

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Bernard Crawford to Elliott Baer, Judson Bruns, John Duncan et al. Subject: Kerrick Memo on Helms-Burton Determination. (4 pages)	11/13/2000	P1/b(1)
002. email	Bernard Crawford to John Wiegmann. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (4 pages)	11/14/2000	P1/b(1)
003. email	Hoyt Yee to Bernard Crawford. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (3 pages)	11/14/2000	P1/b(1)
004. email	Johannes Binnendijk to Wendy Gray, Dora Kale, Kevin Moran et al. Subject: Transition Vulnerabilities/Opportunities. (3 pages)	11/14/2000	P1/b(1)
005. email	Antony Blinken To Bernard Crawford. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (4 pages)	11/16/2000	P1/b(1)
006. email	Steven Black to Richard Saunders. Subject: Memo for VP. (3 pages)	11/16/2000	P1/b(1)
007. email	Bernard Crawford to Kevin Moran, Marilyn Scott-Perez, Wendy Gray, and Mara Rudman. Subject: Helms-Burton. (4 pages)	11/20/2000	P1/b(1)
008. email	Hoyt Yee to Kevin Moran. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (4 pages)	11/20/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5680

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 10/30/2000 6:25:21 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

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

TO Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Countryman, Mary Ellen (PRESS)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Cruise, Daniel L. (PRESS)
Hammer, Michael A. (INTERAM)
Pisar, Leah F. (NSCCOMM)
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)
Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Countryman, Mary Ellen (PRESS)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Cruise, Daniel L. (PRESS)
Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
Matthews, Sonyia (SPCHW)
Pisar, Leah F. (NSCCOMM)
Stockwell, David B. (PRESS)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

dpb # 107 October 30.doc
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Daily Press Briefing Index
Monday, October 30, 2000

BRIEFER: Richard Boucher, Spokesman

SERBIA (Kosovo)

1-2 Municipal Elections Held on October 28/Results

1-2 Next Steps in Kosovo/Final Status Issue

INDONESIA

2,4-6 US-Indonesian Relations

3-4,6-7 Threat to Embassy in Jakarta/Status of Embassy/Travel
Advice

CUBA/VENEZUELA

7 Castro's Visit to Venezuela

YEMEN

8 Reported Request for US Assistance to Compensate for Loss of Port
Revenue

8-9 Status of USS Cole Investigation/Yemeni Cooperation with
Investigation

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS

9-12 Status of Implementation of Sharm el-Sheikh Agreements

9,11 Acting Israeli Foreign Minister Ben-Ami Visit to Washington
This Week

10 Prospects for Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat Coming
To Washington

12-13 US Engagement/Role in the Peace Process

COTE D'IVOIRE

13 Situation in Abidjan and in Country

13-14 Ordered Departure for US Embassy Non-Emergency
Positions/Travel Warning
Issued

14,17 Prospects for Elections/US View of Working with Governing
Authorities

17 Discovery of Mass Grave On Outskirts of Abidjan

RUSSIA/IRAN

14 Congressional Request for Gore-Chernomyrdin Documents

RUSSIA

15 US-Russian Cooperation in Space Mission

15-16 Update on Edmond Pope Case

NORTH KOREA

16 Next Round of US-DPRK Missile Talks in Kuala Lumpur, 11/1-
11/3

16-17 Prospects for President Clinton to Travel to North Korea

IRAQ

17 Resumption of Iraqi Domestic Flights/Possible Violation of No-Fly
Zones

18 Congressional Letter Regarding Effectiveness of Iraqi Sanctions

19 Airflights to Baghdad/UN Sanctions Committee Approval

KYRGYZSTAN

18-20 Presidential Election in Kyrgyzstan

SPAIN

20 Spanish Supreme Court Judge Killed in Car Bomb Explosion

PERU

20-21 President Fujimori's Decision to Replace Military High Command

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
DAILY PRESS BRIEFING

DPB # 107

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000 12:50 P.M.
(ON THE RECORD UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED)

MR. BOUCHER: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. It's a pleasure to be here, a pleasure to see all of our friends who went with us on the trip come back.

Q You were here Friday, weren't you?

MR. BOUCHER: I was here Friday, looking for you -- or looking for them. Anyway, off the top, I would like to say something about the elections in Kosovo and then I would be glad to take your questions.

First of all, we congratulate the people of Kosovo for successfully holding municipal elections on October 28th. This is a key step towards implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1244. All indications are that the elections were free and fair, that they were conducted peacefully without intimidation or violence. The vote truly represents the will for democracy of Kosovo citizens, who deserve praise for turning out in such massive numbers to vote. We are pleased that the Council of Europe election observer mission indicated that the elections were carried out in full accordance with international standards of democracy.

The international community must move forward with the next phase of Security Council Resolution 1244, which is to establish Kosovo-wide institutions and move forward toward general elections for those. So we're happy to see that.

It fits
with the path of democracy that is being followed throughout the
Balkans, and we
are happy to see that Kosovo too has held an election that is
recognized as free
and fair by international observers.

Q Would you care to get a little deeper into it, if the State Department
cares
to?

MR. BOUCHER: Okay.

Q It's being portrayed as a victory for moderation. I would ask you
two
questions, if the State Department wants to get into Kosovo's politics
that
deeply.

Does it seem that moderates have won? And, secondly, which I think
you might
easily be able to respond to, how do you think Belgrade and the new
leadership
there should respond to these returns so far as their stand on Kosovo
as
autonomous, but this, but that? You know what I'm trying to --

MR. BOUCHER: Well, let me handle both sides of it. First of all, as
far as who
won the election, it's too early to say. The final results aren't out, and
certainly we're not going to go getting ourselves involved in who
should win or
who shouldn't win. The results will come out, I think, in the next few
days.

Second of all, as far as the response in Belgrade, I think I would just
say
generally that we would hope and expect that people in the region
would welcome
the furtherance of the cause of democracy in the region, and that it's
important
as we move forward with Resolution 1244, which is the basis for
handling the
Kosovo issue, that that be carried out thoroughly, but also in as
democratic a
manner as possible. Resolution 1244 is the basis for international
policy on
Kosovo. It means that Kosovo should first develop democratic
institutions in the
interim period, before the determination of final status.

The elections that were just held are a major step along the way towards meaningful self-administration in Kosovo. That's called for under Resolution 1244. Kosovars obviously have a voice in the question of final status, consistent with the UN resolution as well.

So as we proceed down this road, we would hope the international community as a whole would welcome the establishment of democratic institutions, the holding of democratic elections, and support the carrying out of 1244.

Q There were reports that President Kostunica did not recognize the elections because he said that a large part of the Serbian population in Kosovo wasn't able to vote. Do you have an opinion on that characterization?

MR. BOUCHER: I didn't see his exact comments, but as far as the Serbs go, all indications, first of all, are that the elections were held in a free and fair manner. Second of all, Kosovar Serbs did have the chance to register for the election. Frankly, we regret that most of them chose not to do so.

But we would note that representatives of the Kosovar Serbs have agreed to, first of all, respect the election results and, second of all, to accept appointments to municipal bodies. So we hope to see more progress in this regard in terms of having the new institutions that are established be able to work with all the communities in Kosovo.

Q One more on Kosovo.

MR. BOUCHER: One more.

Q Are you still not calling for independence for Kosovo?

MR. BOUCHER: We have consistently supported Resolution 1244, and Resolution 1244 says determination on final status should be made after meaningful self-administration is established in a democratic manner in Kosovo.

Q I'd like to change the subject and ask you if you can enlighten us as to what in the world is going on down in Indonesia. Earlier this year, the Secretary made it a point of calling Indonesia one of the four chief goals for democratization in terms of US foreign policy, and now it seems you guys barely have diplomatic relations down there. You have an Ambassador who is basically involved in a screaming match with a lot of members of the Indonesian parliament and mobs running around telling Americans they want to -- telling Americans to get out.

So, one, are you telling anyone to leave or take extra precautions? Two, is there any thought of Gelbard coming back to the States anytime soon? And, you know, is this in general the way you want to be having a dialogue with one of your four top foreign policy priorities?

Q Can we do each of those separately, and start with are you telling people to leave?

(Laughter.)

MR. BOUCHER: I'll tell to remember the ones that I want to answer, and then you can follow up on the others.

The first thing: What is going on in Indonesia? There are a number of different things going on in Indonesia, and I think we have to deal with each of these situations on its own. Your overall characterization, obviously, I don't accept.

The first thing is that, in regard to our Embassy itself, there is credible information -- there was credible information as of last week -- of a threat to our Embassy compound. Ambassador Gelbard and his team decided on October 24th that they would suspend the Embassy's public services through October 27th. That reflects our desire to reduce the risk to members of the public who might be

visiting the Embassy.

Based on an October 27th review of that threat information, then, the Embassy -- Ambassador Gelbard and his team -- decided to remain closed for public services on October 30th and 31st. Warden messages were released last Monday and Friday last week, telling the American community about this and telling them that the public services would be closed. That essentially means visa lines, visa services, and some of the other sort of open public events. The Embassy can make arrangements to see American citizens who call in who need American citizen services, so that's something they have managed to take care of even when they're closed in terms of the public services.

So that's one thing. There is credible information -- there was credible information -- of a threat to our Embassy compound, and we felt it important to close the compound to public services so that we could operate there but not in a manner there where the public might be needlessly endangered.

Second of all, there were the reports in -- where the place called -- Solo, I think -- of groups looking for Americans in hotels. We have seen the press reports on those. We don't have full reports yet ourselves. We are quite concerned about the situation, and we do expect to revise our advice to Americans who might be traveling in that area. Whether it's broader than that, I don't know. They are still looking at exactly what kind of advice they need to provide.

Third of all, in terms of US-Indonesian relations and the progress that has -- the manifest and demonstrable progress that's been made in terms of democracy and establishing new governance there over the last year, this remains very, very important to us. It is a subject that we will continue to work on. It is a subject that we continue to work with the Indonesian Government on. We have

long-established, friendly relationships with the Government of Indonesia. It has always been of strategic importance to the United States, and now that they are democratizing we have every reason to want to strengthen that relationship.

It is natural that in this process, particularly with the turmoil going on, that there are disagreements. We do occasionally disagree with some of our best friends and allies, but that doesn't detract from the strength and the importance of these relationships to us.

Q So is there any doubt of Gelbard coming back?

MR. BOUCHER: That's not -- I haven't heard anything about that. I don't have anything like that.

Q Does the State Department agree with the manner with which Ambassador Gelbard has very publicly disagreed with Indonesian officials? Is this something that he was given guidance from from the State Department? Because previous Ambassadors have had a much more sort of low key approach there.

MR. BOUCHER: The issues that our Ambassador is raising, the issues that he has consistently raised since he got there -- the issues of reform, of open economy, of need for anti-corruption steps, and, in fact, the responsibility of the host country to protect diplomats and foreign visitors and tourists -- these are all things that are very important to us. They represent US policy in Indonesia, and he has been raising them on our behalf. So I don't have any -- we stand with him on that.

