

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Cameron Munter to Antony Blinken. Subject: Proposed May 18 Transatlantic Forum on Security Issues. (8 pages)	03/16/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Non-Record (Mar 97-Jan 01) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 630000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/28/2000-04/27/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5697

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 02/28/2000 2:25:30 PM
FROM Storey, Sharon V. (NSA)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: SRB-hosted Kosovo Meeting, Wednesday, March 1, 5PM, Roosevelt Rm [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Hilliard, Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

that would be fine. thanks for your help

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

From: Hilliard,
Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2000 2:15 PM
To: Burrell,
Christina L. (LEGIS); Storey, Sharon V. (NSA)
Cc: Hilliard, Brenda
I. (EXSEC)
Subject: RE: SRB-hosted Kosovo Meeting, Wednesday, March
1, 5PM, Roosevelt Rm [UNCLASSIFIED]

Sharon: For the table, do
you mean the usual gold nameplates which are used for DCs and PCs?
They are easy.

Chris: Will you please keep track of the Cong
people who are attending and let me know when a final list is known.
Then we'll do the seating chart. Thanks.

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

From: Burrell,
Christina L. (LEGIS)
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2000 1:36 PM
To: Hilliard,
Brenda I. (EXSEC)
Subject: SRB-hosted Kosovo Meeting, Wednesday,
March 1, 5PM, Roosevelt Rm [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks for your help.

Principals:

Berger/Albright/Cohen/Shelton/Lew

Inivited Senators: John Warner,
Carl Levin, Joseph Lieberman, Ted Stevens, Richard Lugar, Joseph
Biden, Mitch McConnell, Patrick Leahy, Gordon Smith, Robert Byrd,
Daniel Inouye and Jesse Helms.

Sharon and Miles both said name
tags are not needed. Sharon said just names on the table.; she said
she will have a final
head count on Senators later today but looks
like most are coming.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/02/2000 1:00:55 PM
FROM Witkowsky, Anne A. (DEFENSE)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Package -- [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Brackman, Stella S. (DEFENSE)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Stella:

Please prepare the attached package in final for my signature.
I have incoming for you when you need it.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

1265a.doc

Dear Joe:

In response to Condition (5)(C) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe of November 19, 1990 ("The CFE Flank Document"), adopted by the Senate of the United States on May 14, 1997, enclosed is the 1999 Report on CFE Compliance.

The Report is provided in both a classified and unclassified version.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Joseph Biden
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

2

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 1265b.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In response to Condition (5)(C) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe of November 19, 1990 ("The CFE Flank Document"), adopted by the Senate of the United States on May 14, 1997, enclosed is the 1999 Report on CFE Compliance.

The Report is provided in both a classified and unclassified version.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse Helms
Chairman
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Washington, D.C. 20510

2

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 1265c.doc

Dear Mr. Leader:

In response to Condition (5)(C) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe of November 19, 1990 ("The CFE Flank Document"), adopted by the Senate of the United States on May 14, 1997, enclosed is the 1999 Report on CFE Compliance.

The Report is provided in both a classified and unclassified version.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Richard Gephardt
Minority Leader
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

2

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 1265d.doc

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In response to Condition (5)(C) of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification on the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe of November 19, 1990 ("The CFE Flank Document"), adopted by the Senate of the United States on May 14, 1997, enclosed is the 1999 Report on CFE Compliance.

The Report is provided in both a classified and unclassified version.

Sincerely,

The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert
Speaker of the
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

UNCLASSIFIED
~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENTS~~

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 1265prs.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: THE EXECUTIVE CLERK

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
CHARLES M. BRAIN

SUBJECT: CFE Compliance Report

Purpose

Transmit an annual Report to Congress on CFE Compliance.

Background

At Tab B is the third annual Report to Congress on CFE Compliance, which has been prepared by the State Department consistent with Condition (5)(C) of the May 14, 1997 Senate resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the CFE Flank Document. Condition (5)(C) states that you must certify which countries are in compliance with the CFE Treaty and discuss the compliance issues

concerning those
countries not certified.

Like previous years, this year's Report judges that, of the 30 CFE Parties, 25 (all but Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine) are certified to be in compliance. In the case of the five states that are not certified as in compliance, our judgments are based mainly on previously existing issues.

The scale of Russia's violations of the flank limits, however, have been exacerbated because of the situation in Chechnya. This noncompliance problem is well known on the Hill among those who follow CFE and European security, but the details of its scale may provide a basis for additional criticism of Russia and/or Administration policy toward Russian actions in Chechnya. Russia's compliance problems also extend now to several other areas of the Treaty, including, for the first time, exceeding one of its overall CFE limits by a small amount (in the category of artillery) -- also as a result of the Chechnya

operation. We have raised all of these issues with Russia repeatedly, and pressed the flank issue in particular. As a result of our high level intervention, Prime Minister Putin has publicly committed that Russia will reduce to adapted CFE Treaty levels as soon as possible. At the Istanbul summit you publicly stated our concern about this noncompliance and made clear you would only submit the adapted CFE Treaty to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification when Russia had in fact made its promised reductions.

The Report concludes that, although they may have regional implications, none of the compliance issues identified are militarily significant to the United States, our NATO allies, or to NATO as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letters of transmittal for the CFE Compliance Report at Tab A.

Attachments
Tab A Letters of Transmittal
Tab B Report to Congress

2
UNCLASSIFIED
~~w/SECRET Attachment~~

UNCLASSIFIED
~~w/SECRET Attachment~~

UNCLASSIFIED
~~w/SECRET Attachment~~ 1265

UNCLASSIFIED
~~w/SECRET Attachment~~ cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 1265srb.doc

March 1, 2000

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL R. BERGER

THROUGH: HANS BINNENDIJK

FROM: ANNE WITKOWSKY

SUBJECT: CFE Compliance Report

Attached is the third annual Report on CFE Compliance, for submittal to Congress consistent with the Senate resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the CFE Flank Document. It was prepared by State and has been cleared by all relevant agencies. The memorandum for the President at Tab I recommends he forward the Report to the Congress.

This correspondence was received by the NSC on February 28th.

Concurrence by: Caroline Krass, Andrew Weiss, and
Mark Tavlarides

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve the Memorandum for the President at Tab I.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for the President

Tab A Letters of Transmittal

Tab B Report to Congress

Tab II Incoming Correspondence

2

UNCLASSIFIED

~~w/SECRET Attachment~~ 1265

UNCLASSIFIED

~~W/SECRET ATTACHMENT~~

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Cameron Munter to Antony Blinken. Subject: Proposed May 18 Transatlantic Forum on Security Issues. (8 pages)	03/16/2000	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
Exchange-Non-Record (Mar 97-Jan 01) ([Jesse Helms])
OA/Box Number: 630000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/28/2000-04/27/2000]

2006-1363-F

vz5697

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/17/2000 9:51:50 AM
FROM Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Finding a Package [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Darnes, Victoria J. (RECORDS)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Thanks.

