[My fear about doing it this way is that this could play into hands of those who argue our foreign policy is eco-centric, i.e. everything we do primarily

motivated by mercantile interests, that even our efforts for democracy are to

make world safe for capitalism. Better way to make many of same points is to make

case, as SRB does in his Dartmouth speech, that POTUS recognizes we are at

critical turning point. for 50 years, we urged people in FSU, CEE, Latin

America, Africa, Asia to choose democracy and open markets because best way to

realize aspirations of people and to recognize their fundamental rights as human

beings. Over last decade, people in all those places made that fundamental

choice. But now we are at second key crossroads where we need to move beyond

elections and privatization to make democracy and free markets deliver for

people, lest they begin to question choice they made. Other way to say is that

old order/barriers and block have come down. Now hard work of building up

functioning societies /systems in their place. You can lift from SRB speech

directly. and I would put this after terrorism etc.. as last piece of speech, to

put big picture in even bigger picture.]Beyond that, this year the President, in

Johannesburg, in Santiago, in Moscow, at the Council on Foreign Relations and

elsewhere, has outlined a broader vision. It is his thesis that in the 21st

Century, central to progress and prosperity will be the deepening of democracy.

Nations will be best able to weather economic storms if people have power and use

this power: to root out corruption and old, inefficient ways of doing business;

to ensure a free press and the free flow of ideas and information across borders;

to uphold the rule of law and protect consumers; to provide equal opportunity

through strong education and health care.

Investors and entrepreneurs increasingly have an ever-widening array of choices as to where to put their resources. They don't want to go to where the system is rigged, where insiders will be favored with bailouts, where they could get burned and have no recourse in the courts. They will move in the direction of openness and fairness -- and that is the direction of mature and sustained democracy.

It is, to us, an encouraging scenario: Those nations that treat its citizens, all its citizens, with dignity and afford them full political rights and responsibilities will be able to prosper in the global economy. But there is a serious risk today in nations where democracy is still thin and fragile: That instead of reacting to hard times by further deepening democracy, citizens will instead surrender their liberties to forces of reaction.

That would be a blow for our economic interests, for our interest in justice and human rights, and, very clearly also, for our security. For, as the President has noted, around the world it is the authoritarian nations, without democracy and open markets, who are the aggressors and provocateurs. As he has said, "Nations that give their people freedom are good neighbors; when nations turn away from freedom, they turn toward tension, hatred and hostility."

So our security and our interest in supporting democracy will be directly affected by our ability to address the economic crisis, by our ability to restore hope and preserve stability in nations -- from Asia to Latin America -- that are seeking to do the right thing for their people.

Our security also depends on meeting a fifth challenge, that posed by enemies of democracy and peace. From the start this Administration has recognized that the very forces of integration that have helped spread freedom and prosperity --

technology and open borders -- can be exploited by forces of disintegration -- criminals and terrorists and their rogue state supporters.

We have been unrelenting in the fight against terrorism. We have devised and implemented long-term strategies for combating terrorist groups, as well as international crime rings, for shielding our computer systems and other critical infrastructures against cyber-attacks, and for protecting our citizens against the threat of chemical and biological weapons.

We do not hesitate to take the fight directly to the terrorists. In August, after members of Usama bin Ladin's organization killed Americans, Kenyans and Tanzanians in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, and after we received information that bin Ladin planned more attacks against our citizens, we struck decisively against his terrorist camps and against the site of chemical weapons activity.

We are fortunate that, in addressing all of these goals, we have a lot of support -- thousands of extremely dedicated, talented and courageous men and women in our foreign service, our intelligence agencies, our armed forces, and elsewhere. They are the strong and steady backbone of all our government does. We also have an international community that is increasingly united behind core principles we champion: democracy, human rights, free markets, and peaceful resolution of conflicts old and new.

But we also need resources. We need to work with Congress to provide adequate funding for military readiness, for our diplomacy, and to meet our obligations to multilateral institutions like the U.N. and the IMF.

Congress is also our essential partner in the effort to increase security through verifiable treaties. On that score, let me mention one very important goal of this Administration for the coming year, and that is Senate ratification of the

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This agreement, signed by 149 nations, would ban all nuclear explosive testing. Senator Helms has called the treaty "worthless" now that India and Pakistan have conducted nuclear tests. He has compared it to "closing the stable door after the horses have galloped away." But we think the dangerous arms competition in South Asia makes it more critical than ever to act, while the horses are still in the corral and before there is a stampede. It is an extraordinary opportunity to slow the spread of nuclear weapons, and increase our capability to monitor suspicious activity overseas. The Treaty is endorsed by four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as all of the current members. The Senate should exercise leadership and ratify this treaty as soon as possible.

