

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Gary Samore to Jack Segal. Subject: [Points for Foreign Policy Breakfast] [50 USC app. 2411(c)(1)] (3 pages)	02/22/2000	P3/b(3)
002. email	Jack Segal to Andrew Weiss, Gary Samore, Steven Black et al. Subject: Clearance needed for ABC Lunch Item. (3 pages)	02/25/2000	P1/b(1)
003. email	Jack Segal to Miles Lackey and Mark Tavlarides. Subject: ABC Lunch Item. (3 pages)	02/28/2000	P1/b(1)
004. email	Gary Samore to Brooks Bash, Robert Bradtke, Bathsheba Crocker et al. Subject: FW: ABC Lunch Item. (3 pages)	02/28/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/15/2000-04/13/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5674

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 02/15/2000 3:06:42 PM
FROM Segal, Jack D. (NONPRO)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: HR1883 - Helms/Gilman Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO)
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Medish, Mark C. (RUE)
Weiss, Andrew S. (RUE)
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)
Black, Steven K. (VP)
Saunders, Richard M. (VP)
Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

MKA's letter to the Chairmen would accompany the notification about the license for the technical cooperation agreement (TCA), which is the heart of the project. Eric clarified that the pending issues regarding licensing which were mentioned to me yesterday are not connected to the TCA, but to licenses for sub-elements of the program.
JS

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

From: Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO)

Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2000 3:03 PM

To: Segal, Jack D. (NONPRO);

Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Medish, Mark C. (RUE); Weiss, Andrew

S. (RUE); Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS); Black, Steven K. (VP);

Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)

Subject: RE:

HR1883 - Helms/Gilman Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

I guess main thing
is to keep DoD patient. Is there some reason in the project why
the letter has to go now?

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

From: Segal,
Jack D. (NONPRO)

Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2000 1:44 PM

To: Samore,

Gary S. (NONPRO); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Medish, Mark C. (RUE);

Weiss, Andrew S. (RUE); Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS); Black, Steven K. (VP); Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)
Subject: HR1883
- Helms/Gilman Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

Eric Newsom reports that
Gilman staff's draft letter to Albright has gone to Marshall Billingsley.
Sen Helms reportedly will sign it today or tomorrow and it will
then go to Gilman for his signature. No word on what it says, but
Eric said that if -- as is likely -- it demands "tranche-ing," MKA
would respond that we cannot agree to that because the project is
a national security priority. The internal State process -- digesting
the letter, drafting and clearing a reply and getting MKA to focus
on it -- could take a while.

Once the letter is sprung, we may
need to call a small meeting here to keep things moving. JS

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 02/15/2000 5:43:11 PM
FROM Segal, Jack D. (NONPRO)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: HR1883 - Helms/Gilman Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Black, Steven K. (VP)
Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO)
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Weiss, Andrew S. (RUE)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

They've been on recess until two weeks ago. Consultations began as soon as they got back, then this letter idea surfaced.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Black, Steven K. (VP)
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2000 5:35 PM
To: Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO); Segal, Jack D. (NONPRO); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Medish, Mark C. (RUE); Weiss, Andrew S. (RUE); Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS); Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)
Subject: RE: HR1883 - Helms/Gilman Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

DoD has been patient for a long time. There was a Principals' decision taken in Dec to send forward this notification. Now it's been another 6 weeks or so. I don't understand why it hasn't gone forward yet.

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

From: Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO)
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2000 3:03 PM
To: Segal, Jack D. (NONPRO); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Medish, Mark C. (RUE); Weiss, Andrew S. (RUE); Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS); Black, Steven K. (VP); Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)
Subject: RE: HR1883 - Helms/Gilman Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

I guess main thing

is to keep DoD patient. Is there some reason in the project why the letter has to go now?

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

From: Segal,

Jack D. (NONPRO)

Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2000 1:44 PM

To: Samore,

Gary S. (NONPRO); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Medish, Mark C. (RUE);

Weiss, Andrew S. (RUE); Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS); Black, Steven

K. (VP); Saunders, Richard M. (VP); Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)

Subject: HR1883

- Helms/Gilman Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

Eric Newsom reports that

Gilman staff's draft letter to Albright has gone to Marshall Billingsley.

Sen Helms reportedly will sign it today or tomorrow and it will then go to Gilman for his signature. No word on what it says, but Eric said that if -- as is likely -- it demands "tranche-ing," MKA would respond that we cannot agree to that because the project is a national security priority. The internal State process -- digesting the letter, drafting and clearing a reply and getting MKA to focus on it -- could take a while.

Once the letter is sprung, we may

need to call a small meeting here to keep things moving. JS

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Gary Samore to Jack Segal. Subject: [Points for Foreign Policy Breakfast] [50 USC app. 2411(c)(1)] (3 pages)	02/22/2000	P3/b(3)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/15/2000-04/13/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5674

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Jack Segal to Andrew Weiss, Gary Samore, Steven Black et al. Subject: Clearance needed for ABC Lunch Item. (3 pages)	02/25/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/15/2000-04/13/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5674

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Jack Segal to Miles Lackey and Mark Tavlarides. Subject: ABC Lunch Item. (3 pages)	02/28/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/15/2000-04/13/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5674

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. email	Gary Samore to Brooks Bash, Robert Bradtke, Bathsheba Crocker et al. Subject: FW: ABC Lunch Item. (3 pages)	02/28/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/15/2000-04/13/2000]

2006-1363-F
vz5674

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/17/2000 11:42:46 AM
FROM Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Concurrence on Package 1148 [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

You are welcome.

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

From: Krass, Caroline
D. (LEGAL)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2000 11:41 AM
To: Williams,
Mary C. (ADMIN)
Subject: RE: Concurrence on Package 1148 [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks.

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

From: Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)
Sent: Friday, March
17, 2000 11:40 AM
To: Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)
Cc: Baker, James
E. (LEGAL)
Subject: RE: Concurrence on Package 1148 [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

Caroline,

I
just back and it was not there. I picked up an Exec. Highlights
and a copy of an action for you #1994 (Response to Rep. Gilman &
Sen. Helms regarding ABM Treaty.

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

From: Krass,
Caroline D. (LEGAL)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2000 11:22 AM
To: Williams,
Mary C. (ADMIN)

Subject: RE: Concurrence on Package 1148 [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks.

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

From: Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)
Sent: Friday, March
17, 2000 11:22 AM
To: Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)
Subject: RE:
Concurrence on Package 1148 [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

I
have not bee latley, will go shortly!!!!

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

From: Krass,
Caroline D. (LEGAL)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2000 11:20 AM
To: Williams,
Mary C. (ADMIN)
Cc: Baker, James E. (LEGAL)
Subject: FW: Concurrence
on Package 1148 [UNCLASSIFIED]

Mary: I am trying to find the
package referred to in the attached. Have you had a chance to go
by room 379 recently? I'll also send this to Jamie in case it is
in his in box. Thanks.

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

From: Gordon-Hagerty,
Lisa E. (TNT)
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2000 6:35 PM
To: Cullom,
Philip H. (DEFENSE); Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL); Lackey, Miles
M. (LEGIS)
Cc: Robinson, Jack A. (TNT); @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;
@DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;
@TRANSNATIONAL
- Transnational Threats
Subject: Concurrence on Package 1148 [UNCLASSIFIED]

Requesting
your concurrence on attached package. Incoming SecDef correspondence
is in your mailbox.

This has been vetted through interagency

and all affected parties concur. Please return your changes and/or concurrence to Jack Robinson, TNT. Thanks for your help.

<<

File: 1148 srb to potus.doc >> << File: 1148 LGH to SRB.doc >>

<< File: 1148 POTUS approval .doc >>

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/24/2000 3:11:20 PM
FROM Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Nigeria--for legis [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Byrne, Catherine E. (AF)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Aha!

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

From: Byrne, Catherine E. (AF)

Sent: Friday, March 24, 2000 3:05 PM

To: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)

Subject: RE:

Nigeria--for legis [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks--I'm not embarrassed,
lots I don't know. But that explains why the DoD guys who briefed
me called him Congressman, and why it sounded like an insult when
they said it. I should have asked.

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

From: Shapiro,

Daniel B. (LEGIS)

Sent: Friday, March 24, 2000 3:02 PM

To: Byrne,

Catherine E. (AF)

Subject: RE: Nigeria--for legis [UNCLASSIFIED]

Sorry,

I shouldn't presume knowledge, and didn't mean to embarrass you.
Marshall Billingslea is on Sen. Helms' SFRC staff -- he handles
arms control, military assistance, and the like. He is quite a piece
of work -- very arrogant -- and like many Helms staffers, wields
a fair bit of influence in matters like holds. Helms gives them
a lot of rope, which, of course, makes them feel like they are elected
officials in their own right. Trust me, had you intended to be ironic
when you called him "Congressman", you would not have been the first.

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

From: Byrne, Catherine E. (AF)
Sent: Friday, March
24, 2000 2:56 PM
To: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Cc: @AFRICA -
African Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs
Subject: RE: Nigeria--for
legis [UNCLASSIFIED]

Irony sounds better than uninformed, so
I'll take it...

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

From: Shapiro, Daniel
B. (LEGIS)
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2000 2:32 PM
To: Byrne, Catherine
E. (AF)
Cc: @AFRICA - African Affairs; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs
Subject: RE: Nigeria--for legis [UNCLASSIFIED]

I spoke
with DOD and they are going up at 3:00 today to take another crack
at this, armed with more detailed descriptions of what the \$10 million
is to be used for. Not terribly optimistic that this will be solved
after this briefing. When we get a read-out, we can see what other
steps we can consider.

By the way, I hope your reference to "Congressman"
Billingsley was ironic.

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

From: Byrne,
Catherine E. (AF)
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2000 8:06 PM
To: Shapiro,
Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Cc: @AFRICA - African Affairs
Subject: Nigeria--for
legis [UNCLASSIFIED]

Congressman Billingsley has placed a hold
on Nigeria's \$10 million in FMF and has asked DoD for a detailed
spending plan for the entire amount. PDAS McConnell (OSD) and DAS
Jeter (State/AF) have been unsuccessful in getting the hold lifted
so far. McConnell suspects Billingsley may aim to take some or all
of the money from Nigeria for other countries (the Baltics, his "pet
rocks"), regardless of the merits of the Nigeria program. Taking
advantage of the DATT's presence in Washington, they plan to make

another run at Billingsley either today (Friday) or early next week, with the Nigeria programs costed out. They may ask Gayle and/or State A/S Susan Rice to go as well, or perhaps to make a separate trip to the Hill, to underline the importance of military assistance to our overall support for Nigeria's political transition.

We need to protect this FMF. Nigeria has been ruled by the military for 30 of its 40 years of independence. The military voluntarily withdrew to the barracks when military dictator Sani Abacha died in 1998 and remains there today. Its leaders are largely willing to transform it into an apolitical, national institution. The military was cut off from Western assistance during the Abacha years, and both officers and men have suffered from the lack of access to Western training and equipment. Moreover, under Abacha, the military was systematically neglected; barracks, equipment, and training facilities have deteriorated until they are largely unserviceable, and salaries and benefits are woefully inadequate. Soldiers expect their lot in life to improve under democracy, and so far this has not happened. Our FMF, along with other military to military programs such as joint exercises and military sales, will help the military begin to realize a democracy dividend. Programs to be funded under FMF include:

- * \$3.5 million for half of Phase II of the program to design a civilian ministry of defense, as well as a force structure and mission plan for the Nigerian army. Nigeria will fund the other half. Phase I was already completed and was welcomed by the Nigerian military.

- * A C-130 program, including spares and training for both ground and air crews. The C-130 fleet (I believe 9 aircraft), which Nigeria uses in peacekeeping operations, had deteriorated so seriously that only 1-3 fly at a time by cannibalizing other aircraft.

- * Barracks and training facility rehabilitation. Barracks have deteriorated so badly that buildings are crumbling, no running water or electricity has become the rule, and most windows are broken or missing entirely.

If the military withdraws its support from Obasanjo, Nigeria's democratic transition will almost certainly fail, with potentially catastrophic results for West Africa, and damage to the \$6 billion in U.S. oil investment there. So far, it continues to "go to the mat" for Obasanjo, as it did to good effect during the recent communal violence in Kaduna. U.S. support is both materially and psychologically important to the army; it needs tangible improvements as well as evidence that it is no longer regarded as a pariah service by the West.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/30/2000 4:31:53 PM
FROM Wilcox, Richard M. (MULTI)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Readout of State and Hill meetings [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Schwartz, Eric P. (MULTI)

CARBON_COPY Feldman, Daniel F. (MULTI)
Kale, Dora A. (MULTI)
McLean, Matthew K. (MULTI)
Naplan, Steven J. (MULTI)
Patten, Wendy L. (MULTI)
Schwartz, Eric P. (MULTI)
Vaccaro, Jonathan M. (Matt) (MULTI)
Wilcox, Richard M. (MULTI)

TEXT_BODY

Please pass to Jim

Readout of meetings:

Mild and constructive,
no repeats of provocative exchanges like during Helms visit to NY.

State

Fowler summed up what the UNSC members want from their visit to Washington: Commitment by US that if we get through Helms-Biden, then the US will fully and constructively engage in the UN.

Pickering's

morning meeting functioned as a prep for the PermReps prior to their meetings on the Hill. Pickering and Holbrooke sought to preempt any provocative questions the PermReps might face by informing them that some legislators were even more conservative on UN issues than Senator Helms. Pickering also added that the US public in general was more supportive of the UN than Congress.

Questions and comments

from the PermReps stressed that most of them strongly disliked Helms-Biden conditions and hoped the law would be a short-lived phenomenon.

Fowler, in particular, was outspoken on this matter. Moreover, PermReps underlined that they were in DC in a personal capacity and, while able to discuss peacekeeping, had no mandate to engage on assessment

issues which are the domain of the General Assembly. Despite their willingness to work with the Administration, the PermReps, especially Fowler, stressed that they would not be shy about their views on the shortcomings of Helms-Biden legislation

Holbrooke explained that we understood all that and reminded the PermReps of the great progress made since a Presidential candidate ridiculed former SYG BBG in his campaign. Holbrooke also attached importance to the fact that Helms had invited Annan to address this year's commencement at Helm's NC alma mater as an indication of progress. UK Amb. Greenstock asked whether any serious progress could be made on UN issues this year given the campaign. Pickering responded that in his personal view, campaigns are fought on domestic issues and, therefore, we certainly intend and will be able to make progress still this year.