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

From: Darnes, Victoria J.
(RECORDS)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2000 9:48 AM

To: Krass, Caroline
D. (LEGAL)

Cc: Ficklin, John W. (RECORDS); @WWD - West Wing Desk

Subject: RE:

Finding a Package [UNCLASSIFIED]

Caroline--

A copy of the package
(9801994) is in your box in 379.

Vicki

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

From: Krass,

Caroline D. (LEGAL)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2000 8:37 AM

To: Ficklin,

John W. (RECORDS)

Cc: @RECORDS & ACCESS MGMT

Subject: Finding

a Package [UNCLASSIFIED]

John:

I was wondering if you could
help me get a copy of the "come-back" copy of a memorandum to the
President that would have accompanied a letter that he sent to Jesse
Helms on May 21, 1998. The package would have originated with Andreasen.

The topic is ABM Treaty succession. I have the letter but would like to see what the memo to the President said and whether he had any comments.

Thank you.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 03/17/2000 8:53:48 AM
FROM Darnes, Victoria J. (RECORDS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: Finding a Package [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Ficklin, John W. (RECORDS)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY I've identified the package...Ralph is retrieving from the 5th floor.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)

Sent: Friday, March

17, 2000 8:37 AM

To: Ficklin, John W. (RECORDS)

Cc: @RECORDS &

ACCESS MGMT

Subject: Finding a Package [UNCLASSIFIED]

John:

I was wondering if you could help me get a copy of the "come-back" copy of a memorandum to the President that would have accompanied a letter that he sent to Jesse Helms on May 21, 1998. The package would have originated with Andreasen. The topic is ABM Treaty succession. I have the letter but would like to see what the memo to the President said and whether he had any comments.

Thank you.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/18/2000 3:45:55 PM
FROM Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

I love it

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

From: Crowley, Philip J.
(PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:44 PM

To: Widmer, Edward

L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public

Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

How

about "A Bridge (Too Far) to the 21st Century?" No, I think that's
Jesse Helms' speech.

PJ

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

From: Widmer,
Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:43 PM

To: Crowley,

Philip J. (PRESS); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public

Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

how

about "A Billion Points of Light?"

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

From: Crowley,
Philip J. (PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:37 PM
To: @SPEECH
- NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: SRB Speech
at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

Columbia is asking if we
have a title for the speech. It will be on China. What do you think?
A Relationship with China for the 21st Century.

PJ

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/18/2000 3:57:12 PM
FROM Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Did you see the Taiwan guidance in today's package?

PJ

-----Original

Message-----

From: Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)

Sent: Tuesday, April

18, 2000 3:54 PM

To: Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS); Widmer, Edward

L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public

Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

How

about - "A Green Light for Red China"

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

From: Crowley,

Philip J. (PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:44 PM

To: Widmer,

Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS

- Public Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University

[UNCLASSIFIED]

How about "A Bridge (Too Far) to the 21st Century?"

No, I think that's Jesse Helms' speech.

PJ

-----Original

Message-----

From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)

Sent: Tuesday,

April 18, 2000 3:43 PM

To: Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS); @SPEECH

- NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB

Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

how about "A Billion

Points of Light?"

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

From: Crowley, Philip

J. (PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:37 PM

To: @SPEECH

- NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs

Subject: SRB Speech

at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

Columbia is asking if we

have a title for the speech. It will be on China. What do you think?

A Relationship with China for the 21st Century.

PJ

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/18/2000 3:58:39 PM
FROM Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

You've gotten wittier since you left.

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

From:
Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:54 PM
To: Crowley,
Philip J. (PRESS); Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC
Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: RE: SRB Speech
at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

How about - "A Green Light
for Red China"

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

From: Crowley, Philip
J. (PRESS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:44 PM
To: Widmer,
Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS
- Public Affairs
Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University
[UNCLASSIFIED]

How about "A Bridge (Too Far) to the 21st Century?"
No, I think that's Jesse Helms' speech.

PJ

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

From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
Sent: Tuesday,
April 18, 2000 3:43 PM
To: Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS); @SPEECH
- NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: RE: SRB
Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

how about "A Billion
Points of Light?"

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

From: Crowley, Philip
J. (PRESS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:37 PM
To: @SPEECH
- NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: SRB Speech
at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

Columbia is asking if we
have a title for the speech. It will be on China. What do you think?
A Relationship with China for the 21st Century.

PJ

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/18/2000 3:58:43 PM
FROM Halperin, David E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

Awesome!

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

From: Gobush, Matthew N.
(VP)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:54 PM

To: Crowley, Philip

J. (PRESS); Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC
Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS

- Public Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University
[UNCLASSIFIED]

How about - "A Green Light for Red China"

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

From: Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday,
April 18, 2000 3:44 PM

To: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH
- NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB

Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

How about "A Bridge

(Too Far) to the 21st Century?" No, I think that's Jesse Helms'
speech.

PJ

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

From: Widmer, Edward
L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:43 PM
To: Crowley,
Philip J. (PRESS); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public
Affairs
Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

how
about "A Billion Points of Light?"

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

From: Crowley,
Philip J. (PRESS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:37 PM
To: @SPEECH
- NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: SRB Speech
at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

Columbia is asking if we
have a title for the speech. It will be on China. What do you think?
A Relationship with China for the 21st Century.

PJ

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/18/2000 4:21:11 PM
FROM Orzulak, Paul K. (SPCHW)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
Cooper, Colby J. (ADMIN)
Halperin, David E.
Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
Matthews, Sonyia (SPCHW)
Orzulak, Paul K. (SPCHW)
Rosshirt, Thomas M. (SPCHW)
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)

CARBON_COPY Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
Hoelzer, Jennifer I. (PRESS/INTERM)
Leklem, Erik J. (NSCCOMM/PRESS/INTERM)
Stockwell, David B. (PRESS)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

TEXT_BODY How about "The Great Wall(endas): Extending A Hand on the Highwire of the Global Economy." ("Subtitle: The Consequences of Playing Without a Net"?)

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

From: Gobush, Matthew
N. (VP)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:54 PM

To: Crowley, Philip
J. (PRESS); Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC
Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS

- Public Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University
[UNCLASSIFIED]

How about - "A Green Light for Red China"

-----Original

Message-----

From: Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday,

April 18, 2000 3:44 PM

To: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH

- NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB

Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

How about "A Bridge

(Too Far) to the 21st Century?" No, I think that's Jesse Helms' speech.

PJ

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

From: Widmer, Edward

L. (Ted) (SPCHW)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:43 PM

To: Crowley,

Philip J. (PRESS); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public

Affairs

Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

how

about "A Billion Points of Light?"

