

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/98 7:40:46 AM
FROM Schulte, Gregory L.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Halperin, David E.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY good speech. pls see my one addition

-----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. And NATO has

retained the authority, the forces and the readiness to act if Milosevic backslides on his commitments.

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

3

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/98 8:39:13 AM
FROM Bader, Jeffrey A.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Arvizu, Alexander A.
Bader, Jeffrey A.
Heitkotter, Karen R.
Lieberthal, Kenneth C.
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Russ, Judith P.
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Jack, I've done some further fiddling with the Japan-China section. Didn't want to say that the US-Japan alliance enables us to pursue engagement with China, also didn't want to neglect our other allies. How does this look? Jeff

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

From: Pritchard,
Charles (Jack) L.
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 1998 8:25 AM
To: @ASIA
- Asian Affairs
Subject: FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]

All,

I
have made some edits, particularly regarding Korea, but also a Japan-China
sentence as well. Please take a look and adjust as necessary so
we can forward to Halperin this morning.

Jack

-----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 a 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 a 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, Northern Ireland, and 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 cornerstone of our Asia policy has been our long-standing alliance with Japan. Our security interests in the region are built on our system of alliances, our military forward deployment, and our growing engagement with China. (looking for a way not to lump Japan and China in the same "cornerstone" category. Need to have a clear distinction that Japan is the cornerstone as we engage China - without diminishing the importance of what we are doing with China. Japanese are paranoid enough.)

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.

(Don't know how we get away not having a couple of sentences on North Korea. If you can include them, would suggest something like: When the Clinton Administration came to office we faced an extraordinary challenge in North Korea. The North was actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program that threatened to destabilize the entire region. The result of our efforts was the Agreed Framework. While there are plenty of arm-chair critics, the Agreement did stop the production of plutonium that left unchecked would have led to an unacceptable and unstable situation. Today we have concerns about suspect underground construction that may lead to a violation of the Agreed Framework. We are not content to wait and see what develops. We have begun the process to determine to our full satisfaction that the North is not engaged in a clandestine effort to produce a nuclear-related facility in violation of the Agreed Framework. On November 16, we will have a team in Pyongyang to further work toward a resolution of our concerns.)

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

4

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/98 9:15:43 AM
FROM Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Arvizu, Alexander A.
 Bader, Jeffrey A.
 Heitkotter, Karen R.
 Lieberthal, Kenneth C.
 Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
 Russ, Judith P.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

Ken,

This incorporates Jeff, Alex and my comments. If you agree we will forward to Halperin (speech writer).

Jack

-----Original

Message-----

From: Bader, Jeffrey A.

Sent: Thursday, October 29, 1998 8:39 AM

To: @ASIA - Asian Affairs; Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.

Subject: FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]

Jack,

I've done some further fiddling with the Japan-China section. Didn't want to say that the US-Japan alliance enables us to pursue engagement with China, also didn't want to neglect our other allies. How does this look? Jeff

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

From: Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.

Sent: Thursday, October 29, 1998 8:25 AM

To: @ASIA - Asian Affairs

Subject: FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]

All,

I have made some edits, particularly regarding Korea, but also a Japan-China sentence as well. Please take a look and adjust as necessary so we can forward to Halperin this morning.

Jack

-----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 a 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 a 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, Northern Ireland, and 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 cornerstone of our Asia policy has been our long-standing alliance with Japan. Our security interests in the region are built on our system of alliances, our military forward deployment, and our growing engagement with China. (looking for a way not to lump Japan and China in the same "cornerstone" category. Need to have a clear distinction that

Japan is
the cornerstone as we engage China - without diminishing the
importance of what
we are doing with China. Japanese are paranoid enough.)

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.

(Don't know how we get away not having a couple of sentences on
North Korea.
If you can include them, would suggest something like: When the
Clinton
Administration came to office we faced an extraordinary challenge in
North Korea.
The North was actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program that
threatened to
destabilize the entire region. The result of our efforts was the Agreed
Framework. While there are plenty of arm-chair critics, the
Agreement did stop
the production of plutonium that left unchecked would have led to an
unacceptable

and unstable situation. Today we have concerns about suspect underground construction that may lead to a violation of the Agreed Framework. We are not content to wait and see what develops. We have begun the process to determine to our full satisfaction that the North is not engaged in a clandestine effort to produce a nuclear-related facility in violation of the Agreed Framework. On November 16, we will have a team in Pyongyang to further work toward a resolution of our concerns.)