Q The reports of ill will precede the terrorism threat, or the Embassy half-closing or something. I mean, as Gelbard --

MR. BOUCHER: I didn't link one to the other.

Q No, I know, but you picked up on Matt's question as -- you sort of suggested

all the trouble began --

MR. BOUCHER: He had a dozen questions. I tried to answer them, but I didn't try to say that people criticizing the Ambassador or the Embassy started only last week. No, this is --

Q Well, but as the Embassy attempts to -- makes these suggestions, how are they being received? Are they resented by the authorities in Indonesia?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, that's something you have to ask them. They have been quite vocal in some of their remarks, as well. I think the --

Q Well, but does the Ambassador report back, "I'm trying, but, gee, they don't like it"?

MR. BOUCHER: No, the Ambassador reports back. I mean, we have certain things that are important to us in Indonesia: democracy, reform, anti-corruption. These are the issues our Ambassador has been raising for us; these are the issues that are important to US policy. In addition, on the security side, the responsibility of host governments to protect our people and to protect visiting Americans is also important to us. So these are the issues that he has been raising. These are the issues that we raise as a matter of policy.

Q Richard, I wasn't asking what the Department's opinion was about the issues that Ambassador Gelbard was raising, but rather the manner with which he was raising them. Does the State Department feel that the very public criticisms that Ambassador Gelbard has put forward of the Indonesian Government was appropriate?

MR. BOUCHER: Yes.

Q Richard, it doesn't seem like you're wanting to criticize the Indonesians for the threats against the Ambassador and Americans. Are you not going to -- don't you feel like you should warn the Indonesians that they need to

respect diplomats
and diplomatic property? Why are you not telling the Indonesians that
you'll
hold them accountable for threats and that sort of thing?

MR. BOUCHER: Didn't I just say that it's the responsibility of host
governments
to provide protection to our diplomatic missions, to our diplomats, to
our
tourists and to other people who are there, and not to exacerbate the
problems?

Q I must have missed it.

Q Can I move on to a new subject?

Q No, no, wait a minute. I have one more on this. I mean, do you
regret the
fact that the dialogue between the United States and Indonesia has
gone -- has
taken such a -- has gone on such a low road now, considering that it is
one of
these four priorities? That's the part of my question you never
answered before.

MR. BOUCHER: Well, as I said, I'll answer the portions I want to
answer. But
let me try to deal with this one now. I think, first of all, naturally,
peace,
harmony and public solidarity is always nice. We often have
disagreements with
governments; we often have disagreements with governments in
public, even where
we have profound similarities of interests.

I think, first of all, we think the relationship that we have built with
Indonesia -- we think the progress that Indonesia has made in the last
few years
on democracy and many other areas, is extraordinarily important. We
have, as you
know, regular consultations with the Indonesian leadership, and those
will
continue. We are building a very strong relationship with Indonesia.

Naturally, yes, we do regret that we have public disagreements, but
we recognize
that those happen sometimes, even between friends.

Q For most Americans who don't pay attention to this on a daily basis,
can you

try and explain why Indonesia, in the State Department's assessment, is now such a difficult place for Americans, and why, given all the tensions in the Middle East, the one Embassy that is closed right now because of security concerns is Indonesia?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, I mean, a difficult place for Americans is kind of a very broad thing. In terms of specific travel advice, we're going to revise our travel advice and we'll have more detailed advice for travelers, I hope, during the course of the day.

Indonesia is an important place for Americans. Indonesia offers opportunity for Americans. We have generally supported the progress that has been made. I wouldn't describe it as a difficult place for Americans. I would describe it as a place where we have some disagreements and a lot of very broad and significant areas of agreement with the government.

The fact that this is a democratic nation, that this is a large, if not the largest, Moslem nation, these make it important. Its strategic importance, its importance as democracy, its importance as a society to us has been something that we have consistently stressed and that we have tried to work with. At this juncture, yes, we do have some disagreements. We also have had fundamental similarity of interests and desire to support their path of democracy and reform.

Q If I could, Richard, on the Embassy closures, though. It is up to the individual embassies to decide whether they close or open, but by closing the Embassy there and not having Embassies closed in the Middle East, are you suggesting that it's more dangerous for Americans to visit the Indonesian Embassy than to visit, say, Israel?

MR. BOUCHER: It depends on the day you ask. I think a week ago Friday, the Embassy was open in Indonesia but they were closed in the Middle

East. So it depends. Different days, different places, things. If we get something - here we have a situation where we have a specific and credible threat that has to do with this particular Embassy compound. We thought it was necessary to take the steps that we have taken in terms of closure.

That is a specific situation, not one that is related to the Worldwide Cautions and Advisories and concern that we have where we have pretty much got everybody on a higher state of vigilance. But the decision to close in one particular place is still -- is decided by the Ambassadors locally, unless there is a kind of blanket instruction that we have issued in the past.

Q Is it closed indefinitely, or did you say just through Tuesday?

MR. BOUCHER: No, it's closed Monday, Tuesday, and then they'll obviously have to decide. But, at present, the plan is to open back up on Wednesday.

Q Okay. Fidel Castro is finishing his triumphal five-day tour of Venezuela today as a guest of President Chavez, and together they have called for a military force of Latin American nations as a counterweight to US power in the hemisphere. At the same time, Foreign Minister Rangel has said he wants -- they want the most excellent relations with the United States. His chief political opponent, who ran against him in the presidential vote --

MR. BOUCHER: I'm sorry, Castro's chief political opponent?

Q Yes.

MR. BOUCHER: Oh, he doesn't have any, does he?

Q No, no. Chavez, Chavez. I'm sorry.

(Laughter.)

Q Chavez' chief political opponent, Commander Arias, has declared that the two commandantes are directed -- are trying to oust the US from its

political and
economic position in Venezuela. And polls show that a lot of
Venezuelans agree
with this point of view.

Now, what is the US reaction to all of this? And specifically -- let me
add
this -- does the State Department consider that Venezuela is less
threatening to
democracy and to US interests in the region than that of Peru, in the
case of
Peru, where it has been giving so much attention?

MR. BOUCHER: That's a loaded question. I'll leave you to your own
analysis of
the whole situation between Castro and Chavez. I think we have
expressed
ourselves many times on the subject of Fidel Castro and our concerns.
We have
expressed ourselves fairly frequently on the situation in Venezuela, as
well.
Obviously, democracy in Venezuela is no less important to us and to
people in the
hemisphere than democracy anywhere else, and we have talked about
that in the
past.

But I really don't have a broad analysis for you at this point. I'll check
and
see whether anybody wants to deliver themselves of such an analysis,
but I think
we leave it to you all to analyze the sequence of events and the
developments
there.

Q Isn't it a little odd that nothing is being said about this by the US
Government?

MR. BOUCHER: They seem to be saying it on their own, and you
guys seem to be
able to pick up all the signs on your own. I'll see if there is anything
we
particularly want to say on it, but I think we've said enough in the
past,
frankly.

Q There were reports that Yemen is indicating that it may want to
seek
reparations for loss of use at the Port of Aden there. Is that true, and is
this

something that the United States would consider?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, I don't have an answer because, at this point, the Yemeni Government has not made any formal request of either financial compensation or assistance to offset any loss of revenue at the Port of Aden. Throughout this investigation, we and the Yemeni authorities have focused on minimizing disruption to people who need to use the port, to port activities as much as possible, consistent with the need to conduct the investigation. So we have tried to minimize any disruption, but we don't have any requests for compensation at this stage.

Q Have you seen the press reports on the Yemeni willingness to cooperate with the investigation today?

MR. BOUCHER: I don't know how up to date you are from the White House side, but let me tell you what we know. President Clinton wrote to Yemeni President Salih last week, thanking him for the cooperation we have received during the initial phase of the investigation and encouraging this cooperation to continue as we enter a new phase. You will remember that was the substance of the statement that we issued Friday on behalf of Secretary Albright and FBI Director Freeh.

President Salih called President Clinton on Saturday, basically in response to our President's letter to him. President Salih called to assure our President that Yemen would continue to cooperate fully. We have made clear that in the next phase of the investigation we will need to have access to suspects and other more detailed and further cooperation.

I think an investigation of this size and complexity has never before been seen in Yemen. We are discussing with the Yemeni Government how best to achieve the common objective of identifying the perpetrators of the terrorist act

and
bringing them to justice. We have made clear to the Yemeni
authorities -- and
will continue to make clear to them -- the importance that we attach to
carrying
out a thorough investigation. President Salih assured President Clinton
that
Yemen would continue to cooperate fully, and we are now in detailed
discussions
with the Yemeni Government of the modalities of that cooperation.

Q You said that the Yemeni Government, or President Salih, said that
Yemen will
continue to cooperate fully, but kind of officials were indicating last
week --
and I know we spoke about this on Friday -- that the real cooperation
would be --
a test of the cooperation, full cooperation, would be whether they have
access to
these suspects. So, I mean, his definition of continuing to cooperate
fully
doesn't seem to be in line with what you seem --

MR. BOUCHER: Well, I mean, you're trying to -- we made clear last
week that
complete further cooperation would be required and would include
access to the
suspects. We have made that clear to you, made that clear to the
Yemeni
Government. Subsequent to that, we got a phone call from the
president of Yemen
saying that he intended to cooperate fully with the investigation, and
he talked
to the President about what that would involve. So we are still
working out the
details and modalities, but I would take it as a good sign that after we
made
clear what we needed, the guy called us and said we're going to
continue to
cooperate fully; we want to work with you on this one.

Q But if he says continue to cooperate fully, and you're still working
out the
details, I take it he didn't say whether you would have access to
witnesses.

MR. BOUCHER: I don't know. I didn't get that detailed a readout of
the
President's conversation. But we do take it as a positive sign the fact
that he

called over the weekend to say that he did want to continue to cooperate fully and that we have -- in this process we have also made quite clear to the Yemenis what we need in terms of the investigation.

Q Richard, it was announced today, at least on NPR, that the Israelis are planning to take more or stronger offensive actions to take out the gunmen that are mixed with the Palestinian population. It sounds like a dangerous escalation. What does the State Department say about it?

MR. BOUCHER: I think what I have to say is that I'm not going to try to characterize specific steps as we go through this. There have been statements on both sides. There have been steps taken on both sides. What is important to us is that the commitments made at Sharm el Sheikh be implemented. That remains the overriding requirement, we think, to restore peace, to restore calm, and that once we do restore calm we can start talking; we can talk about how to get back to the peace process.

Now, the Acting Israeli Foreign Minister Shlomo Ben-Ami is coming to Washington this week. He'll have meetings with the Secretary on Wednesday. We continue to discuss with both parties the meetings or the efficacy of meetings we could have at various levels, both here and in the region but, on our side, there are no plans for travel at this point. So we'll have this conversation on Wednesday with the Acting Israeli Foreign Minister.

We continue to say, and as I've said today, that the key at this point is to get the parties to carry out their commitments. The Secretary made clear this morning we want to see them disengage, we want to see them lessen the violence, and that they will do everything they can to get the peace process back on track.

Q So you can not comment on this specific policy shift?

MR. BOUCHER: I don't think I've ever tried to comment on specific security steps that the parties have been taking.