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

From: Crowley,

Philip J. (PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:37 PM

To: @SPEECH

- NSC Speechwriters

Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs

Subject: SRB Speech

at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

Columbia is asking if we

have a title for the speech. It will be on China. What do you think?

A Relationship with China for the 21st Century.

PJ

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/18/2000 4:29:24 PM
FROM Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY

this gets first prize

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

From: Gobush,
Matthew N. (VP)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 15:54 PM
To: Crowley,
Philip J. (PRESS); Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC
Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: RE: SRB Speech
at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

How about - "A Green Light
for Red China"

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

From: Crowley, Philip
J. (PRESS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:44 PM
To: Widmer,
Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW); @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS
- Public Affairs
Subject: RE: SRB Speech at Columbia University
[UNCLASSIFIED]

How about "A Bridge (Too Far) to the 21st Century?"
No, I think that's Jesse Helms' speech.

PJ

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

From: Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
Sent: Tuesday,
April 18, 2000 3:43 PM
To: Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS); @SPEECH
- NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: RE: SRB
Speech at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

how about "A Billion
Points of Light?"

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

From: Crowley, Philip
J. (PRESS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 3:37 PM
To: @SPEECH
- NSC Speechwriters
Cc: @PRESS - Public Affairs
Subject: SRB Speech
at Columbia University [UNCLASSIFIED]

Columbia is asking if we
have a title for the speech. It will be on China. What do you think?
A Relationship with China for the 21st Century.

PJ

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/24/2000 3:01:23 PM
FROM Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: Bush Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Goldberg, David B. (RECORDS/INTECON)

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Hatch is on Supreme Court

Also, Ronald Reagan's Birthday is a
National Holiday

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

From: Goldberg,
David B. (RECORDS/INTECON)
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2000 2:56 PM
To: Marsh,
Thomas S (RECORDS)
Subject: RE: Bush Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

Oh
its Jake Garn all right! Don't you think we can tap some Utahns
like Orrin Hatch? He's gotta be good for something

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

From: Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)
Sent: Monday, April
24, 2000 2:53 PM
To: Sanborn, Daniel R. K. (Records); Goldberg,
David B. (RECORDS/INTECON); Good, Travis C. (RECORDS)
Subject: RE:
Bush Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

NSC: Condly Rice
OMB: One
of those Dot Com genius CFOs that can cook some serious books
NASA:
Jake Garn from Utah (or is it Jack?)

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

From: Sanborn,
Daniel R. K. (Records)
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2000 2:46 PM
To: Marsh,
Thomas S (RECORDS); Goldberg, David B. (RECORDS/INTECON); Good,
Travis C. (RECORDS)
Subject: RE: Bush Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

Helms
tabbed for USUN Rep.

Surgeon General - Dr. Laura Schlessinger
Supreme
Court appt - Judge Judy

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

From: Marsh,
Thomas S (RECORDS)
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2000 14:41 PM
To: Goldberg,
David B. (RECORDS/INTECON); Good, Travis C. (RECORDS); Sanborn,
Daniel R. K. (Records)
Subject: RE: Bush Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

Nah...
Jesse's gonna be Ambassador to France.

Indian Affairs: Steve
Wynn (The gambling magnate from Harrah's)

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

From: Goldberg,
David B. (RECORDS/INTECON)
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2000 2:36 PM
To: Marsh,
Thomas S (RECORDS); Good, Travis C. (RECORDS); Sanborn, Daniel
R. K. (Records)
Subject: RE: Bush Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thinking
that Jesse Helms would make a better Sec State... And I kinda miss
the days when James Watt was Sec Interior

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

From: Marsh,
Thomas S (RECORDS)
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2000 2:33 PM
To: Goldberg,
David B. (RECORDS/INTECON); Good, Travis C. (RECORDS); Sanborn,

Daniel R. K. (Records)
Subject: RE: Bush Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

Chief
of Staff: Rep. Tom DeLay
JCS: One of the guys busted for Tailhook
(THAT'LL learn 'em)
HUD: Rep. J.C. Watts (Windowdressing only)

-----Original
Message-----
From: Goldberg, David B. (RECORDS/INTECON)
Sent: Monday,
April 24, 2000 2:30 PM
To: Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS); Good, Travis
C. (RECORDS); Sanborn, Daniel R. K. (Records)
Subject: RE: Bush
Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

CIA has GOT TO BE Oliver North

-----Original
Message-----
From: Marsh, Thomas S (RECORDS)
Sent: Monday, April
24, 2000 2:26 PM
To: Good, Travis C. (RECORDS); Goldberg, David
B. (RECORDS/INTECON); Sanborn, Daniel R. K. (Records)
Subject: Bush
Administration [UNCLASSIFIED]

Cabinet:

Secretary of Interior:
Sen. Frank Murkowski
Secretary of Health & Human Services: Phyllis
Schlafly
Secretary of Energy: N/A (Budget Cuts)
Secretary of Education:
N/A (Budget Cuts)
Secretary of Transportation: Rep. Bud Schuster
Secretary
of State: Steve Forbes
Secretary of the Treasury: Milton Friedman
Secretary
of Defense: Colin Powell (or Schwartzkopf)
EPA: N/A (Budget Cuts)
CIA:

Justice: Kenneth Starr

USTR: Pat Buchanan
USUN: No UN Representation
Necessary

Sound good so far?

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/27/2000 7:32:29 AM
FROM Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT PUSHING BACK ON HELMS [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreassen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)
Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE)
Cullom, Philip H. (DEFENSE)
Hill, Roseanne M. (DEFENSE)
Metzinger, Erin M. (DEFENSE)
Mitchell, Rebecca (Julie) J. (DEFENSE)
Peterman, David (Brian) (DEFENSE)
Pimentel, Betsy J. (DEFENSE)
Witkowsky, Anne A. (DEFENSE)
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)
Cooper, Colby J. (ADMIN)
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)

CARBON_COPY Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Gobush, Matthew N. (VP)
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)
Hoelzer, Jennifer I. (PRESS/INTERN)
Leklem, Erik J. (NSCCOMM/PRESS/INTERN)
Stockwell, David B. (PRESS)
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)
Anderson, Brooke D. (NSCCOMM)
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)
Leklem, Erik J. (NSCCOMM/PRESS/INTERN)
Matthews, Sonyia (SPCHW)
Halperin, David E.
Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
Matthews, Sonyia (SPCHW)
Orzulak, Paul K. (SPCHW)
Rosshirt, Thomas M. (SPCHW)
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)
Rudman, Mara E. (NSA)

TEXT_BODY I know that this is contrary to your instincts of simply letting Jesse be Jesse. But I really think there is a need and an opportunity to push back. If they want to make arms control and ABM an agenda

item for the last nine months of the Administration and a prominent issue that the next Administration will have to deal with, let's go. I just don't see what we gain by allowing Jesse to blast us and then staring at our shoelaces in response. Maybe we can debate this at Small Staff.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

Helms.doc

PUSHING BACK ON HELMS

* Senator Helms is an unreconstructed Cold Warrior. His response to arms control is "Just say no."