Hill

Despite earlier expectations the Security Council meetings on the Hill were not contentious at all. Only about half of the Senators expected attended and those present only stayed for parts of the meeting. None of the provocative themes Helms raised in NY resurfaced. Of note was Amb. Fowler remark that while Congress calls for increased UN efficiency, the UN only has 8,000 staff while the Hill has 30,000. He and other PermReps stressed that they felt Helms-Biden was unfair, both to the US and the UN, but this did not draw strong reactions from the Senators present. Van Walsum (Netherlands) explained that the Dutch per-capita contribution to the UN was greater than that of the US while the Netherlands had very little influence in the organization. The Chinese ambassador stressed that US has history of protecting minority interests for benefit of majority and should US apply same logic to UN. In other words, not try to dominate organization. The strongest comment in what was otherwise a very mild meeting was Senator Warner criticism of European members who contribute insufficient troops and police to UN operations.

Expect questions on US reliability
of US financial support to PKOs.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/30/2000 5:56:36 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT State Department Press Briefing - March 30, 2000 [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
Hoelzer, Jennifer I. (PRESS/INTERN)
Stockwell, David B. (PRESS)
Thinakaran, Prabhath (PRESS/INTERN)
Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)
Aragoncillo, Leandro A. (VP)
Babbitt, James F. (VP)
Beardsley, Tyler S. (VP)
Black, Steven K. (VP)
Bolan, Christopher J. (VP)
Davidson, Leslie K. (VP)
Dennett, Todd H. (VP)
Fuerth, Leon S. (VP)
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)
Hinckley, Steedman (VP)
Orfini, Michael H. (VP)
Osius, Theodore G. (VP)
Roberts, Michael W. (VP)
Saunders, Richard M. (VP)
Woolston, Ann E. (VP)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY****TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT**

dpb~#~26~March~30.doc
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Daily Press Briefing Index
Thursday, March 30, 2000
Briefer: James B. Foley

SERBIA (Kosovo)
1-4,5 Extremist Elements/KFOR Actions/Status of Disarming Militias
5-6 Incursion of FRY Forces into Safety Zone

DEPARTMENT

4-5 Secretary Albright's Remarks on Departure of Spokesman Foley

CUBA

6,8-9 Reaction to Castro's Speech

6-8,15 Status of Request for Visas for Juan Gonzalez/Others

7-8,9 Meeting with Officials of Cuban Interests Section

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

9 Reported Administration Consideration of Special Envoy for Israel-Syria Track

9-11,12 Status of Israeli-Syrian Track

ISRAEL/LEBANON

9,11-12, US Position UNSC Resolution 425 on Withdrawal of Foreign Forces From

Lebanon

17-18

UNITED NATIONS

12,14-15 Washington Visit of the UN Security Council Members

12-14 Status of US Arrears to the UN

CENTRAL ASIA

15-17 Secretary Albright's Upcoming Trip to Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan

15-16 Kyrgyz Government Arrest of Opposition Leader Feliks Kulov

RUSSIA

17 President-Elect Putin's Meeting with ICRC President/Access to Chechnya

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAILY PRESS BRIEFING

DPB # 26

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 2000 1:15 P.M.

(ON THE RECORD UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED)

MR. FOLEY: Good afternoon. Welcome to the State Department. In this, my last week of briefing here, I didn't want in any way to break from my consistent record of arriving consistently late in the briefing room.

Q Will you be here tomorrow, too?

MR. FOLEY: I will.

Q I'll be late.

MR. FOLEY: That's okay. You'll have the last word then. That will be my last briefing.

Barry. I don't have announcements, so --

Q I wonder whether you noticed that the UN human rights investigator, Mr. Dienstbier, is talking about - in Geneva is saying that maybe the West has to consider using force against extremist Albanians and Kosovars. And, of course, you all remember Rubin's little trip and some other things you've done to try to restrain them. What about the use of force?

MR. FOLEY: What about what, Barry?

Q What about the use of force? Is that something the US would contemplate recommending if extremist Albanians continue some of their attacks on Serbs?

MR. FOLEY: Well, first of all, concerning Mr. Dienstbier's remarks, we have not seen exactly what he said. I think we saw one press article but it doesn't convey I think the entirety of what he said. And so we are going to have to check on that.

I think the fundamental point is that we've been extraordinarily clear, both in word and deed, to the Kosovar Albanian leadership at all levels of our concern about extremists and of our policy of zero tolerance for violence and provocation. And, as you know, a number of weeks ago, following Mr. Rubin's trip and Ambassador Hill's trip to Kosovo, KFOR forces did act robustly to seize weapons and uniforms of this militia.

And so we've proven our ability to act. We had credible intelligence at the time that enabled KFOR to act and, if we have such credible intelligence in the future, KFOR will act similarly. The message is not only to the

Kosovar Albanian leadership; it is a message that we direct equally to the leadership in Belgrade, that we call on all parties to act responsibly and to refrain from any actions that might provoke violence and instability in the region.

Q Has their behavior changed since that raid?

MR. FOLEY: Well, you weren't here earlier in the week. What happened, as you know, was that on March 23, Mr. Thaci convened a meeting in Kosovo with a number of officials and apparently members of some of these militias and, as a result of that meeting, it was announced that these militias would disarm, would shed their uniforms, would refrain from violence, would refrain from provocation, would integrate themselves into the political life of Kosovo. And we have not seen follow-through on those commitments. We are very disappointed about that.

And therefore, on Tuesday, I reiterated our message of concern, our disappointment, and underscored again our readiness to act against any provocations and any violence that might come from that quarter.

Q Has the State Department received a visa application from the father of Elian Gonzalez?

MR. FOLEY: I think that undoubtedly you may - or some of you may - wish to get to that subject. I wouldn't be totally surprised. But let's see if we've exhausted the Balkans.

Problem with the light?

Q The world of TV.

MR. FOLEY: Now you know what it feels like. Can't stand the light, leave the podium. Get out of the briefing room. (Laughter.)

Q Jim, when you say that the United States or NATO reserves the right to act --

MR. FOLEY: Yes.

Q What do you mean?

MR. FOLEY: I think NATO - KFOR rather, demonstrated what I meant when - I believe it was on March 15, I would have to check the calendar for you - KFOR, on the basis of credible intelligence moved in, seized weapons, seized uniforms, that are not permitted under the agreements that followed the Kosovo conflict and that regulate KFOR's presence in Kosovo.

Q Do you have reason to believe that this group, these extremists, have arms, weapons that are stored somewhere, that you would like them to turn over - more weapons than you've already seized?

MR. FOLEY: Well, I think you can infer from the fact that we've already seized some that we believed that some were there. And subsequent to that action by KFOR, these militias under Mr. Thaci's direction - he convened the meeting - committed to further disbandment or turning in of weapons and uniforms. And that has not happened so we have equally reason to infer that there is more that needs to be turned in and that is at risk of confiscation otherwise.

Q Is there a deadline?

MR. FOLEY: Well, I don't know if anyone affixed a deadline at the time. This was, rather, a commitment made by the Kosovar Albanians themselves. They, on March 23rd, had an important meeting, issued an important declaration that we welcomed at that time, that indicated we will disarm, we will turn in weapons, we will turn in uniforms, we will integrate ourselves. They've not done those things and so KFOR is concerned, is seized with the matter, and will act, as I said, on the basis of credible intelligence.

Before we go to the Middle East, I think we will go to this hemisphere.

Q So you're saying, then, they promised or they committed themselves to disarm and the alliance has inferred that there are additional arms since they have committed to disarm. But it doesn't appear that you're giving them a lot of time to disarm because you've said now that you'll act whenever you get credible intelligence.

And is that right? Are you giving them a period of time to comply with their commitment to disarm, or you'll act when you can?

MR. FOLEY: I'm a little confused as to whether this is a question emanating from Nightline or from ABC News.

Q It depends on the answer.

Q (Inaudible) - the answer is -- (inaudible).

MR. FOLEY: Having bid us farewell, I hope this is not in any way a precedent for my own situation. You may find me up here again in ensuing weeks - at least not for a number of years.

The fact is that these parties made a commitment on March 23rd and there was an article in a newspaper in Washington a few days ago indicating that they were going to renege on their commitment, that they weren't going to follow through. It wasn't merely that they hadn't followed through but that they weren't going to follow through. And so you can rest assured that our antennae are up, as it were, and we are going to be very vigilant and we are prepared to act as information becomes available to us. I can't be more specific, certainly not operationally, than that.

More on this, or do we want to go to the question that's been hanging there? Who was asking the question?

Q Can I just ask on the same subject?

MR. FOLEY: Sure, absolutely.

Q With Jim Dobbins in Brussels, is there some -

(Laughter.)

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Well, I thought I would show up today to say thank you to Jim Foley. This is his last week here, and he has done a really superb job in all kinds of ways.

Jim, I'm going to miss you very much. You've been fantastic, a great traveling companion and a great juggler of answers and questions, and a great provider of good lines, a fabulous foreign service officer, my own personal John Travolta.
(Laughter.)

And poor Jim, he's had, you know, such a life here. But it hasn't been hard enough so I decided to send him to a hardship post, where they have to get up really early in the morning, work very long hours, never have any decent food and just be there all the time with those multilaterals.

So I just really, Jim, wanted to give you a big hug and a thanks for everything that you've done.

MR. FOLEY: Thanks very much, Madame Secretary

(Applause.)

MR. FOLEY: You know, I'm a Spokesman, a Deputy Spokesman. But if you take that title seriously, I'm not supposed to be speechless - and I am utterly speechless and deeply grateful. And I was going to save until tomorrow my parting shots, directed in this direction, and my parting words of thanks in your direction. I think I will do that.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I think we did manage to surprise you.

MR. FOLEY: You certainly did. (Laughter.)

Elaine, I owe you, or you owe me or something.

Thank you, Madame Secretary. Thank you.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thanks.

MR. FOLEY: I don't know how to follow up on that. But the Secretary is - I'll get into this a bit tomorrow but the Secretary is right to say that I am a loyal Foreign Service Officer, and part of the philosophy of being a Foreign Service Officer means that you follow orders. You salute and you go wherever they send you and you do whatever they tell you to do.

And, yes, I have been asked to go to a hardship post, the US Mission in Geneva - (laughter) - and, again, my philosophy is that, you know, you salute and you do what you're supposed to do. Somebody has to go there, and so I'm willing to make the deep personal and professional sacrifice. But, as I said, I'll save my parting words and parting shots for tomorrow.

If I can regain my composure, I will attempt to answer your questions. Where were we?

Q Well, I was asking, on a much different note, Jim Dobbins is in Brussels. And the various things you've said, which are resolute and show resolve on Kosovo, are those views shared by the allies? Is he talking to NATO? Is there a connection between his visit there? I forget who else, someone else is with him.

MR. FOLEY: I think you can be assured that the allies share American concerns in this regard. Obviously, all of us have an enormous stake in the success of the KFOR mission. To the extent that there are groups that are armed, that pose a threat to that mission, that pose a risk of destabilizing the region, that is undoubtedly a concern shared by not only the United States but our allies and partners in KFOR as well.

Equally, though, I want to be clear, as I was a few minutes ago, that our message of vigilance is directed also to Belgrade and that we are warning our parties to avoid from acts of provocation, acts of violence, that can destabilize the situation. The bottom line is that KFOR is not only there; KFOR is robust, is equipped and is capable of dealing with threats from whatever quarter they may emerge.

Q I suppose that was a comment directed in regards of the intrusion of the Yugoslav army to the buffer zone.

MR. FOLEY: Do you have a question in that regard?

Q Would you comment on that? I mean, there was a reaction from KFOR and NATO.

MR. FOLEY: Yes, I would have to refer you to Mr. Bacon at the Pentagon for specific details. We take very seriously any violation of the FRY's - Yugoslavia's - obligations under the military technical agreement that the FRY signed with KFOR last June. This agreement states that "under no circumstances shall any forces of the FRY and the Republic of Serbia enter into, re-enter or remain within the territory of Kosovo or the ground safety zone" -- which is a 5-kilometer band along the Kosovo-Serb administrative border - "without the prior express consent of the KFOR commander."

I'd have to refer you to Mr. Bacon, as I said, and also to KFOR itself for details concerning any specific incursion of FRY forces into that zone. The military-technical agreement also states that the KFOR commander is the final authority regarding interpretation of the agreement and that his determinations are binding on all parties and persons.

There is a Joint Implementation Council established under the agreement and composed of KFOR officers and FRY military personnel that meets

routinely to discuss implementation of this agreement. I understand that KFOR officers and FRY officers did meet under the aegis of the Joint Implementation Council to discuss the report that you're referencing.

There was another disturbing sentence in that report, though, that I would like to refute. I can tell you that KFOR has no plans to coordinate activities related to armed ethnic Albanian groups with the FRY.

Q A Cuba question now?

MR. FOLEY: Is there a Cuba question today?

Q Do you have anything on visas or reaction to Castro's speech or on details of the meeting this morning involving the head of the Cuban Interests Section?

MR. FOLEY: I don't have a reaction to or a comment on Mr. Castro's speech, to answer that particular question. What I can tell you is that at 9 o'clock this morning the Cuban Interests Section delivered to the State Department a transcript of the remarks made by Mr. Castro on TV yesterday regarding the possibility of travel by Juan Gonzalez and various other individuals.

We have not received any visa requests from Juan Miguel Gonzalez or any other individuals in conjunction with this case.

I imagine you may have a follow-up question. I'd rather dribble this out because there's not a lot to say.

Q With this offer of expediting the visa process to the child's father be extended to the wider delegation of 31 individuals who would like to come with him?

MR. FOLEY: Well, on the father, what I can say is that we have long stated that we would give expedited consideration to a visa application and we will do so

under established guidelines. We are willing to do this because we've been saying that we believe it would be helpful to the successful resolution of this case if the father were to come to the United States. So that remains.

In terms though of the other individuals, a litany of individuals mentioned in the speech that was delivered to us today, let me state first of all that the Department of State and the US Government generally does not make any concessions based on pressures, demands or threats from the government of Cuba. If any individuals wish to request visas to travel to the United States, the Department will consider such applications on a case-by-case basis.

As I indicated a minute ago, we have received no such visa requests.

Q But aren't there restrictions on Cubans who can come here? Aren't they supposed to be restricted to exchanges?

MR. FOLEY: Well, in my reference to the possibility of the father coming, I indicated we would give expedited consideration under established guidelines. And certainly those guidelines - I don't have the text of those now and could maybe get them later for tomorrow - but they would apply in each and every case. I don't know if they only apply to exchanges as such. I believe that in some instances family members may travel to the United States, but I can check that for you.

Q Jim, when the last time there was talk about the father coming and instead the grandmothers came, there was a question of whether the father didn't want to come because he might be subpoenaed. That situation still, in theory, prevails. Is there any movement on that? If he comes under any kind of visa that you would contemplate giving, is he still subject to subpoena?