Q Barak seems to have at least an interim lease on political life. Does the State Department think that's terrific?

MR. BOUCHER: We've never commented on Israeli politics, either.

Q Only Kosovo politics?

MR. BOUCHER: We haven't commented on Kosovo politics. If somebody has an election that goes sort of beyond politics to democracy --

Q (Inaudible) -- fundamentally fair? No, it's --

MR. BOUCHER: Come on, Barry. I declined to comment on winning candidates in the Kosovo election.

Q I just wondered if you -- if State wanted to say whether it makes it a little more manageable to persist -- to pursue your policy.

MR. BOUCHER: We're not in a position to talk about that. That's internal to the Israeli political system and they'll have to decide how they proceed.

Q There are some indications that Barak and Arafat may come the following week, around the 9th or so, for separate meetings. Is there anything of that nature on your screen there? And is the Ben-Ami -- one agenda of his visit going to be to perhaps work out details of a subsequent Barak visit?

MR. BOUCHER: I don't have anything further to that particular meeting. We are also obviously in touch with Palestinians to talk to them in various ways, so what develops on that front I don't know. But I think we made clear last week after the President talked to both sides that he was prepared to invite them to Washington separately at some point once calm had been restored in order to

discuss how to get back to the peace process. So whether that materializes at any given point is speculation. I can't say exactly when, but that offer is kind of generally out there.

Q What, specifically, commitments have not been kept from Sharm el Sheikh, and is it a failure to keep commitments or has it been a failure of the publics at large or military units to abide by commitments made verbally at Sharm el Sheikh?

MR. BOUCHER: You know, I think once again these are questions we haven't answered, and I'm not going to start today trying to give a scorecard on everybody in terms --

Q Richard, you said that there might come a -- there was going to be a point when you would. Why hasn't that point been reached yet? I remember you directly saying --

MR. BOUCHER: I remember directly saying that. It just hasn't.

Q Why not?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm not going to give a scorecard on why we don't have a scorecard. It takes 150 points to get to to give a scorecard, and we're only at 76 right now. I don't know. I can't do that every day.

The point is that, at this stage, the parties -- we look to the parties to carry out fully their commitments. We look to the parties to do everything they can to return the situation to one of calm and to end the violence.

Q Can we change the subject, please?

Q No.

Q No.

MR. BOUCHER: We'll do this for a while. I'll get back to you.

Q Is the State Department aware of a group calling itself the Saladdin Brigades who claimed responsibility for a killing -- I'm not sure what day it was? They claimed responsibility today, anyway, and it is apparently a previously unheard of group.

MR. BOUCHER: I hadn't see the report. I'll have to check and see if our guys know anything about it.

Q Just back on this issue of not commenting on the Israelis when they're launching this new offensive, I mean, that really goes in a whole new direction, and they said they're moving in special forces into areas. It sounds like they're going to start methodically trying to take out areas and groups that they see as dangerous to Israeli soldiers. So only limiting it by saying that we expect them to hold to the agreements made at Sharm el Sheikh, can they launch an offensive and still hold to the agreements made at Sharm el Sheikh?

MR. BOUCHER: Again, I'm not -- I've seen some press reports this morning. I don't even know if we have a full readout from the Israelis about what they intend to do and how they intend to manage the situation. But I do know that throughout this process we have avoided comment on specific security steps. We have stressed the importance of carrying out the commitments made at Sharm el Sheikh, and that remains critical to us, in our view, at this point.

Q Will the President be meeting with Ben-Ami?

MR. BOUCHER: That's a question you'll have to ask at the White House. I don't have anything like that at this point.

Q Does the peace process at this point -- does it continue to be as high a priority as it was even two weeks ago? Is everyone still as engaged as they were?

MR. BOUCHER: The President and the Secretary are doing everything they can to get back to the peace process.

Q Is there going to be, or has there already begun, a reassessment of US policy in the peace process since we have indications that high-ranking Israeli officials say that the US role has changed dramatically and there seems to be some of the same feeling on the Palestinian side?

MR. BOUCHER: Didn't you ask that question on Friday? Didn't I answer that question on Friday? If today is a variation, you'll have to enlighten me a little more, but I think that's a question we've tried to answer --

Q We're waiting --

MR. BOUCHER: And the answer today is the same as the one on Friday.

Q We're waiting for the elections, apparently, here in the United States now. We're waiting for Barak. But during this period, can you confirm that there really is a reassessment going on within the Department of State?

MR. BOUCHER: No. The fact is -- we've said this many times -- first of all, we play a role that the parties want us to play; second of all, every indication from the parties is that they want us to continue to play that role. And I think you have heard that from their mouths in recent days, as much as you've heard it from ours.

Third of all, we think it is very important for UN interests, for United States interests, that we continue to have a role and play a role in Middle East peace. So the President and Secretary continue to work on this. You've seen what they have done. You've seen what they continue to do. And until the parties tell us they don't want us anymore or they're not prepared to pursue peace, I think the essential fundamentals of our role will not change.

Obviously, we recognize that it is hard to make peace with all the violence going on, and obviously we recognize that getting back to the peace process is more difficult the longer and deeper and more emotional the violence that takes place.

Q Have the Palestinians told you that they do indeed want you to continue to play the role that Clinton views as honest broker? And if they do, why aren't they sending anyone to come talk in the week that Ben-Ami is coming?

MR. BOUCHER: Yes. And I didn't say that.

Q Yes, they have told you in the recent weeks that they want you to continue?

MR. BOUCHER: I think, if you look back at what we said after the President's phone calls last week, it was quite clear they wanted us to continue to play a role. And, no, I haven't said that they're not sending anybody to Washington.

Q What I'm reaching for in a very clumsy way is: Is there a basic shock to the whole peace process as a result of these events of the last two weeks, and is the Department simply hunkering down or is it actually considering a lot of new possibilities for Land-for-Peace, of sharing Jerusalem and so on?

MR. BOUCHER: I think, as with most questions where I'm offered a choice, I'll take neither of the above. We certainly think that the violence makes the pursuit of peace more difficult at the present time and means that we have to build a path back to the peace process. But we remain fully committed to doing that, and it retains its important that it's always had to us, and we remain --

Q Is it ever going -- I'm sorry -- is it every going to be the same peace process? That's what I'd like to -- I mean, do you really expect to get back to

the same peace process?

MR. BOUCHER: It's not just picking up where we left off. We've talked about getting back to the peace process. How the parties want to do that, how we and the parties agree that can be done, is the subject of discussions that we intended to have, that we forecast at Sharm el Sheikh, of discussions that we hope to have, of discussions that the President might have with leaders should that eventuality materialize.

So how to get back to the peace process is clearly an issue on our agenda, but an issue that is not yet decided because, first and foremost, we have to implement the critical commitments that were made at Sharm el Sheikh and restore calm.

Q Okay. I'm not sure that you're ready to comment on the Ivory Coast situation. Since the situation seems to be calm in the Ivory Coast, is the US intending to support a new government?

And, secondly, just to try to understand if the Embassy -- the US Embassy in Ivory Coast will be reopened soon. I don't know if it has opened.

And, third, the discovery of the mass grave in Abidjan. Is the US intending to say something about that through the State Department?

MR. BOUCHER: All right, let me see how much of this we can deal with. As you say, the situation in Abidjan and in most parts of the country is calm. Life has largely returned to normal. Most businesses, restaurants and schools have reopened. Traffic in Abidjan is normal. The airport is open for normal business. Still don't know the whereabouts of General Guei.

And on our Embassy, we have changed the advisory slightly. We still recommend that American citizens defer all travel to the Cote d'Ivoire due to the unstable security situation throughout the country, but we have moved to what

we call
authorized departure. We have authorized the departure of family
members of US
Government personnel and personnel in non-emergency positions
from Cote d'Ivoire.

US citizens in Cote d'Ivoire, we recommend, should establish and
maintain contact
with the Embassy and consider their own personal security situations
in
determining whether to remain in the country. As always, US citizens
should be
aware of their surroundings and use common sense to avoid locations
that could be
dangerous.

The Embassy in Abidjan is open today, October 30th, and we're
obviously
continuing to assess the situation based on our understanding of
events. With
the improvement of the security situation, the restoration of
commercial air
service, we move from ordered to authorized departure for our own
personnel.

In terms of the government, we are intending -- we will work with the
authorities, with the governing authorities in Cote d'Ivoire, just as we
have
done with predecessors. We do want to see the restoration of
democracy in Cote
d'Ivoire as soon as possible. We would urge all parties to cooperate
toward that
end so that the voice of disenfranchised Ivorians can be heard.

Q Does that mean you want to see another election?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, I think, first of all, we see the October 22nd
election as
failed and fundamentally flawed from the outset due to the exclusion
of major
opposition parties' candidates and the other machinations that led up
to the
elections; nonetheless, Laurent Gbagbo was inaugurated on October
26th as
President of Cote d'Ivoire.

So, first and foremost, we believe the parliamentary elections should
take place
as scheduled on December 10th. These have long been part of the
electoral

calendar, and if those are free and fair we think that will be an important step towards creating the necessary conditions for free, fair and inclusive presidential elections in which the voices of all different -- all Ivorians can be heard.

Q So the answer is yes?

MR. BOUCHER: So the answer is yes.

Q You want to see another election?

MR. BOUCHER: We want to see -- because this election was flawed, we need -- we will obviously work with the government that has taken over, that was inaugurated, but we believe that there should be, first, the parliamentary elections that were planned and, second of all, free, fair and inclusive presidential elections as well.

Q May I ask a question, please, on about another subject -- I'm from Russian television -- about Gore-Chernomyrdin. There was information that today a portion of documents are supposed to be handed from State Department to Senate. Is it true?

And as a continuation of my question, there is a very positive example of the activity of this commission: cooperation in space. Tomorrow morning, an American astronaut is supposed to be also take off from Russia to space. Does it attract any interest as well as the negative questions?

MR. BOUCHER: I hope it would attract interest as well as the negative questions, but let me tell you about both things.

On the question of documents, we received a number of requests to turn over documents that are related to confidential understandings with Russia concerning proliferation issues and arm sales to Iran. We have had a series of exchanges, both oral and written, with Congress regarding the scope of the information

required, and also reiterating the Administration's policy and diplomacy on these issues.

We have to be exceedingly careful in our view as we proceed. We do have an obligation to sustain a policy that has improved the national security of the United States over the last six years by limiting the number and quality of weapons that have gone to Iran. It's a policy that involves sensitive diplomatic negotiations and contacts.

So we are trying to meet the congressional request in a manner that doesn't simultaneously destroy our policy, which would not be in our national interest.

We have offered to provide the Senate leadership with access to key documents at their convenience. And that is the way we have made the offer.

Q So they've backed off the subpoena threat? I mean, this is now taking place in --

MR. BOUCHER: That's a question you have to ask them. We have been in contact with them regarding the scope and the type of access that we would provide. We have offered to provide the leadership of the Senate with access to the key documents at their convenience, and we'll see how that materializes.

Q Does Secretary Albright view the committee actions as any way political, in any way driven by politics?

