

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Steven Andreasen to Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley, Christina Burrell, Jay Farrar, et al. Subject: CTBT Update. (5 pages)	02/07/1998	P1/b(1)
002. email	Jeffery DeLaurentis to Michael Orfini. Subject: Action Memorandum to the President. (7 pages)	02/24/1998	P1/b(1)
003. email	Anne Witkowsky to Robert Bell. Subject: I'm in the Pink. (3 pages)	02/25/1998	P1/b(1)
004. email	Michael Hamel to Michael Roberts. Subject: March 10, 1998. (12 pages)	03/11/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/06/1998-03/12/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5702

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 2/6/98 2:41:23 PM
FROM McEldowney, Nancy E.
CLASSIFICATION CONFIDENTIAL
CLASSIFICATIONREASON 1.5(d)
DATECLASSIFIEDON 02/06/1998
DECLASSIFYON 02/06/2008
SUBJECT FW: Feb 11 NATO Event Memo to POTUS [CONFIDENTIAL]
TO Davies, Glyn T.
Elkon, Nicole L.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Nicole: any comments or additions?
Glyn: just fyi as discussed
earlier today.

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

From: McEldowney,
Nancy E.

Sent: Friday, February 06, 1998 1:50 PM

To: Blinken,

Antony J.; Leavy, David C.; Rudman, Mara E.; Bandler, Donald K.;
Flanagan, Stephen J.

Cc: @EUROPE - European Affairs; @CEE - Central/Eastern
Europe; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat
Plan &

Comm

Subject: Feb 11 NATO Event Memo to POTUS [CONFIDENTIAL]
Importance: High

Could

I please get you comments asap on attached? Was requested by
Kerrick
to be sent forward today. Sorry for the short fuse. Thanks very
much. Nancy

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT FEB11.DOC

February 6, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

FROM: Jeremy Rosner
Don Bandler
Steve Flanagan
Mara Rudman
Tony Blinken

SUBJECT: February 11 Event on NATO Enlargement

Attached at Tab I is your memorandum to the President describing the February 11 event, at which the President will announce his transmittal to the Senate of the protocols of accession to NATO for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

The event will be in the Franklin Room, eighth floor of the State Department, at approximately 12 noon. The Vice President has agreed to serve as emcee. The Foreign Ministers of the three invited states will be in the audience, along with an audience of about 150 composed of: the national security team, foreign policy elites, members of Congress, leaders of supportive interest groups, and NATO ambassadors.

The key question now is the participation of Senators Lott and Daschle or, alternatively, Helms and Biden. We prefer them to participate in a speaking role in order to send a message of early Senate support. If they do not participate, we would instead feature remarks by Secretary Albright and the Vice President. After the President offers his remarks, he would then sign the request for advice and consent. If we secure congressional participation, the President would be flanked during the signing by the leadership as well as by his national security team.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I

Attachment

Tab I Memorandum to the President

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Samuel R. Berger

SUBJECT: February 11 Event on NATO Enlargement
Ratification

Your key event for Wednesday, February 11, will focus on your transmittal to the Senate of the protocols of accession that will add Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to the NATO Alliance. This event will formally launch congressional deliberation on ratification and will be crucial in setting the right tone for the ensuing debate. The event will occur around noon in the Franklin Room, on the eighth floor of the State Department.

This event has three purposes. First, to underscore the continuing leadership of the United States, and you personally, in European security affairs. Second, the event will show your full engagement in the effort to obtain favorable Senate advice and consent on the protocols; the Senate is likely to vote mid-March. Third, the likely participation of Senators of both parties in the event will show there is substantial Senate support as well.

The Vice President and Secretary of State will be the emcee. We are seeking to have Senator Lott and Senator Daschle (or alternatively Helms and Biden) on stage with you; each would make brief remarks stressing their support. You will close the program, setting out the case for ratification in the context of our broader European security strategy.

The foreign ministers of the three invited states will be in attendance, and your

remarks will note their presence. The audience will also include: your national security team (except Secretary Cohen, who will be traveling); former national security officials and retired military officers; foreign policy elites; leaders of veterans, ethnic, and other groups that support enlargement; Senate and House members; and other NATO ally ambassadors.