MR. FOLEY: That you would have to ask the Justice Department about. It's a

matter of law. The question you raise is kind of an old one. I haven't heard it raised in, I think, a couple months, and I'm not sure that it's a matter of concern today. You'd have to ask people in Cuba about that.

I can restate for you what we said at the time, though, when asked the question. We can't provide any such guarantees. We're the Department of State. We're not a judicial body and we can make no pronouncements or guarantees in that regard.

Q You wouldn't consider a special condition of granting a visa that would allow the father to remain - be with the boy in Washington at the Cuban Interests Section?

MR. FOLEY: Why do you say "special" visa or consideration? I'm not sure I understand the reference to that.

Q Was that not one of the requests made at the meeting this morning?

MR. FOLEY: Well, I can only tell you - restate what I've said, which is we are willing to give - and we've been saying this for a long time - to give expedited consideration to an application by the father. We believe his presence in the US can be helpful to successful resolution of the case. And so we stand by that.

As to the particulars of where he could go were he to come here, I think that's very premature. We don't have an application at this point.

Q Could you define expedited? Does that mean within an hour, for instance, he could have a visa once he applied? Or is it Jamie Rubin's "soon"?

MR. FOLEY: Methinks I detect a journalistic interest in the case, since we - I think I can say this publicly since this is not in the realm of information but, rather, of simple fact that we get calls all the time from some of your colleagues, Betsy. Some of them even look and sound like you, too, asking about whether - don't be offended, I'm just making a joke - asking whether

such a visa

- you're not the only one. I could start pointing fingers, if you'd like, if it would make you feel better. Charlie, especially.

Does that help, Betsy?

Asking whether a visa has been delivered or not or applied for or not, I think this is not a problematic question. We've indicated we give expedited consideration. That means, we would act on it rapidly. I can't tell you how long that would take, specifically.

I apologize, Betsy.

Q Jim, you say that they delivered the text of President Castro's speech. Isn't that something that you could - I mean, you could have easily have gotten it or they could have faxed it over to you. Why do you think they wanted to deliver the text of this speech to US officials in person?

MR. FOLEY: Well, you're right, it could be faxed over. I can only speculate as to why they would want to bring it in person, and perhaps you might want to ask the Cuban Interest Section for the rationale behind coming over.

I can speculate that they wanted to underscore, in their view, the importance of the speech and the importance of the proposal, which is fine and dandy. But, as I said, we're not going to just bend to any pressure or any threats or any demands of the Cuban Government. If it is a serious question of a serious visa application, we will adjudicate it, an application seriously, according to our law. But that has not happened, though.

Q When you say "threats," are you - are you --

MR. FOLEY: I was wondering who else might be coming through the door there.

Q Do you believe that there were threats made in President Castro's speech or were there, you know, the impression of threats made during the visit

of these
Cuban diplomats?

MR. FOLEY: Well, there were intemperate remarks made, I believe, a few days ago that we reacted strongly to. So I can cite that as an example, but I didn't care to react to his speech of last evening, as I indicated.

Q In terms of the meeting this morning, in addition to handing you a transcript, was there any other discussion? Was there a discussion about the proposals? Was there any back and forth?

MR. FOLEY: I wouldn't characterize it so much as back and forth because that implies a willingness to engage or negotiate on our side that wasn't there. They spoke about the speech and underscored their view that was reflected I think in the comments of the Cuban diplomat as he was leaving the State Department that I read about how they thought this notion could be helpful. But we, I believe, underscored what I said publicly, which is that we will adjudicate visa applications but that is really where our role would come in in such an event and that has not happened.

Q There is a report in the Israeli press that President Clinton has suggested appointing a special envoy to use shuttle diplomacy between Syria and Israel. Is it true and who is he? And I have another question, please, afterwards.

MR. FOLEY: Well, there is no need to answer the second part of the question because my understanding is that the first part is not true.

Q And the second one is that there is also talk that President Clinton has asked Israel to delay the withdrawal by three weeks. And how does the United States view the withdrawal from Southern Lebanon in absence of any deal on the Syrian side?

MR. FOLEY: Well, I don't believe that first bit of information that the

US has asked Israel to delay something is true. I've not heard that. It would surprise me. I think it's untrue.

Our policy on Security Council Resolution 425 is long-standing. It goes back to the time we voted for the resolution, which is that we would like to see it implemented and we would like to see all foreign forces withdrawn from Lebanon. We've stated, as has the Prime Minister of Israel, that it is our preference that that withdrawal be effected in the context of a negotiated settlement that would address the needs of all sides, and we still continue to hope that that will be possible.

Q Where do you see the Syrian track right now? Is it a failure right now?

MR. FOLEY: I wouldn't say that. It hasn't produced success yet, but the fact is that the parties met here at Shepherdstown; the President had an important meeting with President Assad in Geneva; and the process continues - a difficult process, clearly. But we are going to continue to work to overcome the differences that exist between the parties, and this process is certainly not over.

In terms of where it stands, I think President Clinton was pretty clear about this yesterday. As you know, the United States has been trying to clarify the needs and positions on both sides, and we arrived at a certain point in terms of clarifying the Israeli positions to such that the President was able to convey Israeli ideas and perspectives to President Assad. He was not in a position to accept those points, and; therefore, as the President stated yesterday, we believe that it is now the turn of the Syrians to formulate responses, formulate ideas of their own. And so that's where the matter rests at the moment.

Q Are you going to help them formulate these responses?

MR. FOLEY: Well, we have been playing a role of communicating with the parties, trying to gain a better understanding for ourselves and for them of the needs, the perspectives, the requirements, for a successful outcome, and to help them overcome those differences. And we will continue to play that role in consultation with both sides, but this is not an American effort to generate American ideas. This is something that is going to have to be solved by both parties. Obviously, we have an important role to play that we will continue to play.

Q However true that might be, your description of the President's remarks are accurate but they left a little bit out because he made the point also that he, too, had presented some additional ideas; in other words, that he had presented Assad with a combination of Israeli proposals, which he called very significant, and American ideas as well; and that Assad's posture was to simply stick to his guns.

MR. FOLEY: I'll have to --

Q No. So --

MR. FOLEY: I'll have to check the record on that. I'm not aware that he spoke about American ideas.

Q He didn't use the word "ideas" but he - our options. He spoke of things of an American input - trust me - and I'll get you the text if you'd like. But that's just a setup. That's to lead the question.

The point is that the President has worked up the Israeli ideas and Americans have been involved in embellishing --

MR. FOLEY: Well, I'm not going to accept that formulation. We've been communicating with both sides, we've been trying to gain a better

understanding.

And the President conveyed certain Israeli ideas and perspectives, which he called specific and comprehensive and significant.

Q Very significant.

MR. FOLEY: Yes.

Q Well the question then - forget if you don't accept my construction and we said, let's move to the other side or something.

MR. FOLEY: Sure.

Q Maybe you'll disagree with my description of his description of Assad's posture, which is, basically, he's sticking to his demands and that's that. And he has to be more forthcoming, the President said.

Is the US going to consult with the Syrians in an effort to sort of suggest some ideas to them that might make their position a little bit more forthcoming with the aim, of course, of starting these negotiations going, which isn't going right now with Israel?

MR. FOLEY: I am not going to be able to share your premise about American ideas. You're returning to it again.

Our role has been to try to facilitate the parties coming together and reaching agreement. And we talked to the parties. What we say in particular, neither I nor Jamie Rubin nor Joe Lockhart have gotten into. We want to be helpful. We're not substituting ourselves or substituting our ideas for the ideas and positions of the parties. But we are trying to help them see their way through to common ground which, of course, is the necessary predicate for an agreement.

And that effort yielded certain results on the Israeli side that the President noted, which the Syrian president rejected. And the President made it clear that we believe now, having responded in Geneva, that the Syrian side

ought now to
come back with a further elaboration of points and perspectives from
their side.

Q Let's get back to Lebanon, if we could.

MR. FOLEY: Sure.

Q We know your preference. The preference is that Israel's pullout
should be
part of an overall agreement. But Mr. Barak said, after Sunday's
meetings, that
the next step, it seemed to him, was for Israel to go ahead with a
pullout.

Will the United States - does the United States object to a unilateral
withdrawal? I know what you prefer. Does the United States object to
a
unilateral withdrawal? And there have been rumors - pretty well, I
think,
disputed by talking to people in this building, but let's just check it out

anyhow - that the US is looking for ways to help Israel because Barak
said this
could be, you know, a dangerous situation, a difficult situation. Is the
US
taking steps or will the US take steps to try to assist in that withdrawal
just
to make sure nothing doesn't blow up?

MR. FOLEY: Well, I tried to chase down those reports and rumors as
well and met
with the same response that you apparently have, Barry, so that is not
anything I
can confirm. I can restate our position in favor of the implementation
of
Security Council Resolution 425. Our focus is on helping the parties
achieve a
negotiated settlement that would address the needs of all sides, and
we're going
to continue working with the sides as part of that goal.

Your other question, though, about if push comes to shove where
would we stand in
the event of an Israeli unilateral withdrawal is a question I've gotten
several
times now in the last week. Mr. Rubin's got it. And I will just repeat
what we
said, which is that we voted for Resolution 425, we stand by it, we
would like to

see it implemented, we would like to see all foreign forces withdrawn from Lebanon, and we would prefer to see that happen in the context of a negotiated settlement. But at the end of the day, we support the implementation of that resolution. I think my meaning is clear.

Q Change of subject?

MR. FOLEY: Yes.

Q Is it fair to say, then, that the United States does not expect any new proposals to come from the Israeli side towards President Assad and that now the ball is in his court and nothing more will happen until he's come up with an alternative solution?

MR. FOLEY: Well, if I may revive the end-of-the-day formulation I just used with Barry, at the end of the day both sides have needs that must be taken into account and addressed. You can't have an agreement unless they reach common ground. But it is accurate, though, to say and for me to restate now for the fourth or fifth time what the President said yesterday, which is that we are looking to the Syrians to come forward now with more specific responses, ideas, perspectives, in light of the fact the Israeli side has done so.

Q On the UN Security Council members who are here visiting, they've been here this morning, they'll be back here tonight with Congress sandwiched in between, where I'm sure they'll have some interesting conversations.

After Senator Helms visited them and then invited them to come back here, do you notice that there is any positive movement or narrowing of the gaps on what the US Congress might be willing to do to support our dues? As I understand it, they don't even agree on how much we owe; the UN says one number and we say another because we've unilaterally made some deductions. Do you sense that this is

moving in a positive direction at all?

MR. FOLEY: Well, I think there are a number of aspects to your question, some of which I would quibble with.

Q Okay.

MR. FOLEY: Embedded in your question is the premise, though, that there is daylight between the Administration and Congress on our approach to --

Q No, no, no, between the UN and the United States on what is owed, for example.

MR. FOLEY: Because we reached an agreement that Secretary Albright was instrumental in negotiating with Senator Helms and Senator Biden on the package to repay our arrears.

There are so-called contested arrears. Our package aims to pay almost \$1 billion in the arrears that we owe to the United Nations. Let's remember that we are talking about old money and that the United States has continued in subsequent years to pay our share and a share that vastly exceeds that of other nations. We're the largest supporter financially of the UN in terms of its general budget, its peacekeeping budget and its specialized agencies. There are moneys that the UN claims that we are owed that we dispute.

Q That we are owed?

MR. FOLEY: That we owe.

Q Yes.

MR. FOLEY: That we dispute.

Q Right.

MR. FOLEY: Has a lot to do with the fact that - not only, but a lot to do with the fact that in 1995 Congress passed legislation that the President signed that

reduces our assessment on peacekeeping operations from - if you'll bear with me a second - from 30 percent to 25 percent. And so the UN has continued to charge us at the higher rate that we, by law, do not accept.

If your question, rather, has to do not with those contested moneys but, rather, our ability to repay the moneys in the package that was agreed between the Administration and Congress last year to the tune of, I believe, \$929 -- Q Million.

MR. FOLEY: -- million - yes, I believe you're right. I'll check with you afterwards to make sure I'm right and get back to the other journalists. We paid \$100 million last December. That was the first tranche, right away. There will be a second tranche of \$475 million, plus another \$107 million for peacekeeping reimbursement credit, that we would pay hopefully this year if we can achieve some benchmark reforms.

And that's what your question has to do with. We're seeking - and this is part of the Congressional legislation to get the UN to adopt a lower assessment rate cap for the regular budget, which we're currently assessed at 25 percent. We believe it would be just and appropriate to reduce that to 22 percent. We would also like the cap established for the peacekeeping assessment at 25 percent, at which we're currently paying. Then there would be a third tranche of \$244 million that would be tied to additional reforms in the management area.

But, clearly, these are hard issues. These are difficult issues. They involve renegotiating what other nations pay to support the UN regular budget, to support peacekeeping, and you can imagine this is not easy work. We believe that we have a very good case to make. We are the number one supporter financially of the UN. We don't think the UN should be overly dependent on one single

nation. We believe there is a credible case to be made now, after many years that these assessment rates have been in effect and the world political situation and economy have changed fundamentally, for a relook and a reassessment, literally, of the rates that we and others pay.

Ambassador Holbrooke and our mission to the UN are hard at work on that effort.

Ambassador Holbrooke has been traveling around the world and working in the UN on this effort, and it has the full support of Secretary Albright. Let's remember that one of the highest agenda items the Secretary set upon taking office was to restore America's relationship with the UN, which is in our national interest.

She has made that case around the country and managed to persuade the Congress to go along with this historic decision to reaffirm the importance of the UN to the US to pay our debts.

But in order to get this finally realized, though, we believe we need the support and assistance of other nations to recognize that times have changed and that a change in some of the assessment rates is justified and necessary, and that work continues.

Q Do you think the trip today will help?

MR. FOLEY: I do. I wouldn't look for any immediate results coming out of the trip but, nevertheless, it's important - we believe, first of all - to underline the significance of the United Nations. If the Security Council - this is a historic visit - comes to Washington, that obviously all of you are covering it, and I think it signals to the American public and to the world how seriously we take the UN. The UN is important to our efforts around the world because the US can not afford to be, does not wish to be, the global policeman. We look to others to help share the burden of meeting challenges, of meeting the

problems of
instability and disease and crime and overpopulation and a whole
litany of
problems facing the world. And we look to the UN to share that
burden, to share
that leadership. And the UN advances American national interest.
Their visit
here underscores that.