* We are in discussion with the Russians on a START III agreement that would further reduce the number of warheads that could be used against the United States, to a level of 2,000 to 2,500 that our military leadership says sustains our nuclear5 deterrent. Senator Helms says that such an agreement would be dead on arrival.

* We have agreements pending that strengthen the ABM treaty and would allow for full implementation of START II, which thanks to our determined efforts, has finally been ratified by the Russian Duma and Federation Council. Jesse Helms says dead on arrival.

* Jesse Helms first put CTBT on ice, then restricted debate and finally turned it into a partisan political circus. We have no interest in giving him another opportunity to play with the national interest.

* Now his agenda is to kill the ABM Treaty, which has had broad bipartisan support for almost 30 years. It was designed to be modified as the strategic environment changed through the years. We recognize its value and importance. So do the Russians. So does Kofi Annan and the international community.

* Killing the ABM Treaty means throwing away a legally binding, verifiable arms

control regime that has been a foundation of our national security strategy for three decades. In its place, Jesse Helms wants a new arms race that will inevitably lead to renewed tensions with Russia and undercut American leadership around the world. He is pursuing a narrow, partisan agenda that undermines our national security.

* The American people don't want a return to this Cold War mentality. They want to see us develop a limited national missile defense to effectively counter the emerging missile threat we face from rogue states. Jesse Helms and his anti-ABM cabal wants Star Wars. That debate was settled a decade ago.

* The American people want NMD linked to arms control treaties that further reduce the threats we face and increase strategic stability. We will do that. When the President meets President-elect Putin in June, he will make clear our desire to see START II enter into force. He will help the new Russian leadership understand that we can make progress on START III and ABM adaptation. We will continue with this agenda because it supports the national interest and is ultimately what the American people want us to do.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 04/27/2000 10:02:09 AM
FROM Stockwell, David B. (PRESS)
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT AIDS [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bernard, Kenneth W. (HEALTH)

CARBON_COPY
TEXT_BODY

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT apr20gui2000_.doc
NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS GUIDANCE

April 20, 2000

EUROPE

Germany/Charlemagne Prize

Italy/D'Alema Resignation

RUSSIA/NIS

Russia, Ukraine/POTUS Visit

Russia/START II

Russia/SRB Moscow Visit

Russia/Chechnya

AFRICA

Mbeki Letter

INTER-AMERICAN/MULTILATERAL

UNHCR/Cuba Resolution

Cuban Boy (updated)

ASIA

China Human Rights Resolution

Taiwan Arms Sales

Taiwan Security Enhancement Act (TSEA) (updated)

MIDDLE EAST

Egypt Air

POTUS Q&A on MEPP/Arafat Visit (new)

GERMANY: CHARLEMAGNE PRIZE

April 19, 2000

When is the President accepting the Charlemagne Prize?

* The President will travel to Aachen, Germany on Friday, June 2 to accept the Charlemagne Prize.

German press reports say that he might also accept the German Media Award. Is that true?

* The President is honored by the many tokens of recognition he has been offered around the world during his presidency, and regrets that he cannot accept them all. The President has declined the German Media Award. The President's declining the German Media Award in no way reflects on the value of the prize.

* The White House has informed the organizers of the German Media Prize that the President will not be able to accept the prize.

ITALY: D'ALEMA RESIGNATION

April 19, 2000

Can you comment on press reports that Prime Minister D'Alema has resigned?

* Internal political matter.

* Italy strong democracy.

* We worked closely and well with PM D'Alema, whom we wish well.

* We look forward to continuing close collaboration with his successor.

CLINTON TRIP TO MOSCOW, KIEV

April 20, 2000

Why is the President going to Moscow?

* Many important items on agenda for President Clinton's June 4-5 visit to Moscow. President Clinton told President-elect Putin in telephone conversation on Saturday that he wants to use visit to address issues such as support for democratic reform and economic recovery in Russia and ongoing arms control discussions about START III and ABM Treaty.

* Expect President Clinton and President-elect Putin will also discuss joint nonproliferation efforts as well as key regional issues (e.g., situation in Balkans and European security). President Clinton also made clear that he wants to talk about issues where we have important differences such as war in Chechnya.

* President Clinton will also use his visit to Russia to promote deeper ties between American and Russian people and closer connection between our two

societies. President hopes to use his visit to speak to broad spectrum of Russia

leaders who are building new democratic institutions, civil society, and a market economy.

Why is the President going to Kiev?

* President will also be making important visit to Ukraine. Visit will underscore our commitment to independence, sovereignty and market-democratic

development of Ukraine and other NIS.

* President's visit to Kiev will signal U.S. support for recent economic reform

initiatives launched by President Kuchma and Prime Minister Yushchenko as well as

for advancing Ukraine's integration with EuroAtlantic community.

Doesn't President Clinton's willingness to go to Moscow show that we're not

serious about opposing Russia's devastating war in Chechnya?

* Since beginning of fighting in Chechnya last summer, President has been clear

in public and private with Russians about Chechnya. Position has been

consistent: military solution not viable, will fuel cycle of violence.

Use of

indiscriminate force against civilians, humanitarian toll of conflict unacceptable.

* President's upcoming visit to Moscow important opportunity to engage Russians

and urge them to take meaningful steps toward political solution, to ensure

accountability for reported human rights violations by Russian forces (e.g., by

conducting impartial and transparent investigations), and to increase transparency about situation inside Chechnya.

* President will use discussions with Russians to highlight damage conflict has

done to Russia's international standing and stability throughout Caucasus region.

RUSSIA - START II

April 20, 2000

Are you going to Moscow because you think you can get an START III/ABM deal?

* Hope that Russian approval of START II will allow us to intensify our ongoing

discussions with Russians on further strategic reductions under START III and adapting ABM Treaty to counter new threats. Expect President Clinton and President-elect Putin to address this issue at length during visit to Moscow.

* We're in detailed discussions with Russians on these issues. U/S John Holum is meeting with his Russian counterpart in Geneva this week. Next week Strobe Talbott will meet with Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Mamedov as part of preparations for April 26-27 visit to Washington by Russian Foreign Minister Ivanov.

* Too early to predict outcome of these discussions. Believe it is in both countries' interest to reach agreement on deeper reductions in strategic nuclear forces under START II and adapting ABM Treaty to deal with emerging ballistic missile threat posed to both our two countries. if asked -- What is your reaction to the condition imposed by the Duma tying START II entry into force to U.S. Senate approval of the ABM Succession and Demarcation agreements?

* First, we are still studying the details of the Duma's conditions of ratification and the associated resolutions.

* We would clearly prefer the earliest possible entry into force of START II, without any linkages to the two ABM protocols or to the START II Protocol.