MR. BOUCHER: Secretary Albright, as you know, always tries to stay out of politics these days. So even that question would not be one we would want to answer.

Q On Russia still, can you give us an update on Ed Pope? His wife just came back. They're quite disturbed at the proceedings.

MR. BOUCHER: I mean, unfortunately we are too. There's not a lot new that we

have to say, that we can say about the situation of Edmund Pope, because we haven't had further access.

First of all, the trial continues today with a judge rejecting a defense motion to consider Mr. Pope's health. As you know, we have stated publicly our deep concern about the decline in his health since he was first incarcerated seven months ago. The Russians -- based on examinations by prison doctors, the Russian Government and the court have asserted that his condition is satisfactory, but without independent analysis by specialists or a doctor, we are really not in any position to accept those assertions.

Our consular officers have not had access to Mr. Pope since the trial began, despite our repeated requests to gain that kind of access. As we have said before, we think this case has dragged on for far too long, especially in light of Mr. Pope's medical condition. We think it's time for him to be released and for him to be returned home.

Q His wife said today that she now assumes he will be found guilty by this court, and that her only hope left is some kind of political solution between the two governments. Does the State Department see any type of political solution?

MR. BOUCHER: As we have said all along, I think, we think it is time for him to be released right away and returned home. I think that's where I have to leave it. I think that's what they ought to do.

Q Do you have anything more on North Korea, particularly the Einhorn consultations? When will they start, and so forth?

MR. BOUCHER: The missile talks with the North Koreans will be held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. They will last from November 1st to November 3rd. Assistant Secretary Einhorn will be leading our delegation.

Do we have anything more? Well, I think you know the Secretary and the President and his key advisors were meeting this morning on the subject of North Korea, so they are holding those discussions today.

Q Can I go back to the Ivory Coast for a second?

MR. BOUCHER: Let's finish with North Korea and then go back to the Ivory Coast, I guess.

Q Do you know if the Secretary is prepared -- or during the meeting now is making any kind of recommendation about a visit by the President?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm sure the Secretary and the President will discuss the possible visit of the President. I wouldn't expect that to be decided at this meeting. And as far as whether she makes a recommendation and what recommendation she makes, that's between her and the President and not for us to discuss here.

Q Do you have any better idea -- does the Department have any better idea how long that the KL talks are going to last?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, from the 1st to the 3rd.

Q Oh, I'm sorry. Did you say that already?

MR. BOUCHER: Yes.

Q One more on Ivory Coast. You said that you thought the elections last week were failed and that you want to see new ones, which I don't know if you've answered this question but it raises in my mind: Do you recognize Laurent Gbagbo as president? How would you -- how do you classify him under this situation?

MR. BOUCHER: We recognize countries, not governments, as a matter of legal practice, so it just comes down to whether you work with a government in place. And we have said quite clearly we will work with the government

authorities in
Cote d'Ivoire.

Q Do you call for an international investigation about the mass grave discovery?

MR. BOUCHER: The massacre. First of all, I think it's appalling, the reports that we have seen. There are at least 50 bodies found at the site of a mass killing on the outskirts of Abidjan. We have seen the press reports that say that those killed were supporters of the opposition leader, Alassane Quattara but, frankly, we don't know the identities of the killed or the killers and so we have to rely on the Ivorian authorities for that.

We do applaud the Ivorian authorities' agreement to allow an international investigation of the tragedy. We welcome the commitment of Mr. Gbagbo to find the perpetrators of the massacre and to bring them to justice.

Q If I could get to Iraq. There are reports today that Baghdad has reopened, I guess, flights to the no-fly zone areas, and I was wondering if there was any comment on this internally -- these flights?

MR. BOUCHER: Internal flights?

Q Commercial flights to areas that fall in the southern-northern no-fly zone.

MR. BOUCHER: I'll check on that, but you might actually check with the Pentagon since they are more involved in the enforcement of the no-fly zones. But I'll check and see if we have anything to say on that.

Q If I could follow up, there was a letter that was sent on Friday from Senator Helms and Representative Gilman asking exactly what the State Department was doing about what they say is the collapsing sanctions regime. Do you have any response to that at this point?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm not aware of that particular letter, but I do want

to say that
we think the sanctions continue to be effective. While we have these
disagreements over flights with some of the other countries involved,
we do know
that many, many of the flights that have taken place recently have
been submitted
to the Sanctions Committee and approved by the Sanctions
Committee and that,
overall, the sanctions, we think, remain effective and continue to be
applied by
everyone.

Even the governments with whom we have disagreements over
specifics of particular
flights recognize that the only way for Iraq to get out of the box is by
implementing Security Council Resolution 1284. That has been the
view we have
expressed; that has been the view we have heard from them; and that
remains the
view we continue to hear from them.

Q Are you currently working in the United Nations Sanctions
Committee to try to
change the rules regarding those flights so that there would be less
confusion in
the future?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm not sure I'd go quite that far. Certainly, these
flights do
get discussed in the Sanctions Committee, and the different views on
them get
raised. We have had flights from Russia, Ukraine, Switzerland,
Bahrain, Iran,
Lebanon, Turkey, Algeria, United Arab Emirates, Tunisia, Morocco,
Jordan and
Yemen that were all submitted and approved by the Sanctions
Committee. There
were Sudanese, Egyptian and Syrian flights that didn't have the
approval, and a
few others before that. So there are still a lot of people complying
regarding
flights.

But I think the overall characterization that we can make is that
sanctions
remain effective. There is strong support for controls that limit Iraq's
ability
to threaten other countries in the region to develop weapons of mass
destruction
or harm its own people. The UN controls all but a very small amount

of Iraq's
oil exports, and recent flights don't change that fact.

Q But do you have any response to the fact that on many of these
flights
government officials and business executives are also accompanying
the
humanitarian aid? I mean, is that maybe not violating the letter but
possibly
the spirit of the sanctions?

MR. BOUCHER: Once again, I'll tell you that many of the flights
were submitted
and approved to the Sanctions Committee, and that I think the long
list of
countries who are doing that reflects the fact that there is still support,
even
for that particular aspect where we recognize there is some
disagreement. But,
at the same time, the overall support for the sanctions, the overall
support for
Resolution 1284, is not diminished, and people continue to make clear
that is the
path for Iraq if it wants to get any sanctions suspension or relief.

Q Back in March, I think it was, when the Secretary was in Central
Asia, she
went to Kyrgyzstan and got a whole long litany of promises from the
president
there about how wonderful his elections would be, and now these
things appear to
have collapsed. I'm wondering if you guys are disappointed at all in
the fact
that President Akayev has not followed through on any of his
promises.

MR. BOUCHER: The election was yesterday. As you know, I think
the central
election commission says that President Akayev received 74.4 percent
of the vote.
Nonetheless, the Office of Security Cooperation in Europe, their
Office of
Democracy, Institutions and Human Rights, had an observer mission
there. Their
preliminary assessment is that the Kyrgyz election is -- that it, "failed
to
comply with OSCE commitments for democratic elections." We
support those
findings.

Q Well --

MR. BOUCHER: The National Democratic Institute is there as well, and we look forward to seeing their report as well.

Q But particularly in regards to basically the personal pledges that President Akayev made to Secretary Albright --

MR. BOUCHER: I'd have to look back at exactly what pledges he gave us. I mean, certainly --

Q Well, one of them said his opponent would be allowed to run, and the guy wasn't allowed to run. It's very much like the Ivory Coast. Why are you just saying you support the OSCE? Why are you not saying anything yourself?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, first of all, this is the day after the election. The OSCE assessment is preliminary. We haven't yet seen the assessment of the National Democratic Institute people who are there. We certainly look forward to seeing their report as well. The day after the election we have a preliminary assessment, which we certainly agree with, but, in order to say more, we'll have to know more.

Q You want to basically hold off on --

MR. BOUCHER: At this point, we saw what led up to the election. I think the OSCE noted smooth balloting, transparency in vote tabulation, things like that, on the day of the election, but we also know what led up to it: 14 candidates excluded on various pretexts, the remainder prevented from competing on a free and fair basis, media coverage severely biased in favor of the president, the government put heavy pressure on the independent media not to report on the opposition. There were government promises of access to the polling places, but non-partisan independent monitors weren't allowed to observe the election.

During the vote count there were plenty of reports of ballot-stuffing, multiple voting by individuals and such things.

So we do expect to see the reports. We will look at those when they come in. Certainly, getting beyond the personal and the specific commitments that might have been made to the Secretary -- and I'll look those up to see -- certainly it's a disappointment that Kyrgyzstan has failed to carry out a fully free and fair election here.

Q This morning, the terrorist group ETA in Spain has killed in a car bombing attack a judge. I wanted to know if you have any reaction on that.

And the other question is your assessment of all the military uprising in Peru of this weekend.

MR. BOUCHER: Two questions. Let me give you a statement on the car bombing that we'll have after the briefing. We obviously condemn and denounce those responsible for it. It's a cowardly and brutal attack that follows a pattern of ETA terrorist attacks in Spain, and we certainly support the Spanish Government's effort to bring perpetrators to justice.

So we extend our sympathies and we support the Government of Spain in trying to deal with the situation there. We'll have a more complete statement available for you after the briefing.

As far as the steps being taken in Peru, I think, first, it's worth noting that President Fujimori continues to demonstrate that he is in charge in Peru. His action over the weekend to replace the commanders of the Peruvian army, navy and air force were stated in terms of the need to make changes for the good of the country. And I think there is no indication at that time that the military high command intended to take action against the president, but these actions

underscore the constitutional order and civilian rule that needs to be maintained
-- that will be maintained during this time of political crisis.

This change of command follows last week's reassignment and brief detention of senior and mid-level officers supportive of ex-intelligence advisor Montesinos. He remains at large in Peru. Military and police units continue their search for Mr. Montesinos, and President Fujimori has stated that he will be turned over to judicial authorities once he is located.

There was a protest over the weekend by a single military unit in southern Peru. That appears to have been an isolated incident involving a disgruntled army colonel. Not only did his calls for nationwide action in support of his uprising fall flat, but the army itself condemned his insubordination and sent units to arrest him and his followers.

Certainly, we continue to believe that the electoral process which returned President Fujimori to office was deeply flawed, but President Fujimori has taken several positive steps over the past week towards -- past weeks towards restoring democracy. They have set new elections for April 8th of 2001. They have said a new president will be inaugurated in July. Mr. Montesinos has been fired. The National Intelligence Service is being deactivated under civilian oversight. Military high command has been replaced. Mr. Montesinos' influence in the military has been greatly reduced. And the OAS-sponsored talks on democratic reform are yielding agreements between the government and the political opposition on electoral and judicial reforms.

So there is still a lot going on in Peru, but there is a lot, we think, that represents progress towards restoring democracy.

Q Thank you.

MR. BOUCHER: Thank you.