Now, I know many of you will react to my remarks with this question: What's the story of the day? To which I would reply, have a happy Halloween. Now, I'm glad to take your questions.

#

4

3

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/28/98 9:23:35 PM

FROM Halperin, David E.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT For SRB to take on AF1 -- Friday speech [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Brown, Keim C.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Hachigian, Nina L.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.
Moretz, Sheila K.
O'Brien, Penelope R.
Rice, Edward A.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.
Sutphen, Mona K.

CARBON_COPY @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Blinken, Antony J.
Gobush, Matthew N.
Gray, Wendy E.
Halperin, David E.
Malinowski, Tomasz P.
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted)

TEXT_BODY For SRB/JBS,

Draft for SRB speech for Press Club Friday. With input from Blinken and Widmer. Too long, but I thought you might want to see various options. If you want to address all these topics or add still others, I can find words to cut.

Comments to Halperin,
please. Phone 69377; fax 69210; page 4192.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT srb press club 10-98 2.doc
10/28/98 9:30 pm
SAMUEL R. BERGER
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY
AFFAIRS

OPENING REMARKS AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB
WASHINGTON, D.C.
OCTOBER 30, 1998

Thank you for having me here today.

As journalists, you spend a lot of time chasing the story of the day. Something similar happens at the National Security Council -- a crisis of the day, sometimes two or three crises of the day. But many of you also have strong sense of what you want to accomplish with your journalism over the long term. Similarly, the Clinton Administration's foreign policy effort is guided by a vision of what we would like the world to look like. We are determined not to let what is urgent crowd out what is essential for the long-term security and prosperity of the American people.

I want to take your questions today, but let me first speak for a few minutes about some of the events of the past few months and try to give you sense of how our actions relate to our long-term goals. I want to focus on five areas:

Europe, the Middle East, Asia, terrorism and the global financial situation.

First, Europe and, particularly the situation in Kosovo. During his first trip to Europe as President in early 1994, President Clinton set out a vision of a continent democratic, undivided and at peace for the first time in history -- and we have worked hard to help our European friends achieve that. When you consider the terrible carnage in Europe over many centuries, particularly the first half of this century, and consider the tense Cold War stand-off we had less than a decade ago, it is remarkable how close we are to that vision today. The United States has led the way in adapting NATO to the changes in Europe and to new missions. Now an expanded NATO, with the addition of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, and strong practical cooperation with Russia and Ukraine, will

make Europe more stable. Meanwhile, a strengthened European Union and the global trade liberalization we have pursued is helping to make Europe more prosperous.

The biggest obstacle to realizing our vision for Europe now can be summed up in two words: Slobodan Milosevic. He has been an ethnic supremacist, an enemy of human rights and self-government, an aggressor whose ambitions threaten the fragile stability of the Balkans. But in Bosnia and now in Kosovo, through NATO and the broader international community, we have mobilized in support of ending violence and repression and building a just and durable peace -- using aggressive diplomacy, firmly backed by armed force.

As the President said this week, there is still hard road ahead in Kosovo. But NATO's resolve has compelled Milosevic to very substantially comply with the demands of the international community. The Serb police and military units deployed to Kosovo to repress the ethnic Albanians have almost all been pulled out or placed in garrison. Roadblocks are down and heavy weapons in cantonment. Tens of thousands of Kosovar Albanians, who just weeks ago faced the mortal peril of a winter without shelter, are returning to their homes, aided by an influx of international relief workers.

Milosevic's effort to strip the Kosovars of their freedoms completely backfired; and now he has made unilateral concessions: to permit internationally-supervised democratic elections, to allow the Kosovars to establish their own police force, to restore the substantial autonomy they once had. And now the eyes of the world are on Kosovo, with an intrusive monitoring plan to make sure Milosevic stays in compliance with the commitments he has made.

Second, let me discuss the Middle East. Central to our policy has been our belief that keeping the peace process on track is not only vital to the

security
of Israelis and Palestinians -- it also radiates hope across the entire region.
It energizes moderate Arab states to stand strong for reconciliation and against terrorism -- and against the aggression of Saddam Hussein. Time and again, the President has used the prestige of his office and his unique powers of persuasion to move the process forward -- with the White House signing of the first interim accords; the peace agreement between Israel and Jordan; the Summit of the Peacemakers at Sharm el Sheik; and the 1997 Hebron agreement. We are under no illusions that the breakthrough at Wye River -- after nine days of tough negotiating led by the President -- will allow us to coast to a final settlement. There will be setbacks, and likely more violence. But there is hope and a clear path to follow.