But equally, the visit, we believe, can be enlightening to the Security
Council
as well to have a better understanding of how foreign policy is made
here in the
United States. We have an unusual political system. In most countries
of the
world, the executive branch more or less legislates by fiat - I know
that's an
exaggeration, but at least in terms of parliamentary democracy, a
government that
can't get its foreign policy approved is a government that falls. We
have a
completely different system. It is one marked by separation of powers.
The
Congress has a role to play in foreign policy, they control the purse
strings and
they have to be a partner in foreign policy.

So Secretary Albright very strongly welcomes - indeed, invited - the
visit, along
with the Congress, of the Security Council to Washington and we
think it will
help advance better understanding, better progress and results on both
sides.

How do you like that for a short answer? You know, this is my
second-to-last day
at this soap box and I'm reluctant to walk off the stage.

Q You're starting to sound like Nick Burns.

MR. FOLEY: Thank you.

Q I want to tie up a loose end on the Elian Gonzalez case.

MR. FOLEY: I didn't think I left any.

Q I know you didn't but there's one hanging that at least - you've gone
out of
your way to state several times that State Department's position is that
you

would expedite the visa application for the father. And, as of yesterday, Fidel Castro has thrown in this long list of people who might want to accompany. But you haven't addressed - well, you've addressed it but not in a way of you saying that you would be willing to expedite those visas, if that's part of it.

And let me just finish the question. And saying the State Department's only role is to help in the visa application of the father, it seems to me it's got a different, a larger role, if these other people are part of the mix, or any group of people is part of the mix. Is that correct or not correct?

MR. FOLEY: Well, that was the one unanswered question. I agree with you fully that that was a loose string and I was ready to answer it. And the answer is the following: That we do not prejudge or preadjudicate the visa cases of applicants from whom we have not yet received applications.

Q A quick question about Central Asia. Earlier this week, you announced that the Secretary would be traveling there.

MR. FOLEY: Right.

Q Do you have any more information why she has chosen to make this trip now, what some of the highlights will be when she is there, and also the co-chairman of the US Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, that's Chris Smith, yesterday said that the Secretary should insist Kyrgyz authorities release this opposition leader before she visits there in two weeks. That's Feliks Kulov. Is that something she would be considering?

MR. FOLEY: Yes, indeed, we have important items to discuss with all three countries. Just to repeat, I issued a statement on this a couple days ago. The Secretary will travel to Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan between April 14th and 20th, and this is her first visit to Central Asia as Secretary of State. And the overall aim of the trip is to underscore the importance of these

countries,
New Independent States, to the United States and to the world
community. In
other words, their fate as not only fledgling democracies but as
fledgling
nations, sovereign states, is of importance to the world community.
Their
success is important to stability in Central Asia, in the wider Europe
and for
the global community.

And there are enormous challenges that these young nations face. We
are troubled
- you're right to indicate we are troubled - by some shortcomings in
the field of
democratization and elsewhere in some of these countries.
Nevertheless, we
support their efforts to consolidate their sovereignty and their
democracies and
their economic reform programs and we want to encourage them to do
better in
certain areas of democracy, of the rule of law and human rights and all
of these
important areas, also having to do with economic reform.

The Secretary will consult with officials of the three governments on a
broad
range of bilateral and multilateral issues, discussing progress in their
efforts
to establish strong democratic and market-oriented institutions, as
well as
regional security concerns. She is going to meet with American
business
representatives, meet with civil society, with local NGO and other
leaders who
are active in defending human rights and building, as I said, a civil
society in
these countries.

Your question had to do with Kyrgyzstan, I believe?

Q Yeah, but specifically this opposition leader.

MR. FOLEY: We, I believe, issued a statement about him -- I don't
know if you
have that, we can get that afterwards - expressing our concern over his
arrest
and calling for the rule of law and due process and transparency in his
treatment. I would have to get that statement to address it specifically.
But

what I can say is Kyrgyzstan has been in the past a leader in democratic reform in Central Asia. We find recent events there very troubling.

And the Secretary is traveling to Central Asia precisely because of the recent difficulties there. She intends to deliver a tough message to the government of Kyrgyzstan on democracy and human rights. And she, as I said, will also be meeting with NGOs and representatives of the opposition during her visit.

Q You mentioned that regional security concerns were also high up there. Can you expand on that a little? Is this a human rights trip, a democracy trip or is it --

MR. FOLEY: I don't think it's possible. I think it's incorrect to try to parse a particular aspect of the visit. She will be discussing regional security issues, she will be discussing their efforts to transition to market economies successfully, their efforts to integrate into the world economies, their efforts to attract foreign investment, to create greater economic interaction between the United States and these three countries. She will be discussing their efforts to build democratic institutions. She will be frank about shortcomings we see in those areas. She will be discussing human rights and problems we see in the human rights area in those countries.

She is not going to pull any punches but she goes there as a friend. The United States is a friend of these new countries and these new fledgling democracies of Central Asia. And we will be encouraging. And, as I said, she will be frank where she needs to speak frankly about shortcomings in the field of democratization.

Q Do you have anything on Russian President Putin apparently allowing the International Red Cross to go into detention centers, including the one notorious

one at Chernokozovo? He has apparently - well, quoting Tass, of course, but he has apparently allowed them now to go in.

MR. FOLEY: I have not heard that that decision was made. If it's true, we are encouraged by it, we welcome it. We understand that President-Elect Putin met with the ICRC president, Mr. Kellenberger, today. We are encouraged by that. We do hope that this meeting will facilitate the ICRC receiving unhindered access to all detainees related to the conflict in Chechnya.

We also note that officials of the OSCE Assistance Group have now been able to make several trips to Chechnya, to prepare for establishing the OSCE there. So if that is true, that that access will be allowed, that is a positive step.

What we are encouraging are thoroughgoing steps in different areas, having to do with access by the international media, with the reopening or the opening of the OSCE office, unhindered Red Cross access and thoroughgoing investigations of credible reports of human rights violations in Chechnya.

Other questions? Barry, did you come back for a question?

Q Yeah, we want to go back to Lebanon, while I try to figure out US policy on Israel withdrawing from --

MR. FOLEY: Just a second. Are we finished on Central Asia and Russia?

Q -- while I figure out whether the US approves or disapproves of the unilateral Israeli withdrawal, should it come to that, and I don't know what the US position is yet. I know your preference.

Israel TV is reporting - which is why I came back - that at the behest of the United States, Israel has agreed to delay for at least three weeks seeking international support for that withdrawal. Remember the notion that they might need us --

MR. FOLEY: To delay what for three weeks?

Q For three weeks.

MR. FOLEY: To delay what?

Q As we all know, there have been reports for days now that Israel is soliciting
- trying to solicit international support for a withdrawal because it might be
explosive - whatever the word Barak used. Now the report is the US asked Israel
to cut it out for at least three weeks and Israel has agreed.

MR. FOLEY: So you mean not cut out the withdrawal itself?

Q The withdrawal isn't until July. To cut out --

MR. FOLEY: That's why I asked you to clarify.

Q To stop trying to gather support for an eventual withdrawal, to stop seeking
support for three weeks, take a break on this.

MR. FOLEY: I had not heard that, and so I would have to look into the question
for you.

Q Would you, please?

MR. FOLEY: Yes. I would be glad to.

Q Thank you.

MR. FOLEY: There is going to be an event involving the Secretary any minute now.
I would prefer to - much as I am trying to hog what's left of the limelight for
me, I would prefer to defer to my boss, Secretary Albright.

Thank you.

(The briefing was concluded at 2:07 P.M.)

18

03/30/2000

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/31/2000 7:50:14 AM
FROM Wilcox, Richard M. (MULTI)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: UNSC State and Hill Meetings Readout [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rudman, Mara E. (NSA)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Sorry. Will do in future.

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

From: Rudman,
Mara E. (NSA)
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2000 8:23 PM
To: Wilcox,
Richard M. (MULTI); Crocker, Bathsheba N. (NSA)
Cc: @LEGISLAT
- Legislative Affairs; @RUDMAN
Subject: RE: UNSC State and Hill
Meetings Readout [UNCLASSIFIED]

Richard-- when you're sending
anything related to Congress, as is the case here, you should send
first to @legislat for their take on it, and/or at a minimum cc:
them when you're sending forward to the front office.

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

From: Wilcox, Richard M. (MULTI)
Sent: Thursday,
March 30, 2000 4:46 PM
To: @NSA - Natl Security Advisor; Crocker,
Bathsheba N. (NSA)
Subject: UNSC State and Hill Meetings Readout
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Please pass to Jim

Readout of meetings:

Mild
and constructive, no repeats of provocative exchanges like during
Helms visit to NY.

State

Fowler summed up what the UNSC members want from their visit to Washington: Commitment by US that if we get through Helms-Biden, then the US will fully and constructively engage in the UN.

Pickering's morning meeting functioned as a prep for the PermReps prior to their meetings on the Hill. Pickering and Holbrooke warned the Reps that some legislators were even more conservative on UN issues than Senator Helms. Pickering also added that the US public in general was more supportive of the UN than Congress.

Questions and comments from the PermReps stressed that most of them strongly disliked Helms-Biden conditions and hoped the law would be a short-lived phenomenon. Fowler, in particular, was outspoken on this matter. Moreover, PermReps underlined that they were in DC in a personal capacity and, while able to discuss peacekeeping, had no mandate to engage on assessment issues which are the domain of the General Assembly. Despite their willingness to work with the Administration, the PermReps, especially Fowler, stressed that they would not be shy about their views on the shortcomings of Helms-Biden legislation

Holbrooke explained that we understood all that and reminded the PermReps of the great progress made since a Presidential candidate ridiculed former SYG BBG in his campaign. Holbrooke also attached importance to the fact that Helms had invited Annan to address this year's commencement at Helm's NC alma mater. UK Amb. Greenstock asked whether any serious progress could be made on UN issues this year given the campaign. Pickering responded that in his personal view, campaigns are fought on domestic issues and, therefore, we certainly intend and will be able to make progress still this year.

Hill

Despite earlier expectations the Security Council meetings on the Hill were not contentious. Only about half of the expected Senators attended and those present only stayed for parts of the meeting. None of the provocative themes Helms raised in NY resurfaced. Of note was Amb. Fowler remark that while Congress calls for increased UN efficiency, the UN only has 8,000 staff while the Hill has 30,000. He and other PermReps stressed that they felt Helms-Biden was unfair, both to the US and the UN, but this did not draw strong reactions from the Senators present. Van Walsum (Netherlands) explained that the Dutch per-capita contribution to the UN was greater than that of the US while the Netherlands had very little influence in the

organization. The Chinese ambassador stressed that US a has history of protecting minority interests for benefit of majority and that the US should apply the same logic to the UN. (He meant that the U.S. should not try to dominate the organization.) The strongest comment in what was otherwise a very mild meeting was Senator Warner's criticism of European members who contribute insufficient troops and police to UN operations.

Expect questions on reliability of
US financial support to PKOs.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/13/2000 4:08:55 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT State Department Press Guidance - April 13, 2000 [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
Hoelzer, Jennifer I. (PRESS/INTERN)
Leklem, Erik J. (NSCCOMM/PRESS/INTERN)
Stockwell, David B. (PRESS)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)
Aragoncillo, Leandro A. (VP)
Babbitt, James F. (VP)
Beardsley, Tyler S. (VP)
Black, Steven K. (VP)
Bolan, Christopher J. (VP)
Davidson, Leslie K. (VP)
Dennett, Todd H. (VP)
Fuerth, Leon S. (VP)
Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)
Hinckley, Steedman (VP)
Orfini, Michael H. (VP)
Osius, Theodore G. (VP)
Roberts, Michael W. (VP)
Saunders, Richard M. (VP)
Woolston, Ann E. (VP)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY**TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT**

04-13-2000 Final Guidances.doc

PRESS

GUIDANCES CONTENTS THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2000

AFRICA Eritrea-Ethiopia -- Casualties on the Border
Zimbabwe -- Farm Occupations / U.S. Position

EAST ASIA South Korea -- National Assembly Elections
China / Libya -- Nonproliferation Policies /
Accusations
China -- Resumption of NonProliferation
Dialogue
China (Hong Kong) -- Reported PRC Warning to the
Hong Kong Media / Freedom of
The Press

EUROPE Russia -- Edmond Pope Charged with
Espionage
Switzerland -- Forced Return of Kosovar Refugees

MIDDLE EAST Israel / Lebanon -- Israeli Supreme Court's Decision
That Detention of Lebanese
Hostages is Illegal
Israel -- Aid and Arms Sales to China /
Proposal to Withhold U.S.
Assistance
Iran -- Espionage trial of Iranian Jews
Libya-Taiwan-Switzerland -- Missile Cooperation / Ballistic
Missile Program / MTCR
Commitments / Smuggling of SCUD
Missile Components / UK
Interdiction / Impact of Missile
Activity on Relations with Libya
Western Sahara -- Baker's Pessimism on Accord
Between Morocco and Polisario

Iraq -- UNMOVIC Organization Plan

WESTERN Cuba -- Removal from the Terrorism List

HEMISPHERE Peru -- Elections

Haiti -- Rice Corporation of Haiti / Elections

Mexico -- Killing of Drug Enforcement Agents

Colombia -- Operation Millennium II

MISCELLANEOUS Human Rights -- The 56th Commission on Human Rights in Geneva

THERE WAS NO DAILY PRESS BRIEFING TODAY

NP Press Guidance

April 13, 2000

China: Nuclear Proliferation Accusations

Context: This test supplements today's guidance on the Washington Times report alleging missile related cooperation between China and Libya (shipment of a wind tunnel and other missile-related technology). This guidance is drawn from guidance drafted last year in connection with the allegations that China supplied ring-magnets to Pakistan for use in its nuclear program (centrifuge uranium enrichment).

Q: What is your assessment of China's nonproliferation policies?

A:-- WE HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT, TANGIBLE PROGRESS WITH CHINA ON NONPROLIFERATION.

-- IN RESPONSE TO OUR EFFORTS, CHINA HAS TAKEN A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT STEPS. CHINA HAS COMMITTED NOT TO AID UNSAFEGUARDED NUCLEAR FACILITIES, ADOPTED TIGHTENED NUCLEAR EXPORT CONTROLS, AND MADE THE DECISION TO END ALL NUCLEAR

COOPERATION WITH IRAN.

-- CONCERNING MISSILE EXPORTS, WE SANCTIONED CHINESE ENTITIES IN 1991 AND 1993 FOR M-11 MISSILE RELATED TRANSFERS. BUT HERE TOO WE HAVE MADE PROGRESS WITH CHINA.

-- CHINA HAS NOT SOLD MTCR-CLASS GROUND-TO-GROUND MISSILES SINCE COMMITTING IN 1994 NOT TO DO SO. CHINA HAS NOW UNDERTAKEN TO ACTIVELY STUDY MEMBERSHIP IN THE MTCR. PRESIDENT JIANG HAS ALSO STATED PUBLICLY THAT CHINA WILL NOT SELL MISSILES TO IRAN AND PAKISTAN.