(The briefing was concluded at 1:45 P.M.)
22 10/30/2000

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Bernard Crawford to Elliott Baer, Judson Bruns, John Duncan et al. Subject: Kerrick Memo on Helms-Burton Determination. (4 pages)	11/13/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5680

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	Bernard Crawford to John Wiegmann. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (4 pages)	11/14/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5680

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	Hoyt Yee to Bernard Crawford. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (3 pages)	11/14/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F
vz5680

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	Johannes Binnendijk to Wendy Gray, Dora Kale, Kevin Moran et al. Subject: Transition Vulnerabilities/Opportunities. (3 pages)	11/14/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F
vz5680

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
005. email	Antony Blinken To Bernard Crawford. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (4 pages)	11/16/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F
vz5680

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
006. email	Steven Black to Richard Saunders. Subject: Memo for VP. (3 pages)	11/16/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F
vz5680

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 11/21/2000 10:54:27 AM
FROM Bash, Brooks L. (EXSEC)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Staff packages and the Holiday rush [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Kass, Nicholas S. (EUR)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Thanks for the update. Brooks

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

From:
Kass, Nicholas S. (EUR)
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2000 10:25 AM
To: Bash, Brooks L. (EXSEC)
Cc: Norland, Richard B. (EUR)
Subject: RE:
Staff packages and the Holiday rush [UNCLASSIFIED]

Brooks: We have a letter from Sen Helms to POTUS (pkg, #6953) urging POTUS' involvement to lift a hold by Sens Biden/Sarbanes on a helo sale to Turkey. We understand from State that Biden yesterday lifted his objections for now; State is now working on Sarbanes. We need to see how State's efforts shake out before sending our response. We're likely to get good news after the holiday.

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

From: Bash, Brooks L. (EXSEC)
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2000 8:18 AM
To: @ALLNSC - NSC Staff
Subject: FW: Staff packages and the Holiday rush [UNCLASSIFIED]

All NSC Staff,

As we approach Thanksgiving, we ask that you please identify and accelerate, if possible, any packages which need SRB or POTUS attention through the upcoming weekend. Please work to have all such packages to Execsec

by COB today. If you have any special coordination requirements or packages with hard deadlines which may be late, please coordinate with myself or Bob Bradtke.

Thank you, Brooks

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
007. email	Bernard Crawford to Kevin Moran, Marilyn Scott-Perez, Wendy Gray, and Mara Rudman. Subject: Helms-Burton. (4 pages)	11/20/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5680

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
008. email	Hoyt Yee to Kevin Moran. Subject: RE: Kerrick Helms-Burton Memo. (4 pages)	11/20/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/30/2000-11/21/2000]

2006-1363-F
vz5680

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 11/21/2000 6:11:14 PM

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT State Department Press Briefing -- November 21, 2000 [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Countryman, Mary Ellen (PRESS)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Cruise, Daniel L. (PRESS)
Hammer, Michael A. (INTERAM)
Pisar, Leah F. (NSCCOMM)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)
Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Countryman, Mary Ellen (PRESS)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Cruise, Daniel L. (PRESS)
Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
Matthews, Sonyia (SPCHW)
Pisar, Leah F. (NSCCOMM)
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**

dpb # 117 November 21.doc
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Daily Press Briefing Index
Tuesday, November 21, 2000

BRIEFER: Richard Boucher, Spokesman

CHINA

1-8,9-10 China's Commitment to Strengthen Its Missile-Related Export Control System/
US Decision to Waive Economic Sanctions for Past Assistance by PRC Entities To Missile Programs in Pakistan and Iran and Resume Certain Commercial Space Interactions with China
2-4 Missile Sanctions Law/MTCR Category Items
3-5 Imposition of Sanctions Against Iranian and Pakistani Entities

CUBA

8-9 Reported Abduction of US Citizen Child to Cuba
20-21 Reported Request by Senator Helms for Department to Revoke Visas of Executives of a Spanish Company

SYRIA/IRAQ

10-11 Reports Iraqi Oil Flowing Through Syrian Pipeline

MIDDLE EAST

11-15 Continuing Violence in Region/US in Touch with the Parties/Call For Restraint
12 Egyptian Ambassador Summoned to Cairo for Consultations

15 US Travel Warnings for Region
16 Prospects for Dennis Ross to Travel to the Region

SERBIA (FRY)

16 Prospects for Secretary Albright to Meeting with Yugoslav President
Kostunica
17-19 Cooperation with International Crimes Tribunal
18 Whereabouts of Milosevic/Prospects of Prosecution for War Crimes

SERBIA/MONTENEGRO

17 US Assistance to Montenegro/US Position on Possible Independence for
Montenegro

SUDAN

19-20 Travel by Assistant Secretary Rice/Sudan's Decision on Visas for US
Diplomats

PERU

20 Update on Situation/President Fujimori's Resignation

LIBYA

21 Status of a Decision on US Passport Use Restriction

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
DAILY PRESS BRIEFING

DPB # 117

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2000 1:05 P.M.
(ON THE RECORD UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED)

MR. BOUCHER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to start out with
a statement on China and missiles. And I'll try to go through this very
carefully for you and then answer what questions you have, and then we'll have

somebody available at the end of the briefing who can further explain, as necessary, the areas that I may not be precise on.

First of all, we welcome the People's Republic of China Foreign Ministry Spokesperson's statement of November 21 regarding China's clear policy commitment not to assist in any way other countries to develop ballistic missiles that can be used to deliver nuclear weapons and to further improve and reinforce its export control system, including by publishing at an early date a comprehensive export control list of missile-related items, including dual-use items.

This development can strengthen cooperation between the United States and China to achieve our common objective of preventing the spread of ballistic missiles that threaten regional and international security. In consideration of China's commitment to strengthen its missile-related export control system, we have decided to waive economic sanctions required by US law for past assistance by Chinese entities to missile programs in Pakistan and Iran.

Given the relationship between missile nonproliferation and peaceful space cooperation, the United States will now resume the processing of licenses that are necessary for commercial space cooperation between US and Chinese companies, such as launching US satellites in China. In addition, the United States and China will resume discussions as soon as possible on extending the 1995 US-China agreement regarding international trade and commercial launch services.

The US stands ready to continue to cooperate and hold consultations with China and other countries on the issues of nonproliferation with a view to strengthening their respective export control systems for missile-related equipment and technology.

If I can just add at this point, this has been a subject of ongoing discussion with the Chinese for quite some time, many years in fact. I know there have been reports about China's missile-related activities in the past. What we have done here is to work out an arrangement that commits China not to assist other countries in the development of Missile Technology Control Regime Class ballistic missiles in any way, and to put in place comprehensive missile-related export controls. In exchange, the US side has decided to waive sanctions under US law for past Chinese assistance to missile programs in Pakistan and Iran, and to

resume certain commercial space interactions with China. Sanctions have been imposed upon Pakistani and Iranian recipients of the Chinese assistance.

The effective implementation of China's new commitments would be another important step by China to join the international nonproliferation mainstream, and it would promote international security and further US-China cooperation.

China's statement includes broad new commitments on nonproliferation and security importance, but its value ultimately will depend on whether those commitments are implemented fully and conscientiously. In that connection, while the United States is waiving sanctions that would otherwise be imposed for past transfers to missile programs in Pakistan and Iran, the waiver does not apply to any transfers that might occur in the future. We are confident that the next Administration will follow this question closely.

These discussions with China have been ongoing for some time. I think most recently we had a team go to Beijing after the talks with North Korea in Kuala Lumpur about a month ago. The team went up to Beijing and held some further discussions. This was certainly a topic of the Secretary's discussions and the President's discussions in Brunei, where they confirmed the understandings and emphasized the importance of full and complete implementation of the understandings that have been reached.

So with that introduction, I will be glad to take your questions.

Q Do you have any more information on the sanctions which are being waived?

MR. BOUCHER: Let me try to go through that as much as I can. There is a limit to the amount I can go into this because of the kind of information we have and where we got it. We do have an ongoing process that reviews very carefully all the available information on potentially sanctionable activity. The missile sanctions law imposes a number of requirements that must be met with high confidence in order for the legal standard for sanctions determination to be met.

Moreover, because we do take seriously our responsibility and because of the serious national security foreign policy and economic consequences of imposing sanctions, we have always insisted on a high standard of evidence. These factors

contributed to the amount of time necessary to make these sanctions determinations.

On the activities itself, some Chinese entities and Pakistani entities were involved in transfers of Missile Technology Control Regime Category I items; that is, complete missiles, their major subsystems, or their production facilities, and of Missile Technology Control Regime Category II items, components and materials used to make Category I missiles and subsystems to Pakistani entities that contributed to Missile Technology Control Regime Class Missile Programs in Pakistan.

With regard to Iran, some Chinese entities and Iranian entities were involved in transfers of Missile Technology Control Regime Category II items to Iranian entities that contributed to Missile Technology Control Regime Class Missile Programs in Iran. But that is about as much detail as I can give you in describing the transfers

Q But is it -- I take it that the waiver is allowed under the statute as the President's prerogative, so Congress does not have to approve the waiver?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm assuming that's true. I'll have to reconfirm that for you.

Q Do you know -- leaders in Congress that may be critical of this, have they been consulted? What kind of congress notification --

MR. BOUCHER: We've been doing congressional consultations this morning.

Q This morning?

MR. BOUCHER: This morning. So I don't have a readout yet.

Q The first thing is, do you know how it is that Xinhua actually announced this about 45 minutes ago?

MR. BOUCHER: Do I know how it is? We agreed that we'd do it more or less simultaneously, and they wanted to do it before the morning came.

Q And the second thing is, are there sanctions against Pakistani and Iranian companies that are being lifted, or is this strictly on Chinese entities?

MR. BOUCHER: No, the sanctions are being imposed upon the Pakistani and the Iranian entities.

Q They're being maintained, or were they being newly imposed?

MR. BOUCHER: Hang on a sec. I've got the entities listed somewhere here. Okay. We determined under US law that a number of Chinese entities transferred missile-related equipment and technology to entities in Iran and Pakistan; that those transfers contributed to so-called Category I missile programs in Iran and Pakistan; and that all of the entities knew they were involved in Category I missile activities.

Therefore, under our law, sanctions against these Chinese and Iranian and Pakistani entities are required to be either imposed or waived, as permitted by the sanctions law. In consideration of China's commitment not to assist the development of MTCR-class ballistic missiles in any way and to strengthen its missile-related export controls, we are waiving the sanctions required against the Chinese entities.

We are imposing sanctions against the Iranian and Pakistani entities, and those sanctions will be announced in the Federal Register shortly. The sanctioned entities in Iran are the Defense Industries Organization, the Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics, and their sub-units and successors. The sanctioned entities in Pakistan are the Ministry of Defense and the Space and Upper Atmosphere Research Commission, and their sub-units and successors.

Q Can you go through this one more -- the Ministry in Iran is --

MR. BOUCHER: In Iran, it's the Ministry of -- sorry, the Ministry of Defense Armed Forces Logistics, I guess, Agency, Armed Forces Logistics Command, or whatever, and the Defense Industries Organization, and their sub-units and successors. In Pakistan, it's the Ministry of Defense, the Space and Upper Atmospheric Research Commission, and their sub-units and successors.

Q What, in effect, do these sanctions mean? What happens? I mean, do you stop dealing with the Ministry of Defense or put a hold on defense purchases?