Our involvement in promoting an end to conflict in Kosovo and Bosnia, in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, on the border between Peru and Ecuador, is driven by a compelling fact: Drawing not only on our power but also on our diversity and ideals, America can often be the decisive force for peace. We can't be everywhere or do everything. But we should and we must be ready to engage -- with diplomacy and, if necessary, force -- where important interests and values are at stake and we can make a difference.

Third, let me mention Asia. Upon taking office, President Clinton offered a vision of the United States as a guiding member of a new community -- an Asia-Pacific community, and he soon convened the first-ever Asia-Pacific summit meeting. As we have proceeded, the cornerstones of our Asia policy have been our long-standing alliance with Japan and our growing engagement with China.

We all understand the importance of a strong Japan for the long-term stability

and prosperity of Asia. And we know the role China plays will have a profound impact on the new century -- for better or for worse -- on weapons of mass destruction; on crime and drugs; on trade; on regional conflicts; on human rights. So as to China we have stayed on a steady course: expanding areas of cooperation while dealing directly with our differences, as the President did during his visit there last summer.

This approach has brought results, though still far from enough. China is becoming more open, not just to commerce but to ideas. Our engagement is helping to empower the Chinese people as they seek more freedom. And it has helped us advance vital American interests, from seeking peace in Korea to reducing nuclear dangers in South Asia to promoting cleaner technologies for protection of our environment. A strategy of confrontation, by contrast, would likely push China toward angry isolation. That would clearly make the world more dangerous and undermine our hopes for greater democracy and human rights across the Asian continent.

A fourth major challenge is one that knows no borders. From the start this Administration has recognized that the very forces of integration that have helped spread freedom and prosperity -- technology and freedom of travel -- can be exploited by forces of disintegration: criminals and terrorists and their rogue state supporters.

We have been unrelenting in the fight against these enemies of democracy and peace. We have devised and implemented long-term strategies for combating terrorist groups, as well as international crime rings, for shielding our computer systems and other critical infrastructures against cyber-attacks, and for protecting our citizens against the threat of chemical and biological weapons.

We do not hesitate to take the fight directly to the terrorists. In August, after members of Usama bin Ladin's organization killed Americans, Kenyans and Tanzanians in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, and after we received information that bin Ladin planned more attacks against our citizens, we struck decisively against his terrorist camps and against the site of chemical weapons activity.

The final issue I want to address is one that now looms over virtually everything we do: the global financial crisis. In dealing with the world economy, we have, again, followed a long-term strategy: To break down barriers to trade and investment. To build strong economic partnerships and institutions. And, at the same time, to work for good education and training so no one is left behind. And to see that development does not lead to environmental peril.

This approach has contributed greatly to our unprecedented sustained economic growth. The President rarely fails to mention that one third of this growth since 1993 has come from trade with other countries.

Faced with the current global upheaval, the President has again taken the lead. He has proposed and begun to implement aggressive short term steps to restore confidence, address the crisis in Asia and keep it from deepening elsewhere. In addition, he has launched a pointed discussion about how to reshape the global financial architecture to address the challenges of the rapidly moving and rapidly changing marketplace.

But the President has also sought to address the economic situation in a broader context. We are at a critical turning point. For 50 years, we urged people around the world to choose democracy and free markets as the best way to protect their fundamental rights and realize their strongest aspirations. Now, with our strong support, many nations have made that choice -- across the

former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, throughout Latin Americas, and elsewhere.

Many of these countries are now at a crossroads. They must move beyond free elections and privatization of industry and make their systems deliver for all -- by rooting out corruption and cronyism; ensuring a free press and the free flow of ideas and information across borders; upholding the rule of law and protecting consumers; and providing equal opportunity through strong education and health care.

Deepening freedom and widening opportunity in these nations will not only protect individuals and their rights. It will also help a nation compete in the global economy of the new century. Investors and entrepreneurs increasingly have an ever-widening array of choices as to where to put their resources. They don't want to go to where the system is rigged, where insiders will be favored with bailouts, where they could get burned and have no recourse in the courts. They will move in the direction of openness and fairness.

But there is a serious risk today in nations where freedom is still fragile: That instead of reacting to hard times and the global crisis by further deepening democracy and opening markets, citizens will instead surrender their liberties to forces of reaction and turn inward, away from the global system.