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.
(Might want to insert a line or two about the President's trip to APEC
and our
main objectives in this discussion - as a concrete example of U.S.
leadership and
ideas working together with Leaders from several major economies to
tackle the
financial crisis.)
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

9

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/98 9:28:28 AM
FROM Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Halperin, David E.

CARBON_COPY Arvizu, Alexander A.
Bader, Jeffrey A.
Heitkotter, Karen R.
Lieberthal, Kenneth C.
Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Russ, Judith P.

TEXT_BODY David,
Edits from all 4 of us for you to consider.

jack

-----Original
Message-----
From: Pritchard, Charles (Jack) L.
Sent: Thursday,
October 29, 1998 9:16 AM
To: @ASIA - Asian Affairs
Subject: FW:
Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]

-----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 a 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 a 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, Northern Ireland, and 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 cornerstone of our Asia policy
has been our
long-standing alliance with Japan. Our security interests in the region
are
built on our system of alliances, our military forward deployment, and
one of our
most important accomplishments -- our growing engagement with
China. (looking
for a way not to lump Japan and China in the same "cornerstone"
category. Need
to have a clear distinction that Japan is the cornerstone as we engage
China -
without diminishing the importance of what we are doing with China.
Japanese are
paranoid enough.)

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.

(Don't know how we get away not having a couple of sentences on
North Korea.
If you can include them, would suggest something like: When the
Clinton
Administration came to office we faced an extraordinary challenge in
North Korea.
The North was actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program that
threatened to
destabilize the entire region. The result of our efforts was the Agreed
Framework. While there are plenty of arm-chair critics, the
Agreement did stop
the production of plutonium that left unchecked would have led to an
unacceptable
and unstable situation. Today we have concerns about suspect
underground
construction that may lead to a violation of the Agreed Framework.
We are not
content to wait and see what develops. We have begun the process to
determine to
our full satisfaction that the North is not engaged in a clandestine
effort to
produce a nuclear-related facility in violation of the Agreed
Framework. On
November 16, we will have a team in Pyongyang to further work
toward a resolution
of our concerns.)

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. (Might want to insert a line or two about the President's trip to APEC and our main objectives in this discussion - as a concrete example of U.S. leadership and ideas working together with Leaders from several major economies to tackle the financial crisis.) 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

4

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/29/98 10:37:24 AM

FROM McEldowney, Nancy E.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]

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

CARBON_COPY Bandler, Donald K.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keirn C.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Dowling, John N. (Nick)
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Gordon, Philip H.
Hurley, C. Michael
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Quinn, Mary E.
Sapiro, Miriam E.
Schulte, Gregory L.
Uyehara, Margaret A.

TEXT_BODY Dave: thought it looked very good. Made two minor nits to NATO language, trying to underscore success of NATO's efforts.

-----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 enlarged 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's determination and cooperation of 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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/30/98 8:26:43 AM
FROM Barks-Ruggles, Erica
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Halperin, David E.

CARBON_COPY Barks-Ruggles, Erica
Battenfield, Pat A.
Prendergast, John P.
Sanders, Robin R.
Smith, Gayle E.

TEXT_BODY David - apologies. I thought this had been forwarded to you yesterday.

If there is still time to include any of this language, we would appreciate it. But if not, it is our fault for not getting it to you on time. I apologize for my zinger yesterday - as I said, I thought this had gone to you yesterday morning. - Erica

-----Original

Message-----

From: Prendergast, John P.
Sent: Thursday, October
29, 1998 10:09 AM
To: @AFRICA - African Affairs
Subject: FW: Draft
for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

added
two things in the para you asked for input into

-----Original

Message-----

From: Barks-Ruggles, Erica
Sent: Thursday, October
29, 1998 8:35 AM
To: Sanders, Robin R.; Prendergast, John P.
Cc: @AFRICA
- African Affairs
Subject: FW: Draft for SRB remarks Friday [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

My
suggestions. Let's add together and then Robin can send one piece
back to David from all of us. - Erica

-----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, Congo and Bosnia, in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, on the borders between Peru and Ecuador and between Ethiopia and Eritrea, working to prevent genocide's resurgence in the Great Lakes, 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. Africa colleagues: shouldn't we get him to say something about Ethiopia/Eritrea and our efforts there, Angola?, DROC? Preventing genocide?