* Our intent is to proceed in parallel with START III and ABM, as agreed by President Clinton and then-President Yeltsin at Cologne last summer.

if asked -- What about the other conditions imposed by the Duma relating to withdrawal from START II?

* We are still reviewing these conditions, but our preliminary assessment is that these conditions do not require changes to the START II Treaty, and will not hinder its entry into force.

* While the United States cannot circumscribe the Russian right to withdraw from the START II Treaty if Russia believes its supreme interests are jeopardized, the provisions for withdrawal from the START II Treaty based on supreme national interests clearly envision that such withdrawal could only be justified by extraordinary events that have jeopardized a Party's supreme interests.

if asked -- Has the debate over missile defenses in Congress hurt the chances for bringing START II into force? Moving forward with START III?

* First, would simply note that the U.S. Senate voted overwhelmingly by a vote of 87-4 to approve START II in January 1996. Strong consensus exists that both START I and START II Treaties are vital to our nation's security, and that a START III would be in our national interest.

* Indeed, in last year's debate in the Senate over the Cochran NMD bill, the Senate voted 99-0 to approve an amendment to that bill making clear that it is the policy of the United States to continue to seek negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces.

* Second, believe many in Congress understand the relationship between START and the ABM Treaty, and would support not only START III, but agreements on ABM that adapt the Treaty to permit a limited NMD and preserve strategic stability.

if asked -- Will the U.S. proceed with formal negotiations on START III without a Russian commitment to negotiations on ABM.

* Our intent is to proceed in parallel with START III and ABM, as agreed to by President Clinton and then-President Yeltsin at Cologne.

if asked -- A START III target of 2,000-2,500 weapons still leaves both countries with a substantial nuclear force. How does this square with recent proposals by

Russia to reduce down to a ceiling of 1,500?

* START III talks are proceeding on the basis of the agreements reached in Helsinki in 1997, including reductions to 2,000-2,500 warheads. An agreement would represent a significant step in the direction of reducing the nuclear danger. Would substantially reduce U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals.

if asked -- When will the Administration transmit the 1997 ABM agreements and START II Protocol to the Senate for approval?

* Before making any decisions on this, we will need to review the Russian ratification law and the related Duma resolutions, and consult with the Senate, taking into account the relationship between the September 1997 agreements and our ongoing discussions with Russia on START III and ABM.

DRAFT
BERGER TRAVEL TO MOSCOW
April 20, 2000

* National Security Adviser Berger will travel to Moscow in mid-May at invitation of his Russian counterpart, Security Council Secretary Sergey Ivanov. Expect that discussions will focus on preparations for early June visit to Moscow by President Clinton as well important security issues on U.S.-Russian agenda.

RUSSIA/CHECHNYA
April 20, 2000

BACKGROUND: A group of Russian parliamentarians and public figures announced on April 17 formation of an independent commission to investigate alleged human rights violations in Chechnya. Putin welcomed the commission's formation and promised to render all necessary assistance and facilitate its contact

with
Prosecutor General's Office and other state agencies. The Russian
government has
announced agreement with the OSCE to allow the return of the OSCE
Assistance
Group to Chechnya by early May.

Core points:

* Our position has been consistent: military solution not viable, will
fuel
cycle of violence. Russia has right to uphold territorial integrity,
combat
terrorism, but indiscriminate use of force against civilians is
unacceptable.

* Urge both sides to take meaningful steps toward political solution
through
dialogue with responsible Chechen leaders, ideally utilizing OSCE
good offices.

* Humanitarian toll of conflict considerable: loss of civilian lives,
more than
200,000 people driven from their homes, thousands still trapped in
Chechnya.
Russia must provide for their well-being, ensure freedom of
movement.
International community willing to help via UNHCR/ICRC; U.S.
generously
supporting their activities.

* International community has spoken with one voice about
opposition to Russian
approach to conflict. Must be persistent, highlight that conflict is
fostering
Russia's isolation from international community.

* Worried about destabilizing impact of conflict throughout entire
Caucasus
region. Essential that Russia respect sovereignty, territorial integrity
of
Georgia and Azerbaijan.

Any comment on Putin's announcement of an "independent
commission" to investigate
human rights in Chechnya?

* Understand that several Russian Duma deputies have formed an "initiative group" with the idea of launching a commission to review the situation in Chechnya.

* We note that President-elect Putin welcomed this news yesterday in London and that Russia government provide "all necessary assistance" to the commission's activities.

* Looking forward to getting more details on how commission will operate, what its charter will be, and what its relationship with the Russian government will be.

* Hope that this new initiative conforms with the concept advocated by UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson.

Any comment on reopening of OSCE Assistance Group office in Chechnya?

* Welcome April 15 announcement that the OSCE Assistance Group to Chechnya would return to Chechnya by early May. We believe the OSCE Assistance Group could help play a vital role in seeking a lasting political solution to the crisis in Chechnya.

* An essential part of the Assistance Group's broad mandate is reporting on human rights issues. We expect that this will be a priority task for the OSCE upon its return to the troubled North Caucasus region.

Does the US support the EU resolution on Chechnya at the UNCHR? Why didn't the US co-sponsor it, as Canada did?

* We have been consulting actively with the Europeans and others.

* Our priority at the UNCHR and elsewhere continues to be on finding the most effective ways to bring Russia into compliance with its obligations.

* We note Russia's recent steps forward on engagement with the

international
community; encourage more progress on meaningful steps to increase
transparency
and accountability regarding human rights situation in Chechnya.

If asked -- Why won't you call these war crimes?

* We have said that reports of Russian and rebel actions in Chechnya
raise
fundamental questions under international humanitarian law that merit
immediate
Russian investigation and access to Chechnya by international
observers.

* A thorough investigation would of course be necessary to gather
sufficient
evidence to prosecute any individual for specific criminal acts. It is
because
of the seriousness of these allegations that we urge the Russian
Government to
investigate in an open and transparent way and, where warranted,
prosecute those
responsible for violations.

MBEKI LETTER April 19, 2000

Did South African President Mbeki send a letter to the President
regarding the
AIDS epidemic in his country? What did he say? Do we think that he
is espousing
a dangerous course of action that has been scientifically discredited?
Has the
President responded?

* South African President Thabo Mbeki has written to the President.
The
President has not yet responded. This was a private communication
between two
leaders and I don't want to comment specifically on the contents of the
letter.

* There is no question that President Mbeki understands the depth of

the health crisis facing much of Africa, including his own country. South Africa is doing a great deal, including appointing a senior government task force, an AIDS council between the public and private sector, and a country-wide education campaign.