That would be a blow for our economic interests, for our interest in justice and human rights, and, very clearly also, for our security. For, as the President has noted, around the world it is the authoritarian nations, without democracy and open markets, who are the aggressors and provocateurs. As he has said, "Nations that give their people freedom are good neighbors; when nations turn away from freedom, they turn toward tension, hatred and hostility."

So our security and our interest in supporting democracy will be directly affected by our ability to address the economic crisis -- by our ability to restore hope and preserve stability in nations, from Asia to Latin America, that are seeking to do the right thing for their people.

This is a full plate of issues, and there are many others I haven't even addressed. We are fortunate that, in meeting these challenges, we have a lot of support -- thousands of extremely dedicated, talented and courageous men and women in our foreign service, our intelligence agencies, our armed forces, and elsewhere. They are the strong and steady backbone of all our government does. We also have an international community that is increasingly united behind core principles we champion: democracy, human rights, free markets, and peaceful resolution of conflicts old and new.

But we also need resources. We need to work with Congress to provide adequate funding for military readiness, for our diplomacy, and to meet our obligations to multilateral institutions like the UN and the IMF.

[Congress is also our essential partner in the effort to increase security through verifiable treaties. On that score, let me conclude by mentioning a very important goal of this Administration for the coming year, and that is Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This agreement, signed by 149 nations, would ban all nuclear explosive testing. Senator Helms has called the treaty "worthless" now that India and Pakistan have conducted nuclear tests. He has compared it to "closing the stable door after the horses have galloped away." But in fact the dangerous arms competition in South Asia makes it more critical than ever to act, while the horses are still in the corral and before there is a stampede. It is an extraordinary opportunity to slow the spread of nuclear weapons, and increase our capability to monitor suspicious activity

overseas.

The Treaty is endorsed by four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as all of the current members. The Senate should exercise leadership and ratify this treaty as soon as possible.]

Now, I know many of you will react to my remarks with this question: What's the story of the day? To which I would reply, have a happy Halloween. Now, I'm glad to take your questions.

#

4

8

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/98 7:06:30 AM
FROM Bouchard, Joseph F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreasen, Steven P.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Steve,

Please take a look at the CTBT paragraph in brackets on page 8. I would recommend it stay in, but defer to you on its wording.

Joe
Bouchard

-----Original Message-----
From: Halperin, David E.

Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 1998 9:31 PM
To: @AFRICA - African Affairs; @ASIA - Asian Affairs; @CEE - Central/Eastern Europe; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; Sandalow, David B.; @EUROPE - European Affairs; @INTERAM - Inter-American; @INTECON - Economic Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @MULTILAT - Multilateral and Humanitarian Affairs; @NESASIA - NE/South Asia; @NONPRO - Export Controls; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine; @TRANSNATIONAL - Transnational Threats
Cc: @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Subject: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]

Multiple colleagues --
Draft for
SRB remarks Friday at National Press Club before q & a. Given time constraints, this draft is already with Sandy, but I'm still seeking your comments. Please offer any and all by 4 pm Thursday. Thanks.

(Note:

Sandy is scheduled to speak for 10-12 minutes. These remarks stretch to 15-16. Will have to cut.)

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

srb press club 10-98 2.doc
10/28/98 9:30 pm
SAMUEL R. BERGER
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY
AFFAIRS
OPENING REMARKS AT NATIONAL PRESS CLUB
WASHINGTON, D.C.
OCTOBER 30, 1998

Thank you for having me here today.

As journalists, you spend a lot of time chasing the story of the day. Something similar happens at the National Security Council -- a crisis of the day, sometimes two or three crises of the day. But many of you also have strong sense of what you want to accomplish with your journalism over the long term. Similarly, the Clinton Administration's foreign policy effort is guided by a vision of what we would like the world to look like. We are determined not to let what is urgent crowd out what is essential for the long-term security and prosperity of the American people.

I want to take your questions today, but let me first speak for a few minutes about some of the events of the past few months and try to give you sense of how our actions relate to our long-term goals. I want to focus on five areas:

Europe, the Middle East, Asia, terrorism and the global financial situation.