-- IN 1997 CHINA TERMINATED SHIPMENTS OF C801/802 ANTI-SHIP CRUISE MISSILES AND RELATED TECHNOLOGY TO IRAN.

-- OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS WE HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT, TANGIBLE PROGRESS WITH CHINA ON NONPROLIFERATION. THAT DOESN'T MEAN WE'RE DONE. CHINA'S RECORD REMAINS UNEVEN AND WE STILL HAVE A DISTANCE TO GO.

-- BUT WE MUST REMEMBER THE DISTANCE WE HAVE COME SINCE THE 1970S AND 1980S, WHEN CHINA ACTIVELY OPPOSED THE NONPROLIFERATION REGIMES.

-- THIS ADMINISTRATION WILL CONTINUE TO PRESS HARD ON THESE ISSUES.

Drafted: NP/CPA - JCKessler
Previously
Cleared: NP - JDeThomas - ok
NP - JBarker - OK
NP/NEA - RStratford - ok
NP/CBM - PRoe - ok

EAP/CM - SKim - OK
T - RJEinhorn - subs
T - DGross - ok
P - DStraub - ok
D - RdeVillafranca - ok

EAP PRESS GUIDANCE April 13, 2000

HONG KONG: REPORTED PRC WARNING TO THE HK PRESS

Context: At an April 12 seminar organized by the pro-PRC Federation of Hong Kong Journalists, Wang Fengchao, Deputy Director of the Chinese government's Liaison Office in Hong Kong, said Hong Kong media should not report views that advocate Taiwan independence" as normal news." He claimed that Hong Kong media had "the responsibility to uphold the integrity and sovereignty of the country." He also said Hong Kong should speed up drafting of anti-subversion laws in order to "define the difference between reporting on the issue of Taiwan independence and advocating independence." Hong Kong's Acting Chief Executive Anson Chan (Chief Executive C.H. Tung is still traveling in the United States) immediately issued a statement strongly reaffirming guarantees of press, speech and publication freedoms under the Basic Law, Hong Kong's mini-constitution. Numerous political leaders, media outlets and others in Hong Kong were quick to condemn the Chinese official's remarks.

Q: Does the United States have any comment on the remarks of Wang Fengchao, a deputy director of the Chinese government's Liaison Office in Hong Kong, who said that Hong Kong media should not report on views advocating Taiwan independence?

A: -- FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN HONG KONG ARE GUARANTEED IN THE SINO-BRITISH JOINT DECLARATION AND IN HONG KONG'S BASIC LAW. PROTECTION OF THOSE FREEDOMS IS A FUNDAMENTAL ASPECT OF THE "ONE COUNTRY, TWO SYSTEMS"

CONCEPT,
UNDER WHICH CHINA DECLARED THAT HONG KONG'S SYSTEM AND WAY OF LIFE WERE
TO
"REMAIN UNCHANGED FOR 50 YEARS." IN ADDITION, THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION IS
A
CRUCIAL PART OF HONG KONG'S WAY OF LIFE AND A KEY FACTOR IN ITS ECONOMIC
VITALITY.

WE WERE THUS DISMAYED TO SEE REPORTS THAT A SENIOR CHINESE GOVERNMENT
OFFICIAL
HAS SAID THAT THE HONG KONG NEWS MEDIA SHOULD NOT REPORT ON CERTAIN VIEWS
BUT
INSTEAD SHOULD MAKE NEWS CHOICES BASED ON THE INTERESTS OF CHINA. BY ITS
VERY
NATURE, FREEDOM OF THE PRESS INCLUDES THE RIGHT TO REPORT ON DIFFERING
POINTS OF
VIEW, NOT JUST THE VIEWS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

WE NOTE THAT HONG KONG'S ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE ANSON CHAN HAS REITERATED
THAT
THE GUARANTEE OF PRESS FREEDOM IN THE BASIC LAW MEANS THAT THE HONG KONG
MEDIA IS
FREE TO COMMENT AND REPORT ON ALL MATTERS OF CURRENT INTEREST. WE ALSO
NOTE THAT
A NUMBER OF HONG KONG'S POLITICAL AND COMMUNITY LEADERS HAVE REITERATED
THEIR
SUPPORT FOR THE MEDIA'S RIGHT TO REPORT VIEWS ON ALL SIDES.

WE HAVE NOTED IN THE PAST THAT THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT HAS RESPECTED THE
BASIC
PROMISES IT MADE IN THE JOINT DECLARATION AND BASIC LAW, REGARDING HONG
KONG'S
AUTONOMY. WE CALL UPON THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT TO CONTINUE TO KEEP THE
PROMISES
IT MADE IN THE JOINT DECLARATION, AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGISTERED
WITH THE
UN, AND IN THE BASIC LAW, INCLUDING THE PRESERVATION OF HONG KONG'S BASIC

FREEDOMS, SUCH AS FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.

Q: Does this mean the United States is sympathetic toward the views expressed in the interview of Annette Lu?

A: THE U.S. IS RESTATING OUR STRONG SUPPORT FOR THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT OF PRESS FREEDOM.

U.S. POLICY ON CROSS-STRAIT RELATIONS REMAINS UNCHANGED. WE HAVE A ONE-"CHINA POLICY," INSIST ON PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES, AND BELIEVE DIALOGUE IS THE BEST WAY TO RESOLVE CROSS-STRAIT DIFFERENCES.

Q: What is your reaction to Mr. Wang's comment that the Hong Kong government should speed up drafting anti-subversion legislation as required by Article 23 of the Basic Law?

A: ARTICLE 23 INVOLVES SENSITIVE AND COMPLEX ISSUES. IN RECOGNITION OF THIS, HONG KONG HAS ADOPTED A DELIBERATE PACE AND HAS COMMITTED ITSELF TO ENGAGING IN FULL PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS. ARTICLE 23 LEGISLATION NEEDS TO BE ENACTED IN A WAY THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMON LAW TRADITION AND INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS.

Drafted by EAP:KWMoy
p/p/cm press guidance/041300 HK press freedom

Clearances: EAP:SShirk(ok)
EAP/CMSSchlaikjer
EAP/RSP/TC:JJNorris
EAP/P:KBailes(ok)

P:DS Shields
NSC:JKeith
DRL:MSchall

EAP PRESS GUIDANCE
April 13, 2000

CHINA - REPORTED RESUMPTION OF NONPROLIFERATION DIALOGUE

Context: Following a Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs briefing on Tuesday, April 11, the international press reported on statements made by the spokesperson that the PRC was ready to resume the bilateral nonproliferation dialogue -- suspended by China in the wake of the bombing of its Belgrade Embassy. The spokesperson, Sun Yuxi, was reported to have said "the Chinese side has already expressed a willingness to resume the dialogue" during NSC Berger's recent visit to Beijing, and that "the two sides are now making preparations through diplomatic channels." Our Embassy has confirmed that Sun's words were translated accurately. But, in a follow-up meeting with the MFA Arms Control Department, our Embassy was told that China's position had not changed -- and there were no specific plans to resume the formal dialogue. The Chinese position has been that it is willing to resume the dialogue depending on progress in the overall bilateral relationship. This position was restated Wednesday by an MFA official; "China will consider resuming a dialogue with the United States on nuclear nonproliferation this year if bilateral relations develop smoothly." An article in today's Washington Post suggests that the PRC "backpedalled" on its earlier announcement that it was ready to resume talks and reports that Embassy Beijing "expressed confusion" over "contradictory" Chinese statements.

Q. Please provide information and a reaction to a reported PRC statement that Beijing is ready to resume talks with the U.S. on nuclear nonproliferation, ending a nearly-one year suspension following the bombing of the PRC Embassy in Belgrade. What about about apparently contradictory comments that the PRC "will consider resuming a dialogue....this year if bilateral relations develop smoothly?" Have the Chinese backpedalled from their earlier position? Are we confused over contradictory statements? Has the PRC changed its stance, or did the PRC spokesman make a mistake earlier?

A. -- WE ARE AWARE OF PRESS REPORTS OF CHINESE FOREIGN MINISTRY OFFICIALS' COMMENTS ON TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY.

-- AS WE HAVE MADE CLEAR TO BEIJING, WE ARE READY TO RESUME OUR ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION DIALOGUE, AS THERE ARE MANY ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE DISCUSSED AT SENIOR LEVELS, IN A REGULAR, FORMAL CHANNEL.

-- WE ARE SEEKING CLARIFICATION FROM THE PRC REGARDING THEIR POSITION.
Press Guidance on PRC Spokesperson's Comments on Nonpro Dialogue

P:/P/CM PRESS GUIDANCE/041200 Nonpro Resume.doc

Drafted: EAP/CM: CHegadorn 7-6959 04/12/00

Cleared: EAP: SORoth ok
EAP/CM: SASchlaikjer ok
P: DShields
T: DGross
NP: CDale
AC/ST: PAlmquist
DOD: DMitchell
NSC: JKeith
EAP/P: KBailes ok

EAP Press Guidance
April 13, 2000

ROK: NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

Context: Amid opposition charges that the April 10 announcement of a South-North

summit was a political ploy, a domestic debate centered on voter disenchantment with "politics as usual," and apathy among younger voters, preliminary reports indicate that South Koreans today elected 132 members of President Kim Dae-jung's Millenium Democratic Party (MDP) to the next National Assembly, outdistancing the rival Grand National Party's (GNP) 115 seats. The GNP holds 120 seats to the MDP's 98 in the outgoing Assembly. Ballots are still being tallied and full results unavailable. A strong showing by the MDP, and the ROK's strong presidential system, would assure President Kim of continuity in his economic reform policies and in his policy of engaging the North.

Q.: Any reaction to the results of the ROK National Assembly election? Is the reported strong showing by the MDP an endorsement of Kim Dae-jung's North Korea engagement policy?

A.: BALLOTS ARE STILL BEING COUNTED AND THE FULL RESULTS ARE NOT IN. HOWEVER, WE WANT TO CONGRATULATE THE CITIZENS OF A FELLOW DEMOCRACY, THE ROK, IN THE EXERCISE OF THEIR CHERISHED RIGHT TO FREELY CHOOSE THEIR REPRESENTATIVES.

-- IT WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE TO TRY TO INTERPRET THE RESULTS -- WHICH ARE ONLY PRELIMINARY AT THIS POINT ANY WAY -- SINCE THAT IS AN ROK DOMESTIC MATTER.

-- THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA HAVE SHARED OVER THE PAST FIFTY YEARS THE COMMON GOALS OF PEACE AND STABILTY ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA. WE ALSO HOLD THE COMMON VALUES OF FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY. AS THE NEXT NATIONAL ASSEMBLY TAKES UP ITS TASKS , WE LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUING TO STRENGTHEN OUR SOLID BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP.

Drafted: RScorza 76706
p/k/rokelec.doc

Cleared: EAP:SRoth
EAP:RDeming
EAP:PYun
EAP/K:ERevere(ok)
EAP/K:DShear(ok)
NP/SC:CKessler
P:DSields
C:MStorella
S/P:MPalmer
NSC:JPritchard
EAP/PA:Kbailes

EUR GUIDANCE - REVISED
SWITZERLAND
April 13, 2000

SWITZERLAND: Forced Return of Kosovar Refugees

Context: The NYT this morning reported that Switzerland has forcibly returned to Pristina the first 60 of up to 30,000 Kosovar refugees it took in last year. A larger effort to begin expelling the rest of the refugees from Switzerland is slated for June. Similar reports about forced returns have appeared recently with regard to Kosovar refugees in Australia and Germany.

Yesterday, UNMIK chief Bernard Kouchner warned against the rapid forced return of thousands of refugees, saying the province could not absorb so many refugees all at once. He appealed to host countries to refrain from forcibly returning refugees at this time.

Q: What's your reaction to Bernard Kouchner's call for countries like Switzerland, Germany and Australia to stop forcibly returning Kosovo refugees? Do you think host countries should slow down and keep the refugees until economic

and social conditions improve in Kosovo?

A: MANY COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES, SWITZERLAND, GERMANY AND OTHERS, GENEROUSLY OPENED THEIR DOORS TO HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF REFUGEES FLEEING THE FRY GOVERNMENT'S ETHNIC CLEANSING CAMPAIGN IN KOSOVO LAST YEAR. THESE REFUGEES, FOR THE MOST PART, WERE GIVEN TEMPORARY VISAS THAT HAVE NOW EXPIRED IN MANY CASES. THE UNHCR IN DECEMBER DECLARED THAT KOSOVO WAS SAFE FOR REFUGEES TO RETURN. TENS OF THOUSANDS HAVE DONE SO VOLUNTARILY AND ARE RE-ESTABLISHING THEIR LIVES UNDER UNMIK ADMINISTRATION AND KFOR PROTECTION.

* WE RESPECT THE RIGHT OF ANY COUNTRY TO ENFORCE THEIR IMMIGRATION LAWS. THAT SAID, WE RECOGNIZE, AS DR. KOUCHNER NOTED, THAT ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN KOSOVO AT THE MOMENT ARE DIFFICULT. ABSORBING TENS OF THOUSANDS OF REFUGEES AT THE SAME TIME, WHEN THE INFRASTRUCTURE IS INADEQUATE TO PROVIDE FOR THEM, MAY INCREASE SOCIAL PRESSURES. WE HOPE THAT HOST GVERNMENTS WILL TAKE THESE CONDITIONS INTO ACCOUNT WHEN IMPLEMENTING THEIR REFUGEE POLICIES.

Q: But do you think these countries should be forcing refugees to return against their will? Will the U.S. force Kosovar refugees to return as well?

A: WE URGE ALL HOST COUNTRIES WHO ARE RE-PATRIATING KOSOVAR REFUGEES TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FRAGILE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS STILL EXISTING THERE AND THE CAPACITY OF THE PROVINCE TO ABSORB THEM WITHOUT SEVERE HARDSHIP.

THE KOSOVAR REFUGEES ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE HUMANITARIAN EVACUATION PROGRAM (HEP) LAST YEAR WILL NOT BE DEPORTED. ALL PEOPLE ADMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES AS REFUGEES HAVE THE RIGHT TO REMAIN PERMANENTLY IN THIS COUNTRY.

UNDER THE HEP, KOSOVAR REFUGEES HAVE THE OPTION OF RETURNING TO KOSOVO WITH ASSISTANCE FROM THE UNITED STATES IF THEY CHOOSE TO DO SO BY MAY 1ST.