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 and democracy. 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 hundreds of

Americans,
Kenyans and Tanzanians in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam in cowardly attacks against innocent people, we received information that bin Ladin planned more attacks against our citizens. We acted decisively to protect our interest and the lives of our citizens, and we struck his organization's infrastructure - his terrorist camps and 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 America, Africa, 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. The President today [if we can get it approved in time] announced that the first annual U.S.-Africa Economic Cooperation Forum will take place in Washington in early December. This expansion of the dialogue on trade, investment in the future, and enlarging the circle of democratic and free-market nations on the world's poorest continent is yet another piece of the President's efforts to build a truly global economy where no one is left behind.

Deepening freedom and widening opportunity in these nations will not only protect individuals and their rights. It will also help nations 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, transparency, and a level playing field..

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 collective economic interests, for our interest in justice and human rights, and, very clearly also, for global 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 Africa 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

3

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 11/3/98 6:30:05 PM

FROM Blinken, Antony J.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT CWC Strategic Calendar [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Gobush, Matthew N.

CARBON_COPY Gray, Wendy E.

TEXT_BODY Matt -- voila. please tell tom this is just an example -- he should do whatever works for him.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT COMPLAN3.DOC
CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION WORKING GROUP
COMMUNICATIONS PLAN
As of 3/31/97

DATE
EVENT
STATUS/FOLLOW UP

DECEMB

12/9/96

Meeting w/Arms Control NGOs & Industry Reps. Bell/NSC hosts, conveys
Administration commitment to CWC, solicits views, help.

* Meeting Held.
12/16/96
White House Small Business Conference. Presentation by Lader (SBA), Goldman (Commerce) re. impact of CWC on small business, negative consequences if we fail to ratify.

* Letter from Reinsch (Commerce) to NFIB. NFIB no longer opposes. (WSJ)

12/19/96

Meeting with Veterans Service Organizations. Bell/NSC hosts to convey
Administration commitment, solicit views, help.

* DoD 300 word op/ed submitted to VFW, AL newsltr. Excerpts to appear in March

issue of Dispatch and April issue of magazine. Status?

* DoD working 1000 word Cohen op/ed -- Submitting to WP for 4/4.

* ROA published pro-CWC piece in Feb. newsletter. 100K circ

12/96

End-of-Year/Tenure Wrap Ups - Year Ahead Previews. Encourage Principals to cite
CWC as crucial unfinished business.

P.A. offices circulated memo, reminders.

DATE

EVENT

STATUS/FOLLOW UP

JANUARY

1/6/97

Zumwalt Op Ed.

* Appeared WP 1/6/97.

1/7/97

GWJ Event. Mention in POTUS remarks.

* Done

1/8/97

Albright Testimony.

* Statement included strong reference. Lugar raised in Q&A

1/13/97

4th Anniversary of CWC Signing

* White House, State statements issued.

* Lead editorial in NYT.

1/17/97

League of Women Voters Meeting.

* Bell/NSC spoke

* Assigned lobbyist to issue

* Put in action alert for March sent to all regional offices

1/97

Confirmation Hearings/Budget Meetings. Nominees should signal importance of CWC in statements to/meetings with Senate.

* Memos sent by CWCWG

* In Albright, Cohen, Daley testimony.

FEBRUARY

2/4/97

State of the Union. Strong pitch by POTUS.

* Previewed for Hill

* CWC highlighted in SOU.

* Blast fax sent to media, NGOs, VSOs, Hill, industry, business

2/6/97

National Prayer Breakfast. Put in POTUS remarks.

* WH/OPL sending packages to newsletters.

* WH/OPL follow up w/Franklin Graham.

DATE

EVENT

STATUS/FOLLOW UP

2/8/97

Albright - Bush Meeting. Will raise CWC. Possible public statements.