* We recognize that the AIDS epidemic in Africa, including South Africa, is manifesting itself in different ways than it has in the United States. They are doing everything within their capacity to deal with this crisis. They don't have the same health care infrastructure that we do, for example, which means that in addition to what the South African government is already doing, they also need to look at additional approaches relevant to specific conditions in Africa. Do we agree with the views of every expert he's consulted? No, we don't and we have communicated that to the South African government. But we do agree with his premise that more has to be done globally, and more needs to be done in Africa.

* We have to keep in mind the limited resources Africa has to deal with this. Our estimates are that in some African countries, like Uganda, treating every infected individual would cost more than ten times the national budget.

* There is no question that AIDS threatens the economic, political and social progress that Africa has made. That's the reason the Vice President and Ambassador Holbrooke put this issue front and center in the United Nations Security Council in January, and why we have an interagency working group studying how we can help Africa confront this major challenge.

Is Mbeki coming to the US on an official visit?

* We have not yet made an official announcement.

Will HIV/AIDS be on the agenda?

* Of course, as will a number of other issues of common concern to the United States and South Africa.

UNHCR - CUBA RESOLUTION
April 19, 2000

CONTEXT: Yesterday in Geneva, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights passed a resolution on the human rights situation in Cuba. Introduced by the Czech Republic and Poland, the resolution had several co-sponsors including the United States. The vote was 21 countries in favor, 18 against and 14 abstentions. Last year a similar resolution passed with 20 in favor, 17 against, and 16 abstentions.

Harold Koh, Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, and Ambassador Nancy Rubin, U.S. Ambassador to the UN Commission on Human Rights, at the UNHCR in Geneva, issued a statement in response to the decision of the Commission to pass the resolution. It congratulated those Commission members who supported this resolution and took a principled stand for human rights.

Any reaction to the decision of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to pass of the resolution chastising Cuba's human rights performance?

* We congratulate those Commission members who supported this resolution. This vote draws attention to the brave human rights defenders who risk their lives and freedom to speak out for a free and democratic Cuba.

* Please direct your inquiries to the Department of State for details on the vote.

[ONLY IF ASKED] Given the UN resolution condemning Cuba's

human rights record,
how can you send Elian Gonzalez back to Cuba?

* The Elian Gonzalez case is about the bond between a child and his father. This child needs to be reunited with his father because that is what the law - and fundamental principles of family - require.

* We simply cannot take the position that because the government of a country denies its citizens human rights, a parent in the at country must lose his or her right to raise his or her child, and that a family must be broken apart.

CUBAN BOY April 20, 2000

CONTEXT: Yesterday, the Federal Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit in Atlanta issued an injunction, preventing Elian Gonzalez's removal from the U.S. pending its decision on the Miami relatives' appeal, which is set for oral argument on May 11. While the court suggested that a 6-year-old might have the right to apply for asylum against the wishes of a parent, this ruling is preliminary and does not necessarily predict the outcome of the full appeal. The ruling also comes prior to the filing of the Justice Department's brief in the appellate case.

The 11th Circuit panel did not rule on who should have custody of Elian pending appeal. Parole custody of Elian was revoked by INS after the Miami relatives defied INS instructions to deliver the boy to Miami's Opa Locka airport at 2:00 p.m. Thursday, April 13. The Justice Department held off on action to remove the boy from the Miami home pending an emergency stay issued by the 11th Circuit on April 13. Following yesterday's ruling, the Attorney General announced that the court's order does not preclude her from placing the boy in his father's

care
pending appeal. Juan Miguel Gonzalez's attorney, Greg Craig,
delivered a
strongly-worded statement in which he called upon the government to
remove Elian
from the Miami home and return him to his father immediately. Craig
referred to
a letter from pediatrician Irwin Redlener, one of three child mental
health
professionals advising the INS, stating that the Miami home
psychologically
abusive and the child is in imminent danger to his physical and
emotional
well-being. Craig said that if the government failed to remove Elian, it
would be
responsible for the harm that continues to be inflicted on the boy.

In other legal action, the Miami-Dade County court threw out Lazaro
Gonzalez's
custody action on April 13, a blow to the Miami relatives' efforts to
prevent
Elian's transfer to his father. Separately, attorneys for the Miami
relatives
filed a suit in federal court in D.C. last week, seeking to bar Elian's
return to
Cuba based on several international human rights instruments.

Last night on Nightline, an attorney for the Miami relatives stated that
Lazaro
Gonzalez was willing to bring Elian to meet with Juan Miguel
Gonzalez, but would
not agree to turn the boy over to him. A family agreement seems
particularly
unlikely in light of allegations, made late last week by the Miami
relatives,
that Juan Miguel Gonzalez abused his late wife and Elian. On 60
Minutes on April
16, Juan Miguel Gonzalez denied the allegations, instead insisting that
his Miami
relatives were abusing the child through actions such as recording a
video of him
saying he did not want to return to Cuba.

What's your reaction to the appellate court's ruling preventing the
child's
return to Cuba pending appeal?

* The injunction prevents the boy from being removed from the U.S.
during the

appeal. It does not prevent him from being reunited with his father, which is the most important issue in this case.

[IF ASKED] The ruling seems to indicate that INS is wrong on the law, and that even a six-year-old has the right to apply for asylum against the wishes of a parent. Are you concerned that Justice may lose the appeal?

* This was a preliminary ruling on a request for an injunction to prevent the boy's removal from the U.S. while the 11th Circuit considers the appeal. The court has not yet considered all the briefs in this case or heard oral argument, so I think we cannot prejudge the result. Beyond that, we will not comment on pending litigation, or what the court might do.

Will INS act to transfer the boy to his father's care? Are you going to give the Justice Department permission to send in the U.S. Marshals if the Miami relatives continue to refuse to hand the boy over?

* As the Attorney General has said, the Justice Department is considering the course of action that is appropriate under the circumstances.

* We continue to believe it is time to reunite this child with his father. We urge the family to cooperate in a peaceful transition so that it causes the least disruption for this boy as possible. We believe the relatives in Miami care for this child, and we're hopeful they will make this transition as smooth as possible for Elian.

Are you concerned that if the family does not turn him over voluntarily, there might be violence in Miami?

* We understand that for many this is an emotional issue, but we believe that the Miami community will remain peaceful and respect the law and legal decisions made

in this case.

What's your reaction to Dr. Redlener's assessment that the home where Elian is staying is "psychologically abusive" and that he should be removed immediately?

* The INS and Justice Department take the advice of Dr. Redlener and the other experts very seriously. As we have said, we believe this child should be reunited with his father as soon as possible.

[IF ASKED] Do you agree with Dr. Redlener's view that the home is psychologically abusive?

* We defer to the experts on this issue.

Why are you trying to send Elian back to Cuba while at the same time condemning the deplorable human rights conditions in Cuba?

* The Elian Gonzalez case is about the bond between a child and his father. This child needs to be reunited with his father because that is what the law - and fundamental principles of family - require.

* We simply cannot take the position that because the government of a country denies its citizens human rights, parent in that country must lose their right to raise their child.