Although prospects for ratification look good, we still face the likelihood of difficult amendments, such as a mandated pause on future rounds of enlargement, as suggested in the NYTimes op-ed on Wednesday by Senator Nunn and General Scowcroft. To build momentum for our final push on this issue, Secretary Albright will deliver a speech on Monday, both she and Secretary Cohen will testify before Senator Helms on February 24, and we have an extensive campaign underway to generate supportive editorials, op-eds, and endorsements.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/6/98 4:01:04 PM

FROM Leavy, David C.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT Action Memorandum for NSC [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.
Bandler, Donald K.
Bendick, Gordon L.
Braden, Susan R.
Brown, Keirn C.
Butler, Lawrence E.
Covey, James P.
Dowling, John N. (Nick)
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Marshall, Betty A.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
McEldowney, Nancy E.
Quinn, Mary E.
Sapiro, Miriam E.
Todd, Gwennyth E.
Braden, Susan R.
Flanagan, Stephen J.
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Quinn, Mary E.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

nancy--looks good. just a few thoughts from me.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

NATO POTUS on Feb 11.doc

NATO Enlargement Ratification Roll-Out Event
DATE: February 11, 1998
LOCATION: Roosevelt Room, State Department
TIME: TBD

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER

I. PURPOSE

To formally request advice and consent of the Senate for the protocols of accession that will add Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to the NATO Alliance.

To underscore the continued leadership of the United States in implementing your agenda for NATO enlargement and stability across the European continent and demonstrate your personal commitment to fighting for passage

II. BACKGROUND

This event will formally launch congressional deliberation on ratification of NATO enlargement and will be crucial in framing the tone and message for the upcoming debate.. It will showcase your full engagement in the effort to obtain favorable Senate advice and consent on the protocols and will increase the chances of a clean, early vote, perhaps as soon as mid-March. The likely participation of Senators of both parties in the event will demonstrate substantial, bipartisan Senate support as well.

The Vice President and Secretary of State will emcee. We are seeking to have Senator Lott and Senator Daschle (or alternatively Helms and Biden) on stage with you; each would make brief remarks stressing their support. You will close the program, setting out the case for ratification in the context of our broader European security strategy. Finally, you will sign the letter of request to the Senate, with your national security team and members of Congress standing behind you. A detailed scenario is attached at Tab B.

The Foreign Ministers of the three invited states will be in attendance. You will have already had a brief photo-op with them, and your remarks will note their presence. The audience will also include: your national security team (except Secretary Cohen, who will be traveling); former national security officials and retired military officers; former government officials; leaders of veterans, ethnic, and other groups that support enlargement; Senate and House members; and other NATO ally ambassadors.

Although prospects for ratification look good, we still face the likelihood of difficult amendments, such as a mandated pause on future rounds of enlargement, as suggested in the NYTimes op-ed on Wednesday by Senator Nunn and General Scowcroft. To build momentum for our final push on this issue, Secretary Albright will deliver a speech on Monday, February 9, both she and Secretary Cohen will testify before Senator Helms on February 24, and we have an extensive campaign underway to generate supportive editorials, op-eds, and endorsements.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Attached at Tab A

IV. PRESS PLAN

Open Press.

V. SEQUENCE

Attached at Tab B.

Attachment
Tab A Participant List
Tab B Sequence
Tab C Remarks (to be provided)

2

0909

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT 0909 - SRB on Feb 11_.doc

February 6, 1998

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

FROM: Don Bandler
Steve Flanagan
Mara Rudman
Tony Blinken

SUBJECT: February 11 Event on NATO Enlargement

Attached at Tab I is your memorandum to the President describing the February 11 event, at which the President will announce his transmittal to the Senate of the protocols of accession to NATO for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

The event will be in the Franklin Room, eighth floor of the State Department, at approximately 12 noon. The Vice President has agreed to serve as emcee. The Foreign Ministers of the three invited states will be in the audience, along with a group of about 150 composed of: the national security team, former government officials, members of Congress, leaders of supportive interest groups, and the NATO ambassadors.