MR. BOUCHER: What they mean is that, for a two-year period, all new individual export licenses for Commerce- or State-controlled items and all new US Government contracts are denied to the Pakistani Ministry of Defense, Space and Upper Atmosphere Research Commission, and their sub-units and successors. In addition, for a two-year period, all imports into the US of products produced by the Pakistani Ministry of Defense and its sub-units and successors will be denied. Finally, for a two-year period, all new individual export licenses for Commerce- or State-controlled MTCR Annex items and all new US Government contracts related to MTCR Annex items are denied to the Iranian entities, the Defense Industry Organization, the Ministry of Defense, and their sub-units and successors.

Because of the ongoing US embargo against Iran and preexisting US sanctions against Iran and Pakistan, the new sanctions will actually have very limited economic effect, but they do send a strong signal that the United States opposes these countries' missiles programs.

Q Well, what are the current sanctions against Pakistan right now?

MR. BOUCHER: I'd have to look those up for you, but what they generally cover is the area of military and dual-use items.

Q Can you elaborate on what you mean by an entity and whether in fact, specifically with regard to China, because so much of the defense industry is run by the government, if in fact the Chinese Government itself was aware of these sales?

MR. BOUCHER: It is a hard question to answer because we all know that there are Chinese entities that have close government connections, including being part of ministries and things like that, so I don't think at this point I'm able to answer it. What happened was, because the Chinese Government itself committed to impose and publish a set of controls that were of the same sort as the Missile Technology Control Regime and agreed to implement these restrictions for the future, we were able to waive the sanctions that might be applied to Chinese entities generally.

Q Could I just follow up on that? Why does the US think that China felt it necessary to essentially duplicate part of the MTCR and sign that, rather than just signing on to the MCTR? What distinction is there?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, I mean, first of all, membership in the Missile Technology Control Regime is taken by consensus of the members; there are currently 32 countries. China's new commitments, if they are implemented fully, certainly would constitute major steps towards Chinese membership in the regime in the future. But, at this point, what is important is getting control of the activities that might be considered proliferating, and for China to do this we think is a major step forward.

Q I'm sorry, does that mean that China would like to join the MTCR but is not eligible right now?

MR. BOUCHER: No, I think you have to ask China what their considerations are with joining or not joining. What is important to us is that China control its missile-related exports, and what we have done here is reached agreement with the Chinese, through many months of very detailed discussion on the items and the controls and the publication of rules and the means of control, to make sure that China will impose a set of controls that are largely equivalent to the Missile Technology Control Regime ones.

Q Richard, from your understanding of what the Chinese are proposing in this, how difficult would it be for there to be any leakage of this kind of technology from China now, if the rules were applied? Are you pretty confident that this is hermetically sealed?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, if the rules are applied, there won't be any leakage. How difficult is it to apply the rules? We believe that the Chinese Government is capable and indeed is committed to applying these new rules and to implementing thoroughly their decisions not to assist other countries in developing missile technology -- ballistic missiles of this class. And that is why, I think as I noted, the Secretary's discussions with the Chinese Foreign Minister or the Vice Premier, the President's discussions of this topic with the Chinese President in Brunei, focused on the issue of implementation and the need to thoroughly

implement the commitments that China is making here.

Q You mentioned, I believe, if I heard you correctly, that Iran won't suffer very much economically because of the current situation. What will the economic effect be on Pakistan?

MR. BOUCHER: I think I put both economic -- both Iran and Pakistan in the same sentence there; that because these duplicate other sanctions, the direct economic effect may not be large, but it certainly makes it very clear our position against the development of missiles in these places.

Q Can I go back to Jonathan's question? Can you get into any kind of discussion about what sort of verification -- have you set up any sort of verification steps on this?

MR. BOUCHER: I don't have anything for you on that, except that both China and the United States said that we would remain ready to continue to cooperate in consultations with each other on these matters, and therefore on the complete and full implementation of these restrictions. And obviously that is something that we have done all along, and now we will be continuing to do it in terms of the rules that China is putting in place.

Q You said this statement came from the Spokesman's office. Where should we attribute it in terms of government agency, or government official from China?

MR. BOUCHER: It's the Chinese Foreign Ministry's Spokesman's statement. And I not only have it for you in Chinese, but I also have a translation, which some of you might appreciate. We'll give Andrea the Chinese. And then we'll have copies of my statement available by the end of the briefing.

Q I actually have another question. Sorry. Can you say in terms of what will now this allow US companies in terms of what kind of business would it be allowed to do in just plain terms, with China now that you have looked at the sanctions?

MR. BOUCHER: Okay. I think I mentioned in the statement that we will resume processing certain licenses and resume some discussions with the Chinese on missile launches. Let me go back to more detail.

If the sanctions had been imposed upon the Chinese entities, one consequence would have been to preclude commercial space interactions, like launches of US satellites on Chinese rockets. We decided several months ago not to begin negotiations on the new US -- on a new US-China space launch agreement to replace the 1995 agreement that expires next year, and not to conduct normal processing of export licenses for commercial space interactions until the sanctions process has concluded.

Now that the sanctions process has been concluded, and due to the fact that China is imposing its own set of controls on exports that contribute to ballistic missile programs, we have been able to make this decision to waive sanctions that otherwise would have been required against Chinese entities; therefore, we have decided to resume discussions on the launch agreement and to resume the normal processing of commercial space licenses involving China.

Now, that doesn't require US approval for any specific exports to China. All applications for these export license continue to be subject to case-by-case review on the merits of the individual license. They also remain subject to normal requirements for technology transfer restrictions and other things like that. But we will simply be lifting the suspension that has been imposed and return to a case-by-case review.

Q I'm sorry, but could you -- you said you're resuming discussions on a launch agreement? I mean, I don't know -- have we ever helped the Chinese launch any satellites, and would this be launch discussions on launching a satellite in China?

MR. BOUCHER: This has taken place in the past where US-made satellites have been launched on Chinese boosters subject to rigorous technology safeguards that are administered by the Department of Defense. And so companies can apply to us to have their satellites launched on Chinese rockets, basically.

Q I believe it was -- was it Hughes that caused the original problem about passing technology that was not allowed?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, Chinese exports of missile technology is a problem that

we've dealt with here. The relation to satellite launches, yes, there were, I think, several companies that were being looked at for the way they had handled the technology safeguards that are required. Those issues continue. Obviously our licensing takes into account any legal issues that are related to the specific companies. Those aspects are not affected by the new arrangements with China.

Q So will these companies be allowed to deal with China again for satellite launches? Is that what you're saying?

MR. BOUCHER: That would depend on a specific case-by-case review. I don't have a blanket approval of all licenses or of any specific company's license. That will depend on the specific applications and how we see the situation. With regard to the company, it's the legal situation as well as its ability to apply the required technology safeguards.

Q But they can apply, like anybody else?

MR. BOUCHER: They can apply.

Q One final question on this so that we don't torture Barry too much longer. Is it fair to presume at this point, Richard, that with this now taken care of on Class I MTCR missiles, that the US doesn't have any other proliferation concerns with China?

MR. BOUCHER: Proliferation is a broad area. I would have to check it. But certainly on the missile issue we think that this takes care of the need for -- of the need for China to have a system to control exports that contribute to ballistic missile programs. They are instituting a comprehensive set of controls. We think that's important and we welcome that; and, in return, we're waiving sanctions.

But as I've stressed, I think several times, the key to this is going to be implementation and making sure that implementation is thorough and that all Chinese entities, be they government-associated or not, adhere to this, and that the system works. So I'm sure there will be individual instances that we might raise from time to time in order to make sure that these rules are fully

implemented.

Q Would you take the question under whatever it is you do and see if there is an answer?

MR. BOUCHER: I'd have to check on the nuclear area, the missiles and all that other stuff. I'll check and see if we have a broad statement on Chinese proliferation.

Q Richard, is the State Department involved in an effort by a fellow from Florida named John Colombini, who says his wife or ex-wife has gone to Cuba with their child, and he would like the kid back in the States? Do you have anything on that?

MR. BOUCHER: Yes, we are. We are in touch with Mr. Colombini and we're working with him to, first of all, locate his child and then see what we can do to get him returned. Let me look back here somewhere and see if I have any more details for you.

All right, I'm at a loss. You guys help me out over there. Here we go. It's under Colombia Pickering trip. (Laughter.)

We are aware of the situation. The Office of Children's Issues in our Bureau of Consular Affairs is working with the child's father. They have been working since last Wednesday, November 15th. We are in touch with local law enforcement and the FBI, as well as the US Interest Section in Havana. Our immediate goals are, first of all, to locate the child, and, second of all, to verify the child's well-being.

Mr. John Colombini contacted our Office on Children's Issues on Wednesday, November 15th. He reported that his ex-wife had possibly taken their five-year-old son to Cuba. Since then, we have been working with him, with local law enforcement officials in Florida, and with the FBI in locating his son. We have also been in touch with the US Interest Section in Havana to advise them of the situation and seek their help as appropriate.

Our hope is certainly that Jonathan Colombini will be returned to his father

very soon.

Q He has custody of the child?

MR. BOUCHER: I don't have a full rundown on custody, but I have to assume so. At least, and first and foremost, we need to locate the child and make sure the child is okay.

Q I think his wife -- or his ex-wife -- is Cuban. Does that matter?

MR. BOUCHER: In --

Q I know it's kind of early in the --

MR. BOUCHER: I don't know for sure under that. But the issue, I think, is that the boy has been taken from his father, who I assume has custody.

Q Richard, can I mess up the flow by going back to China for another question, or do you want to finish with this and then go back?

MR. BOUCHER: Let's finish with this and then go back.

Q Do you know if Mr. Colombini is American, or was he Cuban and came to America with his wife and son? Do you know any of that kind of biographical details?

MR. BOUCHER: No, I don't know.

Q Do we have any reaction from the Cuban Government yet? Have they commented on it?

MR. BOUCHER: Not that I am aware of at this point.

Q And I apologize if this has been asked, but there is almost certain to be criticism of this development on China from certain quarters on Capitol Hill, to the effect that this is letting China off the hook, so to speak. What is your view on that? What would your response be to that criticism?

MR. BOUCHER: I would make the argument that the goal here is not to put somebody on the hook or off the hook; the goal here is to end sales of missiles and missile-related components. If we can stop a program, if we can stop exports of missiles, technology, equipment, parts, whatever, that have been contributing to the development of ballistic missile capabilities around the world, and particularly in places like Iran and Pakistan which are dangerous enough already, it is very important to us to be able to stop those sales and stop that assistance.

So that is the goal, and we have succeeded in that goal in working out with China arrangements for China to put in place a very comprehensive set of controls on missile sales and exports. And that is what really matters, that is what we have been working on for many years, and that is what we have achieved.

Q Is there any way that the talks with Pakistan are also been held on the same subject, on instituting some kind of controls? And, secondly, where does India's missile program, which is very well developed, figure in all this in Chinese -- in American concerns?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, we are prepared to discuss with Pakistan the conditions under which a waiver on the Pakistani entities might be warranted, but there is also no basis for waiving the sanctions against Iranian entities.