What's your reaction to the federal suit filed by the Miami relatives last week, alleging that the child's return to Cuba is barred by several international human rights treaties?

* We will not comment on pending litigation.

Cuban television has shown images of a home and school where Elian would live for several months after his return. Some have called this a reeducation

camp.

Does this give you cause to reconsider sending Elian back to Cuba?

* As the Attorney General has said, the focus of this case is on the role of the boy's father in raising him. This father has been very involved in raising his son, and it's time for them to be reunited so that he can continue to do so.

Why did you wait so long to act? In retrospect, do you think the government should have taken steps earlier to resolve this case? Do you think the Attorney General has been too hesitant?

* The Justice Department has followed a deliberate and careful process in order to reunite this child with his father safely and with as little disruption as possible. It is in the power of Lazaro Gonzalez and his family to make this process safe and nonconflictual for Elian, and we urge them to do so.

What's your reaction to the Miami relatives' allegations that Juan Miguel Gonzalez physically abused Elian and his late mother?

* The Justice Department has given the relatives ample opportunity to come forward with any credible information concerning Juan Miguel Gonzalez's fitness as a parent. They have not done so.

Do you think the father really wants to return to Cuba, or is he unable or unwilling to speak freely?

* Under our law, the father is free to apply for asylum if he wishes. It's our understanding that he has said clearly that he wants to return to his country.

* He has had numerous meetings alone with his attorney and also met with the Attorney General and INS Commissioner without any Cuban officials

present.

What's your reaction to the dismissal of the state court custody action?

* We're pleased with the decision. It upholds the longstanding principle that immigration matters are exclusively reserved to the federal government by the Constitution.

What is the White House's role in the matter at this juncture?

* The Justice Department and State Department continue to play their respective leading roles in this matter. Of course, we continue to be in close touch with Justice and State on this important issue.

[ONLY IF ASKED] How do you respond to allegations that you are using this case as a tool to improve relations with Cuba?

* Our only objective is to see that the INS decision in this case is carried out in accordance with the law.

CHINA HUMAN RIGHTS RESOLUTION April 18, 2000

BACKGROUND: The 56th annual session of the UN Commission on Human Rights (CHR-56) began in Geneva on March 20, with voting on country-specific resolutions today.
(Only the 53 member states of the CHR can vote on resolutions.)

On January 11 The US announced our intention to sponsor a resolution at the CHR on the human rights practices of the PRC given the continued deterioration of human rights in China, specifically citing the PRC's intensified crackdown on the China Democracy Party, the Falun Gong, unregistered church leaders, and in Tibet.

Every year since 1990 when China resolutions were first introduced at the CHR (excluding 1991 and 1998 when no resolutions were introduced), the Chinese have always attempted to preempt a vote through their introduction of a procedural maneuver known as a "no-action" motion. A vote on no-action is not a vote on human rights conditions in China, rather it is a vote on whether or not the UN Commission on Human Rights is merely an appropriate venue to debate human rights conditions in China.

It has always been the position of the US that the UN Commission on Human Rights is the right venue for such a debate to occur and we have always opposed Chinese efforts to cut off debate of their human rights practices by opposing their no-action motions.

With the exception of 1995 when we defeated the PRC's no-action motion, the Chinese have always won on these motions, including last year when the PRC won on no-action 22(PRC)-17(US) with 14 abstentions.

CHR 2000: Earlier today as expected, the PRC introduced a no-action motion in a successful attempt to cut-off debate and prohibit a vote on our resolution on human rights practices in China. The PRC's no-action motion was adopted 22(PRC)-18(US)-12(abstain).

Some of the states voting with the PRC to prevent a vote on human rights conditions in China were India, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, and Venezuela. Additionally, several states voted to abstain (a stance not in opposition to the US resolution, but not helpful to our position either) including Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, the Philippines, South Korea, Senegal and Tunisia.

[Note for briefer: still to come, votes on Cuba, Sudan, the former Yugoslavia

and Iran.]

What is the White House's reaction to the defeat of your resolution on human rights conditions in China?

* As you know despite our strong efforts to focus the international spotlight on China's human rights situation, the Chinese prevented the UN Commission on Human Rights from voting on the question of human rights in China. We are disappointed, as we believe that the UN Commission on Human Rights is the right venue for a discussion of these very matters.

* Today's developments are particularly troubling in light of very serious human rights abuses that have occurred in China over the last year, including the PRC's intensified crackdown on the China Democracy Party, the Falun Gong, unregistered church leaders, and in Tibet.

* We would like to thank those countries that voted against the no action motion, despite considerable pressure to vote otherwise. They clearly share our commitment to the principle that no country should be immune from having its actions considered by the UN Commission on Human Rights.

* We will continue to speak out on human rights abuses in China through our annual country reports on Human Rights and Religious Freedom and other venues (including the UN) as appropriate. As we have clearly stated in the past, our relationship with China will never reach its full potential until there is significant progress in the areas of human rights conditions in China.

Did you do enough to promote victory on this vote? What did the President and Vice President do to promote this resolution? How did the President's efforts on behalf of this vote compare to his efforts on the PNTR vote?

* Senior U.S. officials, both here and in capitals abroad, engaged in an

sustained effort on behalf of a China resolution in Geneva.

* The White House was seriously engaged in efforts to encourage other governments to vote with us on this resolution regarding China and on other resolutions at Geneva.

But was the President and/or the Vice President involved?

* I do not want to get into the details of confidential diplomatic efforts; but the Administration, including the White House, was deeply engaged.

Were the resolution's chances of success hurt by the fact that the EU chose not to co-sponsor the resolution?

* We welcome the support of other countries for any resolution we sponsor in Geneva, but co-sponsorship is not necessary for a vote to take place. A large number of countries joined us in voting against the no-action motion and we thank them for their support.

What impact will the non-passage of the China resolution have on US-China relations?

* We see no reason for the non-passage of the China resolution to have any impact on our bilateral relationship with China. We have a broad range of concerns with China and will continue our principled, purposeful policy of engagement to advance those concerns, including our human rights concerns.

What impact will this loss have on PNTR?

* PNTR is a key part of our engagement with China. Congress should vote for PNTR because it is in America's economic and national security interests. It will

create jobs in America and open markets in China. At the same time, it will accelerate the creation of a rules-based society in China.

* PNTR is good for the US, and, in the long run, will encourage greater openness and rule of law in China.

* We will continue to engage with China and work for improvement in its human rights situation.

TAIWAN ARMS SALES April 18, 2000

Can you give us any more on the Taiwan arms sales package? It appears that you have declined to provide the Taiwanese the Aegis destroyers they were looking for. Jesse Helms and others have called this inadequate.

* I'm not going to provide specific details from the podium, but let me make a few general points.