Drafted: EUR/PPA: P.Frayne
Cleared: EUR/PPA: S.Kaiser
EUR/FO: J.Swigert
PRM: R.Mackler
EUR/AGS: J.Shannon
EUR/AGS: C.Cohen
S/SA: J.Pardew
Eur/SCE: P.Kaplan
EUR/SCE: B.Connuck

NEA Press Guidance
Thursday, April 13, 2000

ISRAEL/LEBANON: ISRAELI SUPREME COURT DECISION THAT DETENTION OF LEBANESE HOSTAGES IS ILLEGAL

Context: The Israeli Supreme Court ruled on April 12 that Israel's detention of Lebanese men as hostages for more than a decade is illegal, and government officials said 13 of them will be released on April 17 in compliance with that

decision. The men were detained in the late 1980s by the Israeli military or its Lebanese allies in southern Lebanon as suspected members of the Shiite Muslim Hezbollah party militia. They were then kept in jail without further hearings or trials even after their brief prison sentences ran out. The Israeli Supreme Court agreed with counsel for eight of the prisoners that a 1979 emergency law does not authorize the taking of hostages who pose no risk to Israeli national security. The government subsequently said it will release 5 more men imprisoned under similar circumstances. The men were originally captured as "bargaining chips" to recover captured Israeli military personnel, particularly air force navigator Ron Arad, whose fate is still unknown.

Q: Do you have any facts or comments on the Israeli Supreme Court's decision that Israel's detention of Lebanese men as hostages illegal?

-- WE VIEW THIS DECISION AS POSITIVE AND SEE IT AS PART OF A WELCOME TREND.

-- OUR VIEWS ON DETAINEES ARE COVERED IN OUR ANNUAL HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT.

NP PRESS GUIDANCE

April 13, 2000

CHINA-LIBYA MISSILE COOPERATION

CONTEXT: An article in today's Washington Times (building on a story from January) reports that intelligence officials and a recent National Security Agency (NSA) report have confirmed that China is supplying a wind tunnel and other missile-related technology and expertise to Libya's Al-Fatah indigenous missile development program. The article focuses on Libya's interest in long-range missile development and suggests that Libya recently has been on a buying spree. In this context, it notes that in November 1999, the UK interdicted a shipment of SCUD missile parts being shipped from Taiwan to Libya and that on April 12 Switzerland announced the arrest of a Taiwanese businessman attempting to smuggle SCUD components to Libya. The article also suggests that Libya may be interested in acquiring DPRK No Dong or Taepo Dong missiles.

We cannot comment on the details of alleged intelligence information concerning China-Libya missile cooperation. However, we should stress that we investigate any such reports thoroughly and note that we have repeatedly raised our nonproliferation concerns with China at the highest levels. We also cannot comment on the details of Libya's missile development activities, as any such information would be based on intelligence information. However, we should make clear that Libya's possession of -- and interest in maintaining -- its 300 km-range SCUD missiles is well-known, as is Libya's interest in obtaining even longer range systems (1,000 km). We also should stress that the United States has been working for years to impede the proliferation of missile items to Libya.

Q: What can you tell us about Libya's ballistic missile program?

A:-- IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT LIBYA POSSESSES 300-KM RANGE SCUD MISSILES AND IS ACTIVELY PURSUING ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF EVEN LONGER RANGE SYSTEMS.

-- IT WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE FOR ME TO COMMENT FURTHER ABOUT WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT THE DETAILS OF LIBYA'S MISSILE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

-- WHILE I AM NOT GOING TO COMMENT ON THIS SPECIFIC REPORT, LET ME ASSURE YOU THAT WE HAVE RAISED WITH

-2-

CHINA OUR CONCERNS ABOUT ANY POSSIBLE COOPERATION WITH THE LIBYAN MISSILE PROGRAM.

-- AS WE HAVE SAID BEFORE, HOWEVER, THE UNITED STATES VIEWS LIBYA'S EFFORTS TO

FURTHER DEVELOP ITS BALLISTIC MISSILE CAPABILITIES AS A SERIOUS THREAT TO THAT REGION AND TO OUR NONPROLIFERATION INTERESTS. WE HAVE ENGAGED FOR MANY YEARS IN EXTENSIVE EFFORTS TO IMPEDE THE PROLIFERATION OF MISSILE EQUIPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY TO LIBYA.

-- WE CONTINUE TO PLACE A HIGH PRIORITY ON THIS IMPORTANT MISSILE NONPROLIFERATION ISSUE AND TO WORK CLOSELY WITH OTHER LIKE-MINDED COUNTRIES.

Q: Any comments on reports that China is providing sensitive items to Libya's missile program?

A:-- WE DO NOT COMMENT ON ALLEGED INTELLIGENCE MATTERS.

-- WE TAKE ALL SUCH REPORTS SERIOUSLY AND INVESTIGATE THEM THOROUGHLY.

-- WE HAVE RAISED OUR NONPROLIFERATION CONCERNS WITH CHINA IN THE PAST, AND WILL CONTINUE TO DO SO.

-3-

Q: Is this cooperation sanctionable under U.S. law?

-- WE FULLY AND FAITHFULLY IMPLEMENT THE REQUIREMENTS OF U.S. LAW AND WOULD TAKE ANY ACTIONS REQUIRED BY THOSE LAWS WERE WE TO DETERMINE THAT ENTITIES HAD ENGAGED IN SANCTIONABLE ACTIVITIES.

-- HOWEVER, THE ISSUE OF SANCTIONABILITY WOULD DEPEND ENTIRELY ON THE SPECIFIC NATURE OF ANY TRANSFER.

-- SUCH INFORMATION WOULD BE BASED ON INTELLIGENCE, AND WE DO NOT COMMENT ON INTELLIGENCE MATTERS.

(If asked about China's MTCR Commitments.)

Q: What about China's MTCR commitments?

-- IN OCTOBER 1994, CHINA PLEDGED NOT TO EXPORT MTCR-CLASS GROUND-TO-GROUND MISSILES.

-- WE HAVE NO REASON TO CONCLUDE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA HAS ACTED IN A MANNER INCONSISTENT WITH THIS 1994 COMMITMENT.

-- IN 1998, CHINA ANNOUNCED THAT IT WOULD ACTIVELY STUDY MEMBERSHIP IN THE MTCR.

-4-

-- AS WE HAVE DISCUSSED MANY TIMES BEFORE, HOWEVER, THE UNITED STATES HAS LONG-STANDING CONCERNS ABOUT CHINESE ENTITIES' EXPORTS OF COMPONENTS AND TECHNOLOGY TO MISSILE PROGRAMS OF CONCERN.

-- WE HAVE REPEATEDLY MADE THESE CONCERNS CLEAR TO THE CHINESE LEADERSHIP, AND WE WILL CONTINUE TO DO SO.

-- ENGAGING CHINA ON NONPROLIFERATION HAS BEEN A TOP PRIORITY OF THIS ADMINISTRATION. OVER TIME, THESE EFFORTS HAVE LED CHINA TO EXPAND ITS INTERNATIONAL NONPROLIFERATION COMMITMENTS AND TIGHTEN UP THEIR ENFORCEMENT. IN

PARTICULAR, CHINA HAS MADE MAJOR PROGRESS IN THE IMPOSITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF CONTROLS ON NUCLEAR-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.

-- WE WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH CHINA TO BRING ITS POLICIES AND PRACTICES BETTER IN LINE WITH INTERNATIONAL NORMS.

Q: Can you confirm that Switzerland caught a Taiwanese businessman trying to smuggle SCUD missile components to Libya?

A:-- WE HAVE SEEN PRESS REPORTS ON THE SWISS ARREST.

-- FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THIS INCIDENT, I REFER YOU TO THE GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND.

-5-

Q: What was the origin of these items?

A:-- AGAIN, YOU SHOULD REFER ANY QUESTIONS ON THIS INCIDENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND.

Q: What about the UK interdiction in November? Can you confirm that the UK caught Libya trying to smuggle Taiwan-origin SCUD missile components to Libya?

A:-- AS WE HAVE SAID BEFORE, WE ARE AWARE OF THE UK INTERDICTION. HOWEVER, YOU SHOULD REFER ANY QUESTIONS ON THE DETAILS OF THIS MATTER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Q: What impact will this missile activity have on the Clinton Administration's

efforts to improve relations with Libya? Doesn't this demonstrate that Libya remains a dangerous regime that should continue to be isolated?

A:-- AS WE HAVE SAID ON NUMEROUS PREVIOUS OCCASIONS, THERE HAS BEEN NO CHANGE IN OUR POLICY TOWARD LIBYA. WE ARE FOCUSED ON GETTING LIBYA TO MEET THE OUTSTANDING REQUIREMENTS OF THE RELEVANT UN SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS, WHICH ARE FULL COOPERATION WITH THE PAN AM 103 TRIAL, AN END TO SUPPORT FOR TERRORISM, ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTIONS OF LIBYAN OFFICIALS, AND PAYMENT OF APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION.

DRAFTED: NP/CBM:PROE
X7-4931 04/13/00 ROEPK/PRESSGUI/04-13-00 CHINA-LIBYA.DOC

CLEARED: NP:J Barker ok
NP/CBM:V Van Diepen ok
T:TGodby ok
EAP/CM:CHegadorn ok
EAP/PA:K Bailes (info)
NP/CPA:CKessler ok
NEA/PA:AEreli ok
NEA/ENA:JLaPenn ok
INR/SPM:AVincent ok
EUR/AGS:JShannon ok
EUR/UBI:KPitterle ok
EUR/PPA:SKaiser (info)
NEA Press Guidance
Thursday, April 13, 2000

WESTERN SAHARA: BAKER'S PESSIMISM ON ACCORD BETWEEN MOROCCO AND POLISARIO

Background: At the request of UN SYG Kofi Annan and the UNSC, former U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, the SYG's Personal Envoy for the Western Sahara, recently completed a trip to North Africa. He consulted with Algeria, Morocco, and the Polisario about ways and means to move forward with a settlement of the long-running Western Sahara dispute. In his statements to the press, Baker expressed concern that the UN Settlement Plan was in trouble. As the Secretary General stated in his reports in December and January, the parties to the dispute, Morocco and the Polisario, have fundamentally differing views on the proper composition of the electorate for the proposed referendum on the final status of the territory. More than 130,000 people excluded from the SYG's list of 85,000 eligible voters, have appealed their exclusion. Most of these appeals are supported by Morocco. Processing these appeals could take several more years, throwing the whole process into doubt.

Q: Do you have any comment on James Baker's stated pessimism about the process to reach an accord between Morocco and the Polisario on the Western Sahara?

THE UNITED STATES CONTINUES TO SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND UNSYG PERSONAL ENVOY JAMES BAKER TO FIND A PEACEFUL SOLUTION TO THIS LONG-RUNNING DISPUTE.

WHILE WE CONTINUE TO SUPPORT MINURSO, WE SHARE THE CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY THE SECRETARY GENERAL IN HIS RECENT REPORTS, AND ECHOED BY MR. BAKER, ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF HOLDING, WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME, A REFERENDUM ON THE FINAL STATUS OF THE TERRITORY.

WE URGE THE PARTIES AND INTERESTED NATIONS TO COOPERATE WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND MR. BAKER TO RESOLVE THEIR DIFFERENCES PEACEFULLY.

NP Press Guidance

April 13, 2000

UNMOVIC Organization Plan

CONTEXT: This morning, the United Nations Security Council will meet in informals to discuss the proposed UNMOVIC Organizational Plan. We expect the plan to be approved with little to no opposition. This guidance will be sent to New York for Ambassador Holbrooke's use after the morning session.

Q: Any comment on the plan?

A:-- UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1284 ASKED UNMOVIC EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN HANS BLIX TO PROVIDE, FOR APPROVAL BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL, AN ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN FOR UNMOVIC. HE DID THAT TODAY. [IF TRUE] THE SECURITY COUNCIL STOOD UNITED AND APPROVED HIS PLAN.

-- DR. BLIX HAS TAKEN A SERIOUS APPROACH TO ORGANIZING UNMOVIC. HIS PROPOSED STRUCTURE IS CONSISTENT WITH THE RESOLUTION AND WILL ALLOW UNMOVIC TO CARRY OUT THE COUNCIL'S TASKS.

(IF ASKED)

Q: Can you give us any specifics on the plan?

A:-- THE PLAN PROVIDES UNMOVIC THE TOOLS IT NEEDS TO IMPLEMENT THE COUNCIL'S MANDATE:

-- THE ROLE OF COLLEGE OF COMMISSIONERS AND THE EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN ACCURATELY REFLECTS REQUIREMENTS OF 1284 AND PROVIDES BASIS FOR COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE.

-- THE FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO THE FOUR DIVISIONS AND ONE ADMINISTRATIVE

SERVICE SHOULD ENABLE UNMOVIC TO CARRY OUT ITS CORE RESPONSIBILITIES OF ADDRESSING UNRESOLVED DISARMAMENT ISSUES AND IMPLEMENTING A REINFORCED MONITORING SYSTEM.

-- UNMOVIC'S PLAN TO UTILIZE OFFICES IN NEW YORK, IRAQ, AND A FIELD OFFICE IS NECESSARY FOR THE TASK.

Q: What about staffing the organization?

A: -- WE SUPPORT BLIX'S AUTHORITY TO HIRE WHOMEVER HE THINKS MOST QUALIFIED, WITHOUT UNDUE REFERENCE TO NATIONALITY OR OTHER FACTORS. MOST IMPORTANT IS TO HAVE SUITABLY QUALIFIED EXPERTS. WE HAVE CONFIDENCE IN BLIX'S JUDGEMENT ON STAFFING ISSUES.

Q: Do you expect to have Americans on the staff?

A: -- THERE ARE SUITABLY QUALIFIED AMERICANS FOR BLIX TO CHOOSE FROM. WE RESPECT BLIX'S PREROGATIVE TO CHOSE HIS OWN STAFF.

Q: Are there any aspects of the plan that cause concern to the U.S?

A: -- OUR GREATEST CONCERN IS IRAQ'S REFUSAL TO MEET ITS UNSCR OBLIGATIONS. ANY CONCERNS WE MAY HAVE ABOUT THE PLAN CAN BE ADDRESSED DURING IMPLEMENTATION. THE EXPERTISE OF THOSE WHO ARE HIRED WILL DETERMINE HOW WELL BLIX'S PLAN ACTUALLY WORKS.

Q: Iraq has indicated they will not accept UNSCR 1284! Iraq isn't cooperating. So why does UNMOVIC or this plan matter?