As far as Indians, in terms of what the Indians think or have to do with this, I think you would need to ask the Indian Government. We certainly believe that the Indian Government would agree with our determination that Chinese entities have made missile-related transfers to Pakistan. We believe that India should welcome the comprehensive and explicit assurances that China has given that no such cooperation will take place in the future.

Q New subject?

MR. BOUCHER: Please.

Q Yes. Do you yet have any evidence to support the claim that Iraqi oil is flowing through the pipeline to Syria?

MR. BOUCHER: We have seen the press reports, and we are checking into it. Our Embassy in Damascus has met with the Syrian Foreign Ministry on the subject.

Let me make clear, we are not opposed to oil going through the pipeline, provided that the Security Council first approves the pipeline as an export route under the Oil-for-Food Program. That will ensure that the money that gets paid for the oil is, in fact, used to meet the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people. The import of any commodity from Iraq, including oil, is prohibited by UN Security Council resolutions. The Security Council can approve additional oil export outlets.

Q Well, do you know if that's the idea?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, at this point, Syria has not made an application to the United Nations.

Q Don't you just --

MR. BOUCHER: They would have to apply to the United Nations to include the pipeline in the December renewal of the Oil-for-Food Program.

Q If they don't apply, doesn't that --

MR. BOUCHER: They haven't done that at this point.

Q Doesn't that take -- whatever the legal phrase would be -- doesn't that quiet the issue? I mean, doesn't that tell you that it is actionable as a sanctionable act?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, first of all, we have seen the press reports that oil is flowing; we haven't confirmed that yet.

Q Oh, I understand. But I'm looking ahead.

MR. BOUCHER: Second of all, they can apply, and they should apply.

Q Right. Well, I was just asking. I don't think it is entirely hypothetical.

It is not entirely hypothetical.

MR. BOUCHER: No, it's not entirely hypothetical.

Q If they don't apply, what happens?

MR. BOUCHER: But you are asking me to declare a violation before being confirmed that there is oil flowing. Well, that's somewhat hypothetical.

Q No, I'm asking if there are sanctions that would stand to be applied. Of course it's hypothetical until the oil reaches the Exxon station on the corner, but all right.

MR. BOUCHER: Let us take this step by step. At this moment, we are trying to confirm that there is any oil flowing. We have seen the press reports. We don't have our own confirmation. We are talking to the Syrians. We are telling them, as I am telling you, that they can apply and should apply for approval of this as one of the oil export routes under the Oil-for-Food program because, fundamentally -- and let's get back to basics -- that's the only way to ensure that any money that is gained from these sales is used to help the people of Iraq and not used to bolster the regime.

Q You haven't seen any reports that the oil is not, in fact, flowing?

MR. BOUCHER: No. I think what we have seen is reports that it is flowing, but we don't have confirmation.

Q Are you sure you haven't -- I mean, not published reports but industry reports or -- I mean, is it --

Q Well, it might just be a big hoax.

MR. BOUCHER: Well, there is some news agency that begins with "R" that is reporting it, so I doubt that it is a hoax.

Q You don't have anything verifiable.

Q Can you tell us what's going on vis-à-vis the US efforts on the Middle East today, what kind of phone calls are happening? Palestinian negotiators calling the peace process "clinically dead." Is Secretary Albright or is President Clinton doing anything today to try and revive the patient?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm not aware that the Secretary has made any phone calls on the subject today. She has talked with Russian Foreign Minister Ivanov on the subject, but not other parties in the region today.

I think we made quite clear yesterday that we condemn this heinous attack on a school bus filled with innocent children. We do expect the Palestinian Authority to do the same, and we expect them to do all they can to stop the violence and restore calm. In addition, while we are pressing the Palestinians, we think the Israelis also need to understand that the use of excessive force is not the right way to go.

The Secretary has said we are deeply troubled by the continued violence. There is over 240 people who have been killed, the vast majority of them Palestinians. It is a terrible tragedy to see this suffering go on day after day. There have been civilian victims from all these attacks, and we certainly deeply regret that.

Both sides need to exercise restraint and to implement their responsibilities under the Sharm el Sheikh agreement. We are in touch with the parties through our Embassy and other means. And that is the point that we have been making: Both sides need to exercise restraint, and we need to implement the Sharm el Sheikh commitments.

Q If I could just follow up on that, what kind of notification, if any, did you get from the Egyptian Government that they were recalling their Ambassador? Was the State Department officially notified of this, or did you learn of it through press reports?

MR. BOUCHER: Let's take it one step at a time, okay? Okay. Yes, our missions told us in Egypt and Israel, I take it.

Q Does that mean they read about it?

MR. BOUCHER: They told us that the Egyptian Ambassador Bassayouni has been summoned to Cairo for consultations in light of the situation in Israel and the West Bank and Gaza. The Egyptians have already made statements about this, and I refer you there for their details.

Ambassador Bassayouni has played a very important role in Egypt's efforts to bring about peace in the region, and we hope that we will return to his post as soon as possible.

Q Did President Mubarak in any way -- did he call President Clinton? I take it he has not spoken to Secretary Albright?

MR. BOUCHER: I know the Secretary hasn't had any calls. Our missions in the region -- basically our Embassy in Egypt and probably our Embassy in Tel Aviv -- have reported this to us. They have been in touch with the governments.

Q Richard, your position --

Q (Inaudible)?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, as I said, we hope that he will return to his post as soon as possible. We certainly understand that emotions are running very, very high in the region, but overall we believe it's very important for the parties to remain engaged with each other, and for people who can help to remain engaged with the parties, and not to disengage. So it is important that all continue to do their work. And we, as I said, look forward to his return to his post as soon as possible.

Q As you say, you believe it's important for the parties to remain engaged. So do you think that the withdrawal of the Ambassador, the recall of the Ambassador, is a mistake?

MR. BOUCHER: I'll just say what I've said: We look forward to his return as soon as possible.

Q You cautioned Israel against excessive force. How about economic force? The

blockade that took place obviously reaches people who may have nothing at all to do with the violence. Does the State Department have a view of Israel's blockage of Gaza now?

MR. BOUCHER: I think basically we don't believe that squeezing the Palestinians economically is the right course of action.

Q Can I just follow up? At one point, I guess a couple weeks ago, you said that you weren't keeping score and commenting on some of these specific acts. Has that now changed from the State Department; we're now in scorekeeping mode?

MR. BOUCHER: No, I don't think we're scorekeeping.

Q Okay. And if I could follow up on that, are you drawing -- I mean, do you think that there is -- sort of mentioning these two things, do you think that the bus attack is in some ways a moral equivalent to the attack on the armed compound? Are you saying that by sort of --

MR. BOUCHER: No, I'm not. I mean, clearly in terms of the sequence of events there is a certain relationship, but the attack on a bus filled with school children is heinous and reprehensible. It's something that we've condemned in the strongest terms, and no one should make any mistake about it. We're not condoning it or describing an equivalence in any way.

Q But are you saying that the Israelis shouldn't respond to this, or are you saying that they shouldn't respond with excessive force? I mean, what would be non-excessive force?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm saying what I said, that they -- we're pressuring the Palestinians to, first of all, condemn this horrible attack; second of all, to do everything they can to stop the violence and restore calm. As we do this, we think it's important for the Israelis to keep in mind that excessive force is not the right way to go at this point.

Q Richard, have the Israelis shown you any evidence for their claim that the bombing of the bus had anything to do with Fatah?

MR. BOUCHER: We have seen claims of responsibility from several groups, but we don't have any conclusive information on who is responsible. That's what we've seen from --

Q Right. So you're thinking -- do you think that when you talk about excessive use of force, is it partly that perhaps this force was misapplied, in the sense that it wasn't directed at the people responsible for the attack? You don't seem to have -- you haven't seen any evidence.

MR. BOUCHER: I guess what I'd say is we're concerned about the amount of firepower that's being used on these occasions, particularly when it occurs in civilian areas and therefore results in civilian casualties.

Q Are you concerned also about the demonization of Fatah?

MR. BOUCHER: I've described what we're concerned about.

Q It was the Prime Minister who said that. Are you saying that you have to have your own evidence to know who --

MR. BOUCHER: I'm saying we don't have any conclusive evidence on who is responsible.

Q You won't accept the Prime Minister's statement as --

MR. BOUCHER: No, I didn't say that.

Q No, I'm asking you.

MR. BOUCHER: From a whole variety of sources and contacts that we have at this point, we don't have any conclusive evidence.

Q All right, okay.

Q A Palestinian cabinet minister, Hassan Asfour says that after the recall of the Egyptian Ambassador that they're waiting for more steps against Israel and the United States. He put them together in the same sentence. Do you know if

we've -- besides our general warnings in the area, do you know if we have seen any heightened sense of attack against US interests, given the latest escalation?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, we have fairly strong warnings already for Israel, the West Bank and Gaza, and for the region as a whole. I am sure if there is information we would improve -- we would upgrade those. But I'm not aware of anything at this point.

Q Speaking of those warnings, the Israelis have asked you all to rescind them for Israel, saying it's hurting the tourism industry. What is your response to that?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, I think just generally to say that we have -- we don't make these decisions lightly, but we have an obligation to American citizens to offer them our best advice on travel. We don't do this for or against any particular tourism industry. I know this comes up in a variety of places whenever we have to issue these sort of warnings, but in cases where we think that there is a danger for US citizens, we have an obligation to our citizens to tell them about it.

Q Richard, this is the second day in a row now that you've used the words "excessive force," warning Israel against using that. Do you think last night Israel used excessive force?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm not, at this point, going to try to make judgments on it. I said we're concerned about the amount of firepower that is being used, particularly in urban areas where it results in civilian casualties. I'll stick with that at the moment.

Q But then why did the State Department -- why did you ramp up the rhetoric yesterday for the first time after seven and a half weeks, finally urging Israel not to use excessive force?

MR. BOUCHER: Because we are against excessive force.

Q But why didn't you say that from the beginning?

MR. BOUCHER: I think the situation -- we have tried to react in each of the situations as they have come. We have tried to work to keep the violence contained, to counsel people to use restraint. And when we think it is appropriate on a given day to be more specific, we have done that. But as we have said before, the important thing is to exercise restraint on all sides. That is what the Secretary said yesterday, that is what I said yesterday; and to implement the Sharm el Sheikh commitments. On days when we think it is important to be more specific, we are more specific.

Q Is the US still prepared to veto any resolutions in the Security Council that might criticize Israel for excessive use of force?

MR. BOUCHER: That is what's called a hypothetical. We haven't seen such resolutions at this stage.

Q Do you think that these resolutions against Israel are a bad idea?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, we'd stay with that. She is asking me about something specific that I don't know exists. I would say once again, we don't think it is time for more UN resolutions, and therefore we wouldn't support new UN resolutions.

Q Can I ask about -- yesterday, the Secretary was asked what she was most proud of, and she said what the US did in the Balkans in her four years --

Q (Inaudible)?

Q Yeah, sure. Go ahead.