* This is a very robust package that provides several new systems to Taiwan. It also provides upgrades of existing systems. It provides more training. It will help Taiwan more effectively use equipment they already have.

* There was a strong interagency consensus behind the package put forward by the Pentagon. The President and his national security team accepted the Pentagon's recommendations.

* The package contains new equipment that had been discussed with Taiwan in previous years and was included now based on our assessment of Taiwan's capabilities and needs.

* These decisions are underpinned by a variety of detailed studies that have been undertaken by the Pentagon. Some are finished. Others are still on-going and will take time to complete.

* This is an on-going process by which we meet the responsibility to assist Taiwan with its self-defense under the Taiwan Relations Act.

Can you clarify whether the Aegis destroyers were denied or deferred. And, if deferred, when will they come up again for consideration?

* Without getting into specifics, the Pentagon has a detailed study underway to assess Taiwan's naval defense requirements, including anti-air, anti-surface and anti-submarine capabilities. This would include an evaluation of Taiwan's comprehensive naval defense needs.

* Decisions regarding additional maritime capabilities were deferred pending completion of this study.

What about radar? Is the PAVE PAWS included or not?

* First of all, last year, we decided that we would help Taiwan upgrade its early warning radar. Since then, we have been working with Taiwan on what form those upgrades should take.

* Without commenting on specific systems, there are some things we will do in the near term to increase the range and capability of Taiwan's radar. We will continue to discuss details regarding long-term improvements. Regarding long-term options, we have not ruled any specific system in or out. This is an area that requires more work in terms of how to best improve Taiwan's capabilities.

Has the United States briefed Taiwan on this package? Does that include both the incoming and outgoing governments? What about the Hill?

* We have begun discussions through AIT with a range of Taiwan representatives,

both here in Washington and in Taiwan.

* We have had Hill consultations and are in the process of briefing members and staff on the details.

TAIWAN SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT April 20, 2000

Administration position on TSEA?

* Administration strongly opposes Taiwan Security Enhancement Act.

* Taiwan's security a top priority for this Administration, but the Act would decrease Taiwan's security and put at risk the stability of the region.

* Unofficial relationship with Taiwan very strong under the Taiwan Relations Act, which is an effective mechanism for ensuring robust unofficial ties with Taiwan.

* Now is time to encourage both Taiwan and PRC to take advantage of fresh start with new leadership in Taiwan. Have been urging both sides to resume dialogue and avoid actions that risk conflict or increase tension.

* TSEA threatens these efforts by formalizing a military-to-military relationship, and would significantly increase risk of confrontation in the Taiwan Strait. Its passage would be unnecessary and provocative.

* Therefore, the Departments of Defense and State and the National Security Council have indicated they would recommend to the President that he veto this bill.

Any comment on Murkowski's suggestion that TSEA be postponed?

* Senator Murkowski's met with the incumbent and newly elected leadership in Taiwan. We look forward to hearing his views in light of his discussions in Taiwan.

* (Note : Murkowski is stopping in Hong Kong en route home, will be in Washington the evening of Saturday, April 22.)

EGYPT: PAYMENT FOR EGYPTAIR FLT. 990 INVESTIGATION April 18, 2000

CONTEXT: Rep. John Duncan (R-Tenn) the chairman of the House Aviation Subcommittee, introduced a bill last week that would deduct funds from Egypt's FMF assistance unless it pays for half the investigation of the crash of Egyptair 990, projected to cost \$18.5 million. Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va) who chairs the subcommittee that oversees aviation agency budgets, wrote to President Clinton on Monday to ask that he seek money from the Egyptians. Wolf's letter said that the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) could face a significant financial shortfall without Egypt's financial help. The Egyptian Civil Aviation Authority responded with a letter saying it had offered financial support for the investigation two months ago. "We were informed that we would be contacted when this need arose," he said. Egyptair asked the NTSB to take the lead in the investigation, which still has not been concluded.

What is our position on legislation pending in Congress that would deduct funds from Egypt's foreign military assistance unless it pays for half of the Egyptair 990 investigation?

* It is our understanding that the Egyptian government had previously offered to share the costs associated with the investigation, but U.S. officials declined

the offer. While we have not approached the Egyptian government with an official request to share the cost of the investigation, we understand that financial considerations may have changed significantly and that we may need to revisit this issue with the government of Egypt.

* In light of our close ties with the government of Egypt, it is our view that this matter can be resolved through regular diplomatic channels and that there is currently no need for legislation to address this matter.

POTUS QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON MEPP/ARAFAT VISIT April 20, 2000

Do you think parties can reach a Framework Agreement by May?

* My recent discussions with two leaders and the negotiations that took place in Washington strengthen my conviction that both parties are genuinely committed to reaching an agreement, and there is a real sense of partnership.

* No doubt issues are very difficult and will require tough decisions.

* They are making a real effort to reach their goal and we will do everything we can to help them.

There are reports in Israel about a proposal to reach a partial agreement, and postpone resolution of Jerusalem for example. What is the U.S. view?

* U.S. view is the same as that of the two parties: it's very important to try to reach an agreement on all issues.

* Issues are complex and sensitive, but time will not make their resolution any easier.

* We have a unique opportunity to strive for a comprehensive accord; that is our

goal.

What do you make of Barak's apparent acknowledgment that Israel will recognize a Palestinian state at the end of the process?

* Our position has always been that we do not want to prejudge any of the permanent status issues; best way to preserve effective role in the process.

* Ultimately, of course, we are prepared to support what the parties can agree on.

What will be the nature of the U.S. role now that you will have a seat at the negotiations?

* Both Israelis and Palestinians have requested that we attend the negotiations; it is their common assessment it will help.

* We will be present when negotiations resume in the region; our goal at this point is to become more familiar with the positions of the two sides.

* When the time is ripe, we will be prepared to put forward our own bridging proposals.

Is there anything new on the Syrian track? Bashar has said door is not closed, and Patrick Seale has proposed compromise. What do you make of it?

* Some of these reports may indeed sound encouraging; but only real signal would be an official one.

* At this point, based on what we have heard, the gaps have not been narrowed.

* But we are not giving up and continue to believe in necessity of comprehensive peace. We will continue to be in touch with both sides.

Are you concerned about implications of Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon?

* Israel has conveyed to the UN its decision to withdraw in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 425.

* International community is welcoming that decision and I expect it will seek to ensure that the withdrawal proceeds peacefully and that peace be established in Lebanon. That means security for all who live in Lebanon.

* Israel is complying with UN resolution; should be no justification for continued violence.

If Israel withdraws, shouldn't Syria be asked to withdraw as well?

* We support full restoration of Lebanon's territorial integrity and sovereignty.
Look forward to day when Lebanon will be free of all foreign presence.

* Israel has announced its decision to withdraw in compliance with UN resolutions. Focus now should be on that and ensuring it is completed peacefully