First, Europe and, particularly the situation in Kosovo. During his first trip to Europe as President in early 1994, President Clinton set out a vision of a continent democratic, undivided and at peace for the first time in history -- and we have worked hard to help our European friends achieve that. When you consider the terrible carnage in Europe over many centuries, particularly the first half of this century, and consider the tense Cold War stand-off we had less

than a decade ago, it is remarkable how close we are to that vision today. The United States has led the way in adapting NATO to the changes in Europe and to new missions. Now an expanded NATO, with the addition of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, and strong practical cooperation with Russia and Ukraine, will make Europe more stable. Meanwhile, a strengthened European Union and the global trade liberalization we have pursued is helping to make Europe more prosperous.

The biggest obstacle to realizing our vision for Europe now can be summed up in two words: Slobodan Milosevic. He has been an ethnic supremacist, an enemy of human rights and self-government, an aggressor whose ambitions threaten the fragile stability of the Balkans. But in Bosnia and now in Kosovo, through NATO and the broader international community, we have mobilized in support of ending violence and repression and building a just and durable peace -- using aggressive diplomacy, firmly backed by armed force.

As the President said this week, there is still hard road ahead in Kosovo. But NATO's resolve has compelled Milosevic to very substantially comply with the demands of the international community. The Serb police and military units deployed to Kosovo to repress the ethnic Albanians have almost all been pulled out or placed in garrison. Roadblocks are down and heavy weapons in cantonment. Tens of thousands of Kosovar Albanians, who just weeks ago faced the mortal peril of a winter without shelter, are returning to their homes, aided by an influx of international relief workers.

Milosevic's effort to strip the Kosovars of their freedoms completely backfired; and now he has made unilateral concessions: to permit internationally-supervised democratic elections, to allow the Kosovars to establish their own police force,

to restore the substantial autonomy they once had. And now the eyes of the world are on Kosovo, with an intrusive monitoring plan to make sure Milosevic stays in compliance with the commitments he has made.

Second, let me discuss the Middle East. Central to our policy has been our belief that keeping the peace process on track is not only vital to the security of Israelis and Palestinians -- it also radiates hope across the entire region. It energizes moderate Arab states to stand strong for reconciliation and against terrorism -- and against the aggression of Saddam Hussein. Time and again, the President has used the prestige of his office and his unique powers of persuasion to move the process forward -- with the White House signing of the first interim accords; the peace agreement between Israel and Jordan; the Summit of the Peacemakers at Sharm el Sheik; and the 1997 Hebron agreement. We are under no illusions that the breakthrough at Wye River -- after nine days of tough negotiating led by the President -- will allow us to coast to a final settlement. There will be setbacks, and likely more violence. But there is hope and a clear path to follow.

Our involvement in promoting an end to conflict in Kosovo and Bosnia, in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, on the border between Peru and Ecuador, is driven by a compelling fact: Drawing not only on our power but also on our diversity and ideals, America can often be the decisive force for peace. We can't be everywhere or do everything. But we should and we must be ready to engage -- with diplomacy and, if necessary, force -- where important interests and values are at stake and we can make a difference.

Third, let me mention Asia. Upon taking office, President Clinton offered a vision of the United States as a guiding member of a new community -- an

Asia-Pacific community, and he soon convened the first-ever Asia-Pacific summit meeting. As we have proceeded, the cornerstones of our Asia policy have been our long-standing alliance with Japan and our growing engagement with China.

We all understand the importance of a strong Japan for the long-term stability and prosperity of Asia. And we know the role China plays will have a profound impact on the new century -- for better or for worse -- on weapons of mass destruction; on crime and drugs; on trade; on regional conflicts; on human rights. So as to China we have stayed on a steady course: expanding areas of cooperation while dealing directly with our differences, as the President did during his visit there last summer.

This approach has brought results, though still far from enough. China is becoming more open, not just to commerce but to ideas. Our engagement is helping to empower the Chinese people as they seek more freedom. And it has helped us advance vital American interests, from seeking peace in Korea to reducing nuclear dangers in South Asia to promoting cleaner technologies for protection of our environment. A strategy of confrontation, by contrast, would likely push China toward angry isolation. That would clearly make the world more dangerous and undermine our hopes for greater democracy and human rights across the Asian continent.

A fourth major challenge is one that knows no borders. From the start this Administration has recognized that the very forces of integration that have helped spread freedom and prosperity -- technology and freedom of travel -- can be exploited by forces of disintegration: criminals and terrorists and their rogue state supporters.

We have been unrelenting in the fight against these enemies of

democracy and
peace. We have devised and implemented long-term strategies for
combating
terrorist groups, as well as international crime rings, for shielding our
computer systems and other critical infrastructures against cyber-
attacks, and
for protecting our citizens against the threat of chemical and
biological
weapons.