Q Reports from Israel yesterday said that Ambassador Ross may be going back. Can you just tell us briefly whether this is --

MR. BOUCHER: No travel plans at this point.

Q No travel plans? Okay.

Q I was going to follow up on the Balkans. I think Kostunica will be in Vienna

for an OSCE meeting. They're making their way back into European apparatus, community, et cetera. Will she take that occasion to meet with him? And if she does, is it a chance to make some headway maybe on war criminals, and might she say more about US aid? I mean, is that the next major point of contact, do you think?

MR. BOUCHER: We haven't announced any travel for her to Vienna yet, so that means I have to make this a hypothetical, which I am not wont to do. First of all, let's deal with the fundamentals. Yugoslavia's participation in this meeting, President Kostunica's participation in the OSCE meeting, is a positive step, is a step forward in the integration of Serbia and Yugoslavia to the international community, and that is certainly most welcome.

Second of all, should President Kostunica and the Secretary find themselves in Vienna at the same time, we will have to see whether scheduling would permit arranging a meeting. We would just have to see about that.

In terms of any sorts of meetings, whether it's there or the other meetings that we're having with the government, I think, first of all, our position on Milosevic and the war crimes issue has not changed. There is no statute of limitations. We do see going forward on this issue as part of the process of implementing the rule of law in Yugoslavia.

But second of all, let me also say that we are -- on the other issue that you raise, that certainly is too part of our discussion, that we are looking to assist in any way we can to make sure the people of Yugoslavia see the dividend for adopting democracy, and that we are able to move as swiftly as we can to provide this important assistance that they need in these difficult circumstances that they face recovering from ten years or more of misrule and facing the winter. So we are working, at present, with our Congress to try to move forward on aid and assistance.

Q Would it be not contingent on war criminals, or is that something that you want to -- turning over war crime suspects, or is that something you want to just wait and see how you work it out?

MR. BOUCHER: There are certain things in the law that have to be considered at

certain stages in the process, but I think we have made quite clear, particularly with regard to emergency assistance and the need to show the democracy dividend, that it is important to move forward on those things, even as all these larger processes go forward, too.

Q May I ask you one more thing? Three of us at least here got up early today to hear a couple of eminent think-tankers -- well, one is actually an editor, and the other is a think-tanker with a long career in the State Department -- who are somewhat critical of the Administration's policy, thinking that -- saying basically that you are propping up Yugoslavia as it exists today, and that maybe you're propping up something that really is going to devolve into an independent Serbia, an independent Montenegro, that you're sort of behind the curve.

That takes in a lot of ground, but what is the US view now of Yugoslavia? Is it viable? Are you supporting a Yugoslavia that includes a Kosovo and a Montenegro, or are you in favor of a self-determination in those two places?

MR. BOUCHER: I think, first of all, they are different. The Kosovo situation is clearly covered by UN resolutions, and we support the United Nations' resolutions where the issue there is to implement self-administration before the ultimate dispositions and decisions are made about the future.

In terms of Montenegro, first of all, let me make quite clear, we have not threatened Montenegro with any aid cutoff. We are gratified that our Congress has increased the aid allotment to Montenegro in the Fiscal Year 2001 budget, as well as allocating up to \$100 million for assistance to Serbia. And as I said before, we are in consultations with our Congress on how to move ahead on those funding programs.

We don't favor independence for Montenegro. We support a transparent democratic process of discussions between Montenegro and Serbia that will lead to mutually satisfactory arrangements between the two republics. That process of open, transparent, democratic discussion, I think, is fundamentally different from what has happened over the last 10 years during the Milosevic regime. And therefore I think what we support is what they are, in fact, doing, which is that they are initiating discussions between the democratic leaders of two republics on the full range of issues of their mutual concern.

Q And Kosovo?

MR. BOUCHER: And Kosovo, I started at the beginning by saying it is subject to the UN resolutions, and that is the way it ought to be handled.

Q Can we stay on the Balkans for a second? Do you have any reaction to the fact that the war criminal Slobodan Milosevic is now appearing on, I guess, national Serbian television rallying his Socialist Party to show up and turn out for the vote on December 23rd?

MR. BOUCHER: Well, as we all know, it is pretty easy to get on TV. (Laughter.) No, the answer has got to be that we are certainly aware of it, but our position on him has not changed. He and other indictees belong in The Hague. There is no statute of limitations on war crimes, as I have said. He represents Yugoslavia's unfortunate past, not its future. Public opinion polls show very marginal support for him, and he is widely discredited, even among his former supporters.

Q Richard, on that front, though, his appearance caused several people in the area to say, you know, the US looks really silly for continuing to take this stance of he-belongs-in-The-Hague. And congressional critics continue to say that it really demeans the whole authority of the US to go about charging people with genocide if they are going to allow him to appear on television and rest comfortably in his home. Do you ever feel like you might appear silly talking about sending him to The Hague when he appears on television?

MR. BOUCHER: No, I think if you look -- anybody that looks seriously at the history of the War Crimes Tribunal and our support for it will see that consistency and persistence have paid off in terms of indictments and prosecution of any number of any number of potential war criminals. Those continue to be the hallmarks of our policy. As we have said many times, there is no statute of limitation for war crimes. We are engaged in a process now with Yugoslavia that will involve its integration into international institutions, and rule of law is definitely and absolutely part of that. So these issues are part and parcel of the process under way.

Q Richard, about six weeks ago, after Kostunica first came to office --

MR. BOUCHER: A mere six weeks ago. I thought you were going to go back to the last question.

Q You were saying that the priority was that he should consolidate his position and that the Serbian people should see a dividend for their wise choice. Do those priorities still stand, or does the war crimes priority start moving up the scale at this stage?

MR. BOUCHER: I guess I would say those priorities still stand, except to note that in this mere six weeks that have elapsed, they have done quite a bit in terms of forming a government, working out the process of new elections in Serbia, and moving forward on a host of issues, including establishing relations with the United States and other governments.

So we have seen a lot of progress in terms of their adoption of a democratic form of government, their implementation of the choice that the Serbian people made, and the beginning of their integration with European institutions and, indeed, international institutions. So that process -- pursuing that process remains the overall objective.

Q Okay. So when does war crimes get to the top of the priority list?

MR. BOUCHER: As I said, it's sort of part and parcel of the whole process. I don't have a time table.

Q Could I ask -- returning to the excessive use of force, you have now raised this issue, and yet the Department serves on the Munitions Export Control Act Committee that determines whether a nation is in violation of the use of such things as Apache helicopters and other things which are being used in the excessive force. Is this a beginning of a warning by the Department of State to Israel that she better not go too far?

MR. BOUCHER: The rules on the use of US military equipment are quite clear. And I can get those for you, but I don't want to characterize what I have said in any other way than I have.

Q Susan Rice appears to have got the Sudanese's noses out of joint with her visit that resulted in their suspending the visas for the US chargé, who goes into Khartoum from Nairobi. What is your take on that?

MR. BOUCHER: First of all, Assistant Secretary Rice has returned to Nairobi on Monday -- that's yesterday -- following a two-day visit to southern Sudan. I think the first thing to note is that she was down there working on very important humanitarian issues, issues of former slaves, civil society, human rights. She met with people down there, leaders and advocates that deal with these issues.

Second of all, as you note, the Sudanese Government in Khartoum canceled the visas of American diplomats who travel to Khartoum. We consider that very unfortunate. Reapplications, we understand, will be considered starting December 1.

She used procedures followed by past visitors, including American officials and international relief personnel, in that situation. She did not obtain a visa, but we did in fact inform the Government of her itinerary.

Q Richard, on that, apparently she met with women who she considers to be, or the Department considers to be, still held in slavery. Your briefing note says, "former slaves," and I guess that was part of the contention, with Sudan saying they no longer hold slaves, and some of our allies concurring with them on that front. Is it the State Department position that the Sudanese still allow slavery?

MR. BOUCHER: She met with specific individuals that we describe as former slaves who had returned to their homes in southern Sudan. They, in fact, spoke graphically and from personal experience of the physical abuse, rape and forced labor that they suffered.

She reiterated after these discussions that there is no doubt that slavery continues to exist in Sudan, and that it is carried out with the knowledge and the support of the Sudanese Government. We obviously oppose this practice as morally reprehensible and barbaric. We continue to bring the attention of the international community to slavery in Sudan, and we will continue to support the

application of international and bilateral pressure against Khartoum until that government works in good faith to eliminate the practice.

Q Thank you.

Q Not on Sudan. Do you have any remarks on what is happening in Peru after calling for a peaceful transition? It's still transitioning.

MR. BOUCHER: I will. I do want to point out that we have available somebody to talk a little more to you on background about China, and he is going to have to leave very shortly, so if you want to get on to that, we'll do that. We've got about 15, 20 minutes with him if you want.

Quickly on Peru, President Fujimori has submitted his resignation on November 20th. Second Vice President, now Acting President Marquez, has also submitted his resignation. The Peruvian Congress meets today to determine succession. It appears that the Congressional President Paniagua will be named the interim leader, in accordance with the Peruvian constitution.

We are certainly pleased that all the parties involved are handling this process peacefully and in compliance with the Peruvian constitution. The US delegation that was in Peru yesterday met with the government, opposition, counter-drug officials and private sector representatives. This is a trip that had been planned for some time; the timing of the resignation was a coincidence. They demonstrated our continued support for democratic reform, and we will continue to focus on reform. We don't support any particular individual or political party in Peru.

We understood that Fujimori says he intends to remain in Japan for an indefinite period of time, but he doesn't plan to seek asylum.

Q He does not?

MR. BOUCHER: That's what he says. So that's as good as we've got on that.

Q Were you asked about Cuba and about some family problems?

MR. BOUCHER: Yes. The gentleman from the Associated Press asked me.

Q What about the other -- what about the request from Senator Helms on the visa --

Q That was not asked.

Q That as not asked?

Q Uh-uh.

Q What was that?

Q Was the request by Senator Helms for the State Department to revoke the visas of the executives in the Spanish company that's -- hotel company?

MR. BOUCHER: I don't know about that one. I'll have to check on it.

Q There was a large piece about it yesterday.

Can you bring us up to date on where the Secretary stands on making the decision on the Libya travel passport?

MR. BOUCHER: She has not made any decision on this. The restriction on the use of US passports for travel to Libya expires on the 24th. The Secretary will decide before that date what to do. She can decide to renew it for any period up to one year. She has not decided. Anybody inside this building or outside this building that tells you it is going to be one way or the other is not the Secretary of State, and therefore I would caution you against making assumptions.

Q But she can also just drop it, too, as well, right?

MR. BOUCHER: Yes. She can go from zero to one year, and she will decide when she decides.

Q Richard, you said tomorrow, did you?

MR. BOUCHER: She will decide when she decides.

Q Does that mean probably about 5 o'clock Thanksgiving Day you can put it out?

MR. BOUCHER: I'm not the Secretary of State, so I don't know when she is going to decide, but she will.

Q And that preempts that kind of --

MR. BOUCHER: I am sure she is focused on what you're saying.

Okay? Thank you very much.

(The briefing was concluded at 2: 10 P.M.)

23 11/216/00