A: -- THE COUNCIL HAS NEVER WAVERED IN ITS DESIRE THAT UNDER UNSCR 687 IRAQ WOULD GIVE UP POSSESSION OF ALL WMD AND THE MISSILES TO DELIVER THEM. THIS WAS

THE SINE QUA NON FOR LIFTING SANCTIONS. THIS DEMAND OF THE COUNCIL REMAINS IN PLACE. UNSCR 1284 SUPPLEMENTED THIS BY OFFERING SUSPENSION OF SOME SANCTIONS IF IRAQ COOPERATED FULLY IN THE PROCESS LEADING TO FULL ELIMINATION OF WMD AND MISSILES AS WELL AS IN REINFORCED MONITORING OF ITS PERFORMANCE. THAT GIVES IRAQ A CLEAR MOTIVE FOR ACCEPTING 1284 AND COOPERATING WITH THE SECURITY COUNCIL'S APPOINTED BODIES: UNMOVIC AND THE IAEA.

-- ACCEPTANCE OF UNSCR 1284 IS A NECESSARY FIRST STEP IF IRAQ WANTS THE BENEFITS OF SANCTIONS SUSPENSION OUTLINED IN THE RESOLUTION. WE INVITE IRAQ TO AVAIL ITSELF OF THIS OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH THE COUNCIL TO MEET ITS OBLIGATIONS.

Q: The UN sanctions the US supports are killing Iraqi children every day. What does UNSCR 1284 have to do with the real humanitarian issues in Iraq?

A: -- THE MOST DIRECT WAY FOR IRAQ TO BETTER ITS HUMANITARIAN SITUATION IS TO ACCEPT 1284 AND COOPERATE WITH BLIX. THAT COULD LEAD TO SUSPENSION OF SOME SANCTIONS. UNMOVIC AND IAEA REPRESENTS THE COUNCIL'S APPOINTED MECHANISM TO VERIFY IRAQ IS MEETING ITS OBLIGATIONS. MOREOVER, 1284 OUTLINES A NUMBER OF STEPS TO IMPROVE THE HUMANITARIAN SITUATION IN IRAQ. THE UN AND THE SECURITY COUNCIL ARE WELL ALONG IN IMPLEMENTING THESE PORTIONS OF THE RESOLUTION. 1284 ALSO REQUIRES THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ TO TAKE STEPS TO IMPROVE THE HUMANITARIAN SITUATION; LITTLE HAS BEEN DONE TO DATE BY IRAQ.

-- IN THE MEANTIME, THE UN IS UNDERTAKING THE LARGEST HUMANITARIAN PROGRAM IN ITS HISTORY TO HELP THE IRAQI PEOPLE: THE OIL FOR FOOD PROGRAM

-- WE NOTE IN AREAS OF IRAQ WHERE SADDAM HUSSEIN DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH

HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMS, THE SITUATION OF IRAQI CHILDREN IS BETTER THAN BEFORE THE WAR.

Q: Will the U.S support efforts to gain Iraq's agreement?

A: -- 1284 IS NOT UP FOR NEGOTIATION. WE HOPE IRAQ WILL RECOGNIZE THAT THE COUNCIL IS UNITED BEHIND UNMOVIC AND UNMOVIC'S MANDATE AND ACCEPT 1284. IRAQ HAS PLAYED THIS GAME BEFORE. ONCE IRAQ CONCLUDES IT CANNOT SPLIT THE COUNCIL, IT MAY WELL COME ONBOARD.

Q: [IF TRUE] WHY DID XXXXX SPEAK AGAINST/VOTE AGAINST BLIX'S PLAN? DOESN'T THAT BODE ILL FOR UNMOVIC?

A: THE COUNCIL SUPPORTED BLIX FOR THE CHAIRMAN'S ROLE, AND ASKED HIM TO DESIGN UNMOVIC'S STRUCTURE. THERE IS NO REASON TO SECOND GUESS BLIX. WE URGE OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS TO GIVE

BLIX THE SPACE TO GET THIS DIFFICULT OPERATION UP AND RUNNING, AND JUDGE HIM BY RESULTS, NOT SIMPLY HIS ORGANIZATIONAL CHART.

e:\np\ra\EvansPO\Press Guidance\2000\04 12 UNMOVIC Org Plan.doc
drafted by: NP/RA:WFrant x71617
04/07/2000

Clearance:
NP:
JDeThomas
OK

NP/RA:
EWMcKeen
OK

NP/CPA:

JCKessler
OK

NEA/NGA:
KAllegro
OK

NEA/P:
AEreli
OK

IO/UNP:
ABenesch
OK

P:
JCStevens
OK

USUN/W
JMarty
OK

USUN/NY
DScott
OK

S/CT PRESS GUIDANCE
Thursday, April 13, 2000

TERRORISM LIST: WILL CUBA BE REMOVED?

Context:

This morning's USA Today quotes Ambassador Sheehan as saying he wants terrorist states to change their behavior enough to warrant removal from the "terrorism list" of state sponsors. While all seven designated states are mentioned, Cuba is highlighted in the article. The story is factually correct, but it could be interpreted as a softening toward Cuba, thus angering those who favor keeping Elian Gonzalez in the United States.

Q: Does the United States want Cuba off the "terrorism list?"

A:-- WHAT THE UNITED STATES WANTS IS FOR COUNTRIES TO GET OUT OF THE
TERRORISM
BUSINESS. ALL SEVEN STATES CURRENTLY DESIGNATED AS SPONSORS OF TERRORISM
WOULD
BE ELIGIBLE TO BE REMOVED FROM THE "TERRORISM LIST" IF THEY CEASE SUPPORT FOR
TERRORISM.
-- FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE HAD RECENT DISCUSSIONS WITH NORTH KOREA ABOUT
WHAT STEPS
IT MUST TAKE TO QUALIFY FOR REMOVAL FROM THE LIST.
-- WE HAVE NOT HAD SUCH DISCUSSIONS WITH CUBA.
-- CUBA WILL NOT COME OFF THE LIST THIS YEAR, BECAUSE THEY PROVIDE SAFEHAVEN
TO
SEVERAL TERRORISTS AND US FUGITIVES AND MAINTAINS TIES TO OTHER STATE
SPONSORS OF
TERRORISM AND LATIN AMERICAN INSURGENTS.

Drafted:S/CT:JReap
X78682

Cleared:S/CT:MASheehan
WHA/CCA:Cshapiro
WHA:PRomero
WHA Press Guidance
April 13, 2000

Peruvian Elections - Second Round

Context: On April 12, the Peruvian electoral authorities announced that with 97.682% of the vote counted from the April 9 national elections, no single candidate won an absolute majority of the vote. (Incumbent President Alberto Fujimori currently has 49.84% of the vote, and opposition candidate Alejandro Toledo 40.31%.) There will be a runoff between the two men in the next several weeks. While these results correspond with findings of independent observers, we remain concerned about the numerous irregularities been reported in the campaign, balloting and tallying process.

Q: What is the Department's reaction to the results of the elections in Peru?

A: FIRST, LET ME REPEAT WHAT WE HAVE SAID FROM THE OUTSET. WE REMAIN NEUTRAL ON WHICHEVER CANDIDATE IS ULTIMATELY ELECTED IN A FREE AND FAIR PROCESS. WE WELCOME THE ANNOUNCEMENT BY PERU'S ELECTORAL AUTHORITIES THAT NO SINGLE CANDIDATE IN SUNDAY'S PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS WON AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF THE VOTE. THIS IS A GOOD FIRST STEP TOWARDS RESTORING CREDIBILITY IN THE ELECTORAL PROCESS.

THESE RESULTS CORRESPOND TO THE FINDINGS OF FIVE SEPARATE SAMPLINGS OF ACTUAL ELECTION RETURNS, CONDUCTED BY INDEPENDENT MONITORS AND POLLING FIRMS.

WE REMAIN CONCERNED ABOUT REPORTS OF IRREGULARITIES IN THE BALLOTING AND TALLYING PROCESS, WHICH FOLLOWED A CAMPAIGN PHASE MARKED BY SEVERE ELECTORAL DEFICIENCIES.

THERE WILL BE A RUNOFF BETWEEN INCUMBENT PRESIDENT ALBERTO FUJIMORI AND OPPOSITION CANDIDATE ALEJANDRO TOLEDO IN THE NEXT SEVERAL WEEKS. WE WOULD HOPE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF PERU AND PERU'S ELECTORAL AUTHORITIES TAKE ALL

POSSIBLE
MEASURES TO ENSURE THAT THE NEXT ROUND OF VOTING FULLY MEETS DEMOCRATIC
STANDARDS
OF OPENNESS, TRANSPARENCY, AND FAIRNESS.

Q: When will the second round of voting be held?

A: NO DATE HAS YET BEEN SET. BY PERUVIAN LAW, A RUN-OFF MUST BE HELD WITHIN
THIRTY DAYS AFTER THE NATIONAL ELECTORAL BOARD HAS CERTIFIED THE FINAL
RESULTS
AND RULED ON ANY CHALLENGES. WE THEREFORE ESTIMATE THAT A SECOND ROUND
WOULD BE
HELD IN LATE MAY OR EARLY JUNE.

Doc searaand/andpe00/press guidance/FINAL Q&A Runoff

Drafted: WHA/AND: E Weigold 7-4177 04/12/2000

Cleared: WHA/AND: P Chicola ok

S/P: R Herman ok

P: L Arreaga ok

DRL: P Higgins ok

USOAS: C Roe ok

NSC: D Avery ok

WHA: W Brownfield ok

WHA: P Romero ok

WHA PRESS GUIDANCE

April 13, 2000

HAITI: Elections

CONTEXT: President Preval announced April 11, immediately prior to his departure for the G-77 Summit in Havana, that he and the Provisional Electoral Council (CEP) had agreed on a date for the first round of Haiti's long-delayed legislative and local elections. A member of the CEP subsequently announced that the electoral council is sending a letter to Preval proposing May 21, although this letter has not yet been sent. Also the date will not be finalized until Preval formally agrees to it and includes the date in a decree published in the national gazette. Opposition parties have expressed skepticism that Preval will stick to the new schedule or ensure fair elections, continuing to maintain that he has the politically-motivated goal of combining the vote with presidential elections later in the year when pro-Aristide candidates would have an advantage. Haiti has been without a parliament or independent local governments since January 11, 1999, when Preval effectively disbanded these institutions after their elected mandates lapsed. The U.S. and international community are continuing to press strongly for credible elections without further delays.

Question:

Do you have any comments on the Haitian government's announcement that the first round of legislative and local elections will be held on May 21?

Answer:

We welcome comments by an official of Haiti's Provisional Electoral Council (CEP) that the first round of that country's long-delayed legislative and local elections will be held May 21. We urge the Government of Haiti to finalize dates for both rounds of the elections promptly such that a Parliament with full constitutional powers can be convened without further unnecessary delays. We also urge the Haitian government to provide the CEP with the full security, financial, and logistical support necessary to ensure free, fair, and transparent elections in an atmosphere of non-violence.

Prompt and credible legislative and local elections are absolutely critical for fully restoring Haiti's democratic institutions and allowing that country to benefit from hundreds of millions of dollars in penned up international loans and assistance. Failure to ensure these elections take place in coming weeks will risk isolating Haiti from the community of democracies and seriously jeopardize

future cooperation.

Haiti Press Guidance
SEARAHWG.PG041300.doc

Drafted: WHA/HWG:Rgilchrist ok
Cleared: WHA/HWG:Dlinsky ok
NSC:Chollis ok
Embassy Port-au-Prince: Astewart ok

WHA PRESS GUIDANCE
April 13, 2000

HAITI: Press Guidance on Rice Corporation of Haiti Dispute

CONTEXT: Claiming that Rice Corp. of Haiti (RCH) -- a Haitian company with majority U.S. ownership -- was engaged in smuggling and customs fraud, Haitian Customs on February 7 shuttered the firm's rice mill just north of Port au Prince, and impounded a shipment of rice from Archer Daniels Midland at the dock. RCH tried unsuccessfully to forestall the mill closure by initially admitting to Customs errors but arguing there was no criminal intent. The American principals, Douglas Murphy and Larry Theriot, left Haiti February 23. Our Embassy was informed by Haitian Government officials that there were arrest warrants for Murphy and Theriot, but these warrants were never executed or shown to the individuals involved or to Embassy personnel. The two Americans stayed with the USAID director prior to their departure; when they decided that it was better for them to leave Haiti for the Dominican Republic, they were assisted in doing so by the U.S. Mission. Before departing Theriot and the GOH negotiated a 28 million gourde

(approximately \$1.5 million) fine, to be paid in three installments. To date RCH has paid only about 3 million gourdes (the actual customs duty on the rice plus 1 million gourdes) and is attempting to renegotiate the amount. In mid-March RCH's shipping agent, Madsen, paid a separate Customs fine in order to obtain the off-loading of the remaining rice cargo and release of the ship, which has since left Haitian waters. The mill has been allowed to reopen to process the shipload of rice, which is being sold to pay RCH's fine.

The case has escalated from a primarily commercial dispute into a criminal case because of a dispute over the ownership of RCH. American Rice Inc. (ARI), previously described by RCH as its parent corporation, was wrested from Douglas Murphy's control following acrimonious bankruptcy proceedings in 1998 in Texas. ARI has filed suit in the United States to reclaim RCH assets and the case is due to be heard in Texas in late May. ARI has also filed an action in Port-au-Prince charging fraudulent operation of RCH, which resulted in the arrest warrants issued for Theriot and Murphy.

There has been considerable Congressional interest in this case, with at least six Senate and House offices asking us to insist on fair treatment for the RCH officials by the Haitian Government, which both Embassy Port au Prince and WHA have done. Senator Helms has placed holds on U.S. aid affecting ESF-funded ongoing development projects in agriculture and other areas of economic recovery. The holds do not affect food aid under PL-480 and related programs.

Question:

Can you describe the situation regarding "expropriation" of an American rice company in Haiti that has led Senator Helms to put a hold on U.S. aid?

Answer:

The Rice Corporation of Haiti (RCH) -- a Haitian company with majority ownership by American citizens -- was charged by Haitian Customs with fraud in the shipment of rice that arrived in Haiti on January 31. RCH admitted to Haitian authorities and to U.S. Embassy personnel that documentary errors did occur, but denied the

charge of fraud or criminal intent. RCH negotiated a payment schedule with the Haitian Government for the penalties, which we understand has not been completed. Two American citizens involved in the case have now departed from Haiti. We have urged the Haitian authorities to resolve these matters on the basis of credible evidence and in a manner that conforms to the principles of due process and the rule of law. We have no indication that their actions to date are not in conformance with Haitian law. We continue to actively encourage all parties to reach a settlement that is fair and consistent with Haitian and U.S. law.

Question:

Did the U.S. Government intervene on behalf of the American citizens?