We do not hesitate to take the fight directly to the terrorists. In
August,
after members of Usama bin Ladin's organization killed Americans,
Kenyans and
Tanzanians in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, and after we received
information that
bin Ladin planned more attacks against our citizens, we struck
decisively against
his terrorist camps and against the site of chemical weapons activity.

The final issue I want to address is one that now looms over virtually
everything
we do: the global financial crisis. In dealing with the world economy,
we have,
again, followed a long-term strategy: To break down barriers to trade
and
investment. To build strong economic partnerships and institutions.
And, at the
same time, to work for good education and training so no one is left
behind. And
to see that development does not lead to environmental peril.

This approach has contributed greatly to our unprecedented sustained
economic
growth. The President rarely fails to mention that one third of this
growth
since 1993 has come from trade with other countries.

Faced with the current global upheaval, the President has again taken
the lead.
He has proposed and begun to implement aggressive short term steps
to restore
confidence, address the crisis in Asia and keep it from deepening
elsewhere. In
addition, he has launched a pointed discussion about how to reshape
the global
financial architecture to address the challenges of the rapidly moving
and
rapidly changing marketplace.

But the President has also sought to address the economic situation in a broader context. We are at a critical turning point. For 50 years, we urged people around the world to choose democracy and free markets as the best way to protect their fundamental rights and realize their strongest aspirations. Now, with our strong support, many nations have made that choice -- across the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, throughout Latin Americas, and elsewhere.

Many of these countries are now at a crossroads. They must move beyond free elections and privatization of industry and make their systems deliver for all -- by rooting out corruption and cronyism; ensuring a free press and the free flow of ideas and information across borders; upholding the rule of law and protecting consumers; and providing equal opportunity through strong education and health care.

Deepening freedom and widening opportunity in these nations will not only protect individuals and their rights. It will also help a nation compete in the global economy of the new century. Investors and entrepreneurs increasingly have an ever-widening array of choices as to where to put their resources. They don't want to go to where the system is rigged, where insiders will be favored with bailouts, where they could get burned and have no recourse in the courts. They will move in the direction of openness and fairness.

But there is a serious risk today in nations where freedom is still fragile: That instead of reacting to hard times and the global crisis by further deepening democracy and opening markets, citizens will instead surrender their liberties to forces of reaction and turn inward, away from the global system.

That would be a blow for our economic interests, for our interest in justice and human rights, and, very clearly also, for our security. For, as the

President
has noted, around the world it is the authoritarian nations, without
democracy
and open markets, who are the aggressors and provocateurs. As he has
said,
"Nations that give their people freedom are good neighbors; when
nations turn
away from freedom, they turn toward tension, hatred and hostility."

So our security and our interest in supporting democracy will be
directly
affected by our ability to address the economic crisis -- by our ability
to
restore hope and preserve stability in nations, from Asia to Latin
America, that
are seeking to do the right thing for their people.

This is a full plate of issues, and there are many others I haven't even
addressed. We are fortunate that, in meeting these challenges, we have
a lot of
support -- thousands of extremely dedicated, talented and courageous
men and
women in our foreign service, our intelligence agencies, our armed
forces, and
elsewhere. They are the strong and steady backbone of all our
government does.
We also have an international community that is increasingly united
behind core
principles we champion: democracy, human rights, free markets, and
peaceful
resolution of conflicts old and new.

But we also need resources. We need to work with Congress to
provide adequate
funding for military readiness, for our diplomacy, and to meet our
obligations to
multilateral institutions like the UN and the IMF.

[Congress is also our essential partner in the effort to increase security
through verifiable treaties. On that score, let me conclude by
mentioning a very
important goal of this Administration for the coming year, and that is
Senate
ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This agreement,
signed by 149
nations, would ban all nuclear explosive testing. Senator Helms has
called the
treaty "worthless" now that India and Pakistan have conducted nuclear
tests. He

has compared it to "closing the stable door after the horses have galloped away."
But in fact the dangerous arms competition in South Asia makes it more critical than ever to act, while the horses are still in the corral and before there is a stampede. It is an extraordinary opportunity to slow the spread of nuclear weapons, and increase our capability to monitor suspicious activity overseas.
The Treaty is endorsed by four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as all of the current members. The Senate should exercise leadership and ratify this treaty as soon as possible.]

Now, I know many of you will react to my remarks with this question: What's the story of the day? To which I would reply, have a happy Halloween. Now, I'm glad to take your questions.

###

4

8