* Strong statements from Bush, Baker blast faxed.

2/10-11/97

Commerce Department Exporters Conference.

* Reinsch to address/Goldman work shop

* completed

2/10/97

VFW Annual Meeting. Solicit endorsement.

* Lodal/DoD and Krulak/Marines spoke.

* SecDef called.

* VFW endorsed 2/13

2/11/97

Scowcroft/Deutch Op/Ed in WashPost

* Blast faxed

2/16/97

Baker Op/Ed in NYT.

* Blast Faxed

2/17/97

Reserve Officers Association Meeting. Solicit endorsement.

* Fogleman/AF, Reimer/A and Perry spoke

* SecDef called

* ROA endorsed 2/18

2/26/97

SecDef-Saudi DPM Meeting.

* Joint statement underscored importance of CWC, praised Saudi Arabia for ratifying.

2/26/97

World Trade Center Bombing Anniversary. Highlight anti-terrorism benefits of CWC and implementing legislation.

* AG statement at weekly briefing.

* AG mention in rmks to police association 2

* AG op/ed turned down by WSJ.

* ADL statement issued

* Tps sent to all US attorneys for op/eds, comments to press.

* Mentioned in Chilean press avail.

DATE

EVENT

STATUS/FOLLOW UP

2/28/97

Gulf War Cease-Fire Anniversary. Highlight increased safety for troops.

- * Bacon led DoD briefing
- * SecDef highlighted in statement w/ Saudi DPM
- * VVA, NPGRC & AMVets letter to Hill.

MARCH

Wk. of 3/3/97

United Methodist Church Board Meeting. Put on agenda.

- * OPL follow up.

3/3/97

FLOTUS Speech to American Legion Women.

- * Spoke on CWC and GWI

3/3/97

Reno Letter to Sen. Lott re. Constitutionality.

- * sent.
- * Justice to follow up on sending to all members. Status?

3/3/97

American Legion Meeting.

- * Provide speakers for plenary and foreign policy panel. Lead: Jones/VA

- * Murray/Gaffney Debate

* UnderSecDef Hamre and Holbrooke spoke

3/6/97

Holum Speech to CMA and BENS

* Delivered

3/11/97

CFR Debate.

* Need debater versus Richard Perle

* Holum vs. Perle

DATE

EVENT

STATUS/FOLLOW UP

3/20/97

Tokyo Subway Sarin Gas Attack Anniversary.

* POTUS press statement released.

* Enviro coalition used as peg for endorsmnt.

* BENS briefing for health/hospital leaders with Lederberg, NYC

* NPC breakfast sponsored by PGTF.

3/21/97

Senate Recess Press Plan. Information campaign targeted to states with undecided

senators. Lead: Dillon/ACDA.

* Mailings sent to reporters, ed. boards.

* Status of calls?

3/21/97

POTUS-Yeltsin Joint Summit Statement

* Issued.

* In POTUS statement.

3/25/97

SecState Day in N. Carolina with Sen. Helms.

* Albright speech featured CWC.

* Helms statement

APRIL

Wk. of 4/1/97

Implement Endgame Communications Plan.

* ACDA Breakout plan

4/4/97

White House Event. Remarks by POTUS, others. Invitees: cabinet officials, Bush, Reagan officials, industry, small business, arms control NGOs, VSOs, religious community etc....

* NSC to invite

* Finalize fact sheets

* Liaison w/VP

4/4/97

White House Post Event Briefing. To provide details on status/substance of treaty.

* Briefers: SRB intro. Bell, Holum,Reinsch, General Byron

4/9/97

Berger Briefing for Freshman Senators. Consider POTUS drop-by. Lead: Danvers.

4/19/97

Oklahoma City Anniversary

4/29/97

CWC ENTERS INTO FORCE

ACTION ITEMS

ISSUE/IDEA/EVENT

STATUS/FOLLOW-UP

1. Liaison to Poison Gas Task Force (20 NGOs, incld. BENS, CMA)

- * Murray in contact person.
- * Doing regular Hill briefings.
- * Letter writing, blast fax campaign.