Answer:

The U.S. Government has insisted that all Americans involved in this case be entitled to due process and full respect of the rule of law. We have used the good offices of our Embassy and other direct contacts with the Government of Haiti to press for a fair, rapid resolution to this case.

Question:

Is there another U.S. company involved in this case? Is the ownership of Rice Corporation of Haiti a disputed question?

Answer:

American Rice Incorporated (ARI) has disputed the legal status of Rice Corporation of Haiti, claiming that the latter is a subsidiary of ARI. We understand that lawsuits adjudicating these claims are pending before a U.S. Court and also in Haiti. In view of that pending litigation, we will refrain from commenting further on the case.

Question:

Were the Americans citizens in this case charged with crimes and told not to leave Haiti? If so, did the U.S. Government take actions to help them evade the criminal justice system in Haiti and leave Haiti?

Answer:

The U.S. citizens involved in this case report that they were never presented with arrest warrants or orders not to leave Haiti. The citizens in question have informed us that they believe this case could be pursued more effectively from outside of Haiti, and thus chose to leave Haiti. The status of their case in Haiti is a question better put to the Haitian Government. We are not prepared to provide further information on actions that may have been taken by our Government.

Haiti Press Guidance

SEARAHWG.PG041100 rice&Helms.doc

Drafted: WHA/HWG:MLGarrison/Dsteinberg ok

Cleared: WHA/HWG:DLinskey ok

L/WHA:MPeay ok

CA/OCS:DHeinen subs

WHA/PA:AKoss ok

EB/OIA:CLandberg ok

L/CID:FGaffney ok

INL Press Guidance

April 13, 2000

MEXICO: THE KILLINGS OF MEXICAN DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENTS

Q: The Washington Post reported that three Mexican drug enforcement agents were found tortured and murdered in Tijuana. The article adds that these killings are the latest in a spate of drug-related violence along the U.S.-Mexican Border. What comments does the Department have on the wave of killings occurring along the Southwest Border?

A:-- THE KILLINGS UNDERSCORE THE EXTREME DANGER FACED BY MEXICAN LAW ENFORCEMENT

AGENTS IN TAKING ACTION AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING ORGANIZATIONS. THE DEDICATION OF SUCH OFFICERS REFLECTS THE COMMITMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO TO COMBAT THESE GROUPS. THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE EXTENDS ITS DEEPEST CONDOLENCES TO THEIR FAMILIES.

-- THE SAFETY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS, BOTH U.S. AND MEXICAN, IS A PRIMARY CONCERN IN OUR COUNTERNARCOTICS EFFORTS IN MEXICO.

-- THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IS EXTREMELY CONCERNED ABOUT THE ESCALATING VIOLENCE ALONG THE U.S. - MEXICAN BORDER. IT IS EVIDENT THAT THERE IS A VIOLENT STRUGGLE BETWEEN DRUG TRAFFICKING ORGANIZATIONS COMPETING FOR CONTROL OF SMUGGLING ROUTES AND LUCRATIVE MARKETS.

Mexican Drug Agents Slain Press Guidance
Drafted:INL/LP - JRGise
7-8233 04/13/00

Cleared: INL - BBoone
INL/LP - RClore
INL/LP - ECarroll
WHA/MEX - KWhitaker

INL Press Guidance
April 13, 2000

COLOMBIA: Operation Millennium II

Background: Yesterday, Wednesday April 12, in a major law enforcement action, the Colombian National Police staged a coordinated operation against a major heroin trafficking organization. Dubbed Operation Millennium II, the arrests targeted a group believed to have shipped up to 110 pounds of heroin, worth up to \$9 million, to the United States every month. While this was a nationwide operation, the activity has centered on Cali. Latest reports indicate that 49 of the 64 intended targets have been apprehended, including Nicolas Alberto Urquijo Gaviria, a cousin of late Medellin kingpin, Pablo Escobar. There are no outstanding extradition requests for any of the suspects. While no heroin has reportedly been seized, the operation has netted large amounts of cash and a number of vehicles. For specific details, refer requests for information to the Department of Justice.

Q: Additional comments on drug bust?

A: WE ARE VERY PLEASED WITH THE SUCCESS OF THE COLOMBIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTION, WHICH DEMONSTRATES, ONCE AGAIN, THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA HAS THE COMMITMENT AND CAPABILITY TO TAKE AGGRESSIVE ACTION AGAINST DRUG TRAFFICKING ORGANIZATIONS.

THIS SUCCESSFUL OPERATION ALSO HINTS AT THE POTENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE COUNTERNARCOTICS COOPERATION IN THE FUTURE. SUCH COOPERATION IS ESSENTIAL TO MEANINGFUL COUNTERNARCOTICS ADVANCES. THE USG COOPERATES WITH COLOMBIAN LAW-ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS AND WILL CONTINUE TO DO SO.

Drafted:INL/LP:THanway
4/13/00 04-13-00 press guidance x78727

Cleared:INL:RBoone
INL:RClore - OK
INL/PC:BMcCUTCHAN - OK

WHA/AND:CHoey -OK
WHA:AKoss - OK
P:LAreaga OK

DRL Press Guidance -- No Changes from the Guidance of 3/27/00.
April 13, 2000

UNCHR: THE 56TH COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN GENEVA

Context: The U.N. Commission on Human Rights (CHR) met for the first time in 1947 to draft the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Declaration was adopted on December 10, 1948 (now "Human Rights Day"). The Commission's main purposes are to set human rights standards, address violations of human rights, and provide advisory services and technical assistance to secure enjoyment of human rights. The Commission focuses both on country-specific situations and the universal promotion of civil and political and economic, social, and cultural rights. Former President of Ireland, Mary Robinson, is the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Appointed by U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan in 1997, she is the second to hold this position, which was created in 1994.

Q: What meetings are going on in Geneva right now?

A:

* THE 56TH COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS OPENED MONDAY, MARCH 20, IN GENEVA.
U.N.

HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, MARY ROBINSON, GAVE OPENING REMARKS.

* SECRETARY OF STATE, MADELEINE ALBRIGHT AND NUMEROUS FOREIGN DIGNITARIES
HAVE

GIVEN STATEMENTS. AMONG THEM ARE THE PORTUGUESE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN
AFFAIRS,

JAIME GAMA ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, CROATIAN MINISTER OF FOREIGN
AFFAIRS,

TONINO PICULA, CZECH REPUBLIC DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER JAN KAVAN, AND POLISH
UNDER

SECRETARY OF STATE, JERZY KRANZ.

* THE FIRST WEEK INVOLVED ELECTION OF OFFICERS, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA, VIP SPEECHES, AND INITIAL DISCUSSION OF SOME RESOLUTIONS. THE FIRST WEEK OF THE COMMISSION ALSO FOCUSED ON RACISM AND SELF-DETERMINATION. THE SECOND WEEK WILL COVER SPECIFIC COUNTRY SITUATIONS. THE THIRD WEEK WILL COVER ECONOMIC SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, AND WOMEN. THE FOURTH WEEK WILL CONTINUE TO FOCUS ON WOMEN IN ADDITION TO THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLE. THE FIFTH WEEK WILL FOCUS ON SUB-COMMISSION REPORTS, HUMAN RIGHTS MECHANISMS, TECHNICAL COOPERATION, AND RATIONALIZATION OF WORK, AS WELL AS VOTING ON SOME OF THE KEY COUNTRY RESOLUTIONS. FINAL VOTING AND PREPARATION OF A DRAFT REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION WILL TAKE PLACE IN THE SIXTH AND FINAL WEEK. VOTING ON COUNTRY SPECIFIC RESOLUTIONS IS SCHEDULED TO OCCUR APRIL 18.

* DELEGATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN TO CIRCULATE AND REVIEW DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON A VARIETY OF TOPICS.

Q: Comment on the Secretary's address to the CHR?

A:
(SECRETARY OF STATE MADELEINE ALBRIGHT SPOKE AT THE COMMISSION ON THURSDAY, MARCH 23.

(HER TWO MAIN POINTS WERE THAT DEMOCRACY IS THE "SINGLE SUREST PATH TO THE PRESERVATION AND PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS" AND THAT NATIONS SHOULD NOT FEEL THREATENED BY THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION. THE SECRETARY GAVE AN OVERVIEW OF U.S.

PRIORITIES AT THE COMMISSION AND STATED OUR COMMITMENT TO THE SUMMER 2001
WORLD
CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM (WCAR).

(OVERALL THE SECRETARY'S COMMENTS WERE VERY WELL RECEIVED, ALTHOUGH A
HANDFUL
OF COUNTRIES THAT DO NOT WANT THEIR HUMAN RIGHTS RECORDS TO BE EXAMINED
CRITICIZED HER REMARKS IN THEIR RIGHT OF REPLY OVER AN HOUR AFTER SHE
FINISHED
SPEAKING.

Q: Comment on Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and
Labor, Harold Hongju Koh's address to the CHR on racism?

A:
(ASSISTANT SECRETARY KOH SPOKE AT THE COMMISSION ON FRIDAY, MARCH 24TH ON
THE
AGENDA ITEM CONCERNING RACISM, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, XENOPHOBIA AND ALL
FORMS OF
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.

(KOH STATED U.S. PRIDE IN BEING ONE OF THE MOST RACIALLY AND ETHNICALLY
DIVERSE NATIONS IN THE WORLD. HE ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED MANY DIFFICULT
CHALLENGES
THE U.S. HAS WORKED TO OVERCOME, AND WITH WHICH THE U.S. CONTINUES TO
GRAPPLE,
AND RECOGNIZED THAT WE HAVE A LONG WAY TO GO IN BECOMING A COLOR-BLIND
SOCIETY.

(KOH REITERATED U.S. INTEREST IN FULL PARTICIPATION IN PREPARATIONS FOR NEXT
YEAR'S WORLD CONFERENCE ON RACISM. THE U.S. HOPES THIS WILL BE A CONFERENCE
FOCUSSING ON LESSONS LEARNED AND FORWARD-LOOKING STRATEGIES TO FIGHT
RACISM
THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

Q: U.S. Comment on Cuba's Ambassador comparing Secretary Albright to "Snow

White's evil stepmother?"

A:

(CUBA IS DOES NOT WANT TO BE SUBJECTED TO COMMISSION SCRUTINY PRECISELY BECAUSE IT HAS FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS TO WHICH IT HAS COMMITTED.

(AS THE SECRETARY POINTED OUT IN HER REMARKS, COUNTRIES SHOULD NOT FEEL THREATENED BY THE COMMISSION, BUT RATHER VIEW IT AS SUPPORTING THE RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO CONTROL THEIR OWN DESTINIES BY ASKING THAT ITS MEMBERS ABIDE BY UNIVERSAL STANDARDS.

Q: How is the U.S. being represented?

A:

* AMBASSADOR NANCY RUBIN HEADS THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS. THE ALTERNATE HEAD IS AMBASSADOR GEORGE MOOSE. MOST MEMBERS ARE HUMAN RIGHTS AND REGIONAL SPECIALISTS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BUT THE DELEGATION ALSO INCLUDES A FEW EXPERT PUBLIC MEMBERS.

Q: What are U.S. priorities at the Commission?

A:

* U.S. PRIORITIES AT THE COMMISSION THIS YEAR INCLUDE COUNTRY-SPECIFIC RESOLUTIONS ON CHINA, THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA, CUBA, SUDAN, IRAN, AND IRAQ AND A NUMBER OF THEMATIC RESOLUTIONS INCLUDING THOSE ON DEMOCRACY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE.

* THE UNITED STATES IS AGAIN SPONSORING A CHINA RESOLUTION AND IS WORKING TO GAIN SUPPORT FROM OTHER COUNTRIES IN THIS EFFORT TO ENCOURAGE CHINA TO FOLLOW THROUGH

ON ITS STATED COMMITMENT TO INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ON HUMAN RIGHTS. THE U.S. DECIDED TO SPONSOR THIS RESOLUTION BECAUSE OF THE MARKED DETERIORATION IN CHINA'S HUMAN RIGHTS RECORD OVER THE PAST YEAR.

* THE U.S. IS ALSO SPONSORING A RESOLUTION ON THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA (SPECIFICALLY, SERBIA & MONTENEGRO INCLUDING KOSOVO, BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA, AND CROATIA). THIS RESOLUTION HIGHLIGHTS ONGOING HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEMS OF THE MILOSEVIC REGIME AND RECOGNIZES THE NEWLY ELECTED GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA'S COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES.

Q: Why didn't the U.S. co-sponsor the EU resolution on Chechnya at the UNCHR? Do you support it?

A: -- THE CHR DEBATED THE SITUATION IN CHECHNYA TUESDAY AFTERNOON IN GENEVA, AS A RESULT OF HIGH COMMISSIONER MARY ROBINSON'S REPORT LAST WEEK ON HER TRIP TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

-- AT THE END OF THE DEBATE, THE PORTUGUESE DELEGATION, ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, SUBMITTED A DRAFT RESOLUTION. CANADA COSPONSORED THE RESOLUTION BEFORE IT WAS SUBMITTED.

-- AS IT NOW STANDS, THE RESOLUTION WILL COME UP FOR A VOTE IN THE CHR NEXT TUESDAY, APRIL 18.

-- WE ARE IN VERY CLOSE CONTACT WITH THE EUROPEANS ON THIS; ARE IN CONTACT WITH THE RUSSIANS AS WELL.

-- OUR PRIORITY, AT THE UNCHR AND ELSEWHERE, CONTINUES TO BE ON FINDING THE

MOST
EFFECTIVE WAYS TO GET RUSSIA TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNITY ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHECHNYA. WE NOTE RUSSIA'S RECENT STEPS
FORWARD ON
ENGAGEMENT WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY; ENCOURAGE MORE PROGRESS ON
MEANINGFUL
STEPS TO INCREASE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY REGARDING HUMAN
RIGHTS
SITUATION IN CHECHNYA.

(If Pressed)

-- WE PREFER NOT TO GO INTO THE DETAILS OF OUR ONGOING DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS
IN
GENEVA.

Drafted: DRL/MLA: WShapiro 7-4380 FAX 7-4344

Cleared: DRL: SWagenseil - ok
DRL/MLA: LSicade - ok
DRL/SEA: CBrown - ok
DRL/BA: MSchall - ok
IO/ESA: SBlodgett - ok
EUR/SCE: KWetzel - ok
EAP: KChern - ok
EAP: SLShirk - ok
EAP: DSSedney - ok
G: DSmith - ok
WHA: CShapiro - ok
EUR/RUS: AGodfrey - (info)
DRL/SEA: DPark - ok