2. Rapid reaction to respond to attacks.

- * PGTF + ACDA

3. Set up weekly "Blast Fax"

- * Up and running. ACDA coordinator.
- * Issues not covered? (Myths and Facts. Kyl legislation. April 29? Constitutionality. Non-Proliferation. Verifiability.)

4. Kyl Alternative

- * Rebuttal Tps (Harris, Murray, Dillon)
- * Dear Colleague (Bendick)
- * SAP (wait until mark-up)

5. Update Vote Count

- * Bendick/NSC for 3/10.

6. Outreach to Scientific community

- * Epstein/OSTP action

7. Outreach to Enviros, others

- * Coalition of enviro. grps. endorsed 3/20.
- * Human Rights groups: Feinstein to follow up w/McAfee.

8. Use ratifications as op/ed pegs

- * ACDA watching brief

9. Regular reminder to Principals, Sub-Cabinet to work CWC into speeches, testimony, op-eds, Hill meetings, conferences.

- * All agencies to do weekly preview of events, send reminders.

10. Review effect of non-ratification on US companies with chemical cleanup contracts

- * Giglio/DoD provided list of affected co's (3/21).
- * Epstein mentioned in talk to Environmental Policy Advisory Grp. at Commerce.

11. Set up home page/web site

* Dillon/ACADA. Up and running.

ACTION ITEMS

ISSUE/IDEA/EVENT STATUS/FOLLOW-UP

12. Outreach to Vets.

- * RCA Issue: (i) response to AFA?; (ii) insert in fact/fiction sheet.
- * Bell briefing for VSOs? (Harris)
- * Endorsement letter?

13. Outreach to doctors/AMA

- * Bell, OPL follow up (2/21)

14. Observe landmark in stockpile destruction

- * Giglio/DoD follow up (2/21)
- * Status of Russian visits?

15. Targetted outreach

- * Discuss target list, plan

16. Polling Data

- * Need to highlight.
- * USA Today Snapshot?

17. Chem Defenses -- underscore commitment

- * Horn/DoD to pursue.
- * In fact and fiction.

18. DoD Q&A for USA Today.

- * W/Bacon (3/17). Status?

19. All agencies brief key constituences post-WH event -- Under Secretary briefing, Prinipal drop-by.

- * Factor into endgame communications plan.

20. CMA video. For TV feed after WH event. Scowcroft, Schwartzkopf to take part. Will film POTUS at event. Want soundbite from other admin official.

- * SecDef has taped.
- * SecState? (Feinstein)

* NSA? AG?

21. Pentagon Report on military implications

* With SecDef (3/24). Status?

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 11/5/98 7:48:44 AM
FROM Bouchard, Joseph F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: LOS Strategy Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Peterman, David (Brian)
CARBON_COPY Bell, Robert G.

TEXT_BODY

Yes, there is a list. Actually, two: (a) The State letter to Helms (one is sent at start of each session of Congress -- should see another in February or March). LOS is in the top category on that priority list (with a dozen other treaties). (b) the APNSA Foreign Policy Agenda memo to the President (LOS didn't even make it on that list the last two years). Stop by and I'll give you the State letter.

In addition to CTBT, several other treaties and foreign policy-related legislation rank above LOS: Kyoto (not yet submitted to Senate), ABM demarcation and succession agreements (not yet submitted to Senate), Africa trade bill, fastrack authority bill, Caribbean Basin Initiative bill, and UN arrears, to name a few.

And, oh by the way, a number of foreign policy issues rank above LOS in the Congress, which do not include any of the above (other than the ones Helms wants so he can kill them). Examples of hot button issues in Congress include the Mexico City amendment (banning funds for organizations that support abortion), various human rights bills, various anti-China bills, various anti-Russia bills, and undoubtedly bills that would impose sanctions on the few countries not covered by existing sanctions (Andorra and San Marino are the only two I can think of).

So, my two bits would be to look toward a long-term strategy: one laying groundwork for a full court press to gain Senate advice and consent beginning in 2001.

Joe Bouchard

-----Original Message-----
From: Peterman,
David (Brian)

Sent: Thursday, November 05, 1998 7:01 AM
To: Bouchard,
Joseph F.
Cc: Bell, Robert G.
Subject: RE: LOS Strategy Meeting
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Joe- Thanks very much for you insights. Although you stated it much more eloquently than me, the points you make here are generally what I told Mary Beth. Is there actually a WH treaty priority list on paper? If yes, I'd like to get a copy to back up my further conversations with State. Bob already told me CTBT ratification is our most important effort with Helms.

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

From: Bouchard,
Joseph F.
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 1998 6:23 PM
To: Peterman,
David (Brian)
Cc: Bell, Robert G.
Subject: RE: LOS Strategy Meeting
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Brian,

My reactions:

- * Any approach we try is doomed to failure as long as Senator Helms chairs the SFRC unless we are willing to sacrifice other treaties that are higher on his "must kill" list. Unfortunately, the treaties higher than LOS on his hit list are also higher on the WH ratification priority list. So, trading treaties does not appear to be a viable option.

- * There

were three reasons for the low visibility approach we took this year:

- * A

high visibility WH approach merely would have increased the value of the LOS treaty as a hostage Helms could use to force concessions from the Administration. Given that LOS is not #1 on WH priority list, raising the price of the concessions was (and still is) a non-starter.

- * A

high visibility approach by anyone/everyone else would appear to portray Helms as the lone holdout against the treaty, an image he seems to relish. Our strategy was (a) minimal press until hearings scheduled (only enough to counter occasional anti-treaty sniping in the press, which only happened twice from June 1997 to September 1998); (b) big press push one hearings scheduled, continuing until floor vote; and (c) no broad, high visibility push on Hill until

LOS treaty reported out of SFRC (we made extensive efforts on Hill with Senate Republican leadership -- won everyone, from Lott on down, except Helms).

* Once we go "high visibility," the environmentalists are going to charge the Hill like a hoard of Visigoths. My worst nightmare over the last 18 months was that Ted Danson would appear in a TV commercial holding a fluffy white harp seal pup begging, with tears running down his cheeks, "Senator Helms, let the treaty be ratified to save this poor little guy." We won the Republican leadership by emphasizing national security and commercial grounds for ratification. A strong environmental message runs the risk of alienating the Republicans. We already have essentially 100% Democratic support for the treaty.

* Incidentally, Secretary Albright has been steadfastly lukewarm on the treaty. It isn't anywhere near the top of her list.

Joe Bouchard

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

From: Peterman,
David (Brian)
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 1998 5:36 PM
To: Bouchard,
Joseph F.
Cc: Bell, Robert G.
Subject: LOS Strategy Meeting [UNCLASSIFIED]

Joe-

I attended the LOS strategy meeting at State this afternoon. My initial reaction comes from a Laurel and Hardy movie, "This is another fine mess you've gotten me into." At least it doesn't look as bad as whales.

The IWG wants to start another full court press towards ratification of the LOS. They feel the last campaign was unsuccessful because it didn't bring pressure from industry to bear on Senator Helms. They also feel there wasn't enough visibility of the efforts of DoS, DoC, DoD, and the WH to rally support from outside government. Here are some of the strategies discussed today:

- 1) WH call
a Principles meeting to galvanize support for another LOS ratification campaign.
- 2) Engage industry in supporting ratification.
- 3) WH/key
administration people support ratification often and loud.
- 4) Hire
a well-known name to coordinate ratification campaign (employee of

NSC or State?)

5) Sound out key Congressional supporters for best strategy to follow.

After the meeting I spoke with Mary Beth West and Ash Roach. I told them I would come back and try to determine where LOS ratification sat on the administration's priority list, but I didn't think it was at the top of things to get done. I suggested they needed to convince their Under Secretaries to convince their Secretaries that LOS needs to be a top priority. In turn, the Secretaries need to bring this to the WH and sell it if they want it to happen.

I questioned them about timing. With the 15 Nov "loss of seat" deadline past, it seemed the previous argument of urgency is moot. Now they say we haven't really lost the seat until August when elections are held to fill the seat. If we ratify the treaty before then, we can still run to fill the seat.

Any thoughts on how best to proceed?

I'm inclined to let the IWG members see what kind of support they can muster within their Departments before we start on a quest.

Brian
Peterman
NSC Defense Directorate
Ext. 69188