The key question now is the participation of Senators Lott and Daschle or, alternatively, Helms and Biden. We prefer them to participate in a speaking role in order to send a message of strong bipartisan support. Larry Stein is working

to secure their participation. If they do not participate, we would instead feature remarks by Secretary Albright and the Vice President. After the President offers his remarks, he would then sign the request for advice and consent. If we secure congressional participation, the President would be flanked during the signing by the Congressional leadership as well as by his national security team.

Also attached at Tab II is the list of proposed participants.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I

Attachment

Tab I Memorandum to the President

2

0909

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/6/98 5:29:24 PM
FROM Andreasen, Steven P.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Farrar, Jay C.
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.

CARBON_COPY Andreasen, Steven P.
Bell, Robert G.
Bouchard, Joseph F.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Langley, Janice M.
Mulligan, George D.
Seaton, James B.
Witkowski, Anne A.

TEXT_BODY Jay/Tony -- Sorry for the short fuse, but I need to send this over tonight. Please OK ASAP. Thanks. Steve.

PLEASE PASS TO SANDY
FOR NEXT MONDAY'S A-B-H LUNCH. THANK YOU.

Background. With one notable exception, January was a good month for CTBT. The President's State of the Union pitch for Senate approval of CTBT this year, the endorsement by the four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the lab director's endorsement during the President's trip to Los Alamos have gotten our 1998 CTBT ratification campaign off to a strong start. Moreover, over the past two weeks, an interagency team briefed senior staff from Senate Intelligence, Foreign Relations and Armed Services on CTBT, with follow-up briefings to come. That said, the months of February and March will be crucial to our ratification effort: during this time, we must work the "inside" game of breaking the CTBT-Kyoto-ABM linkage constructed by Senator Helms. This will require the engagement of Agency principals, most immediately Secretary Albright (who heretofore has been largely absent from the campaign, along with most of the Department of State) and you.

Points to be Made

* With the notable exception of Helm's "linkage" letter, January was a good month for CTBT. The President's announcement in the State of the Union that the Treaty has been endorsed by four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, including Colin Powell, will pay big dividends down the road.

* Bob Bell's interagency team has briefed all three Senate committee staffs, and more briefings are expected this month.

* Moreover, the President is now personally engaged in the ratification effort: he had a good trip last week to Los Alamos, where he secured the endorsement of the 3 lab directors.

* Need to use the next two months to work the "inside" game with Helms and Lott if we are to get this treaty through the Senate in 1998. Question is, how best to start?

* I would suggest that you (Secretary Albright) find an opportunity as soon as you can arrange it to have a quiet conversation with Senator Helms. We need to probe to find out how "hard" this linkage really is, that is, is he positioning himself to deal (in which case we'll need to have a better sense of what he thinks is a quid pro quo), or do we need now to assume we will only be able to move this by working with Democrats to take hostage things that matter to him?

* In either case, to succeed we will need to convince Senate Republicans there is a "price to be paid" for stonewalling on CTBT, as measured in public perceptions (i.e., the perception that Senate Republicans favor nuclear testing, which is overwhelmingly opposed by the public) and in terms of our being able to criticize them for undercutting our broader nonproliferation agenda just as Saddam is reminding the world how dangerous the WMD threat really is.

* For those reasons, we need to follow the President's lead and keep the CTBT issue in front of the public: we should all look for opportunities to underscore our case for why the Senate should act on this treaty this year.

* We should also touch base next week with Daschle and Biden.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/6/98 5:56:34 PM
FROM Farrar, Jay C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Mara,

Steve is hot on this. I have no serious objection to it, but in the last point, it might be useful to have Gen. Shelton call Biden, as well. Biden likes Shelton, has in the past offered to help him, and this could be the type of issue with little "payback" baggage for Shelton (Biden can sometimes be demanding).

Otherwise, this is classic Andreasen/Bell aggressiveness on one of their issues. Need to be careful about "threatening" Senate Republicans. Two can play that game, and we could get our fingers hurt if we're not careful. Probably better to enlist sympathetic Republicans to help our cause and see what headway we can make before we go "nuc."

-----Original

Message-----

From: Andreasen, Steven P.

Sent: Friday, February

06, 1998 5:29 PM

To: Farrar, Jay C.; Blinken, Antony J.; Gray, Wendy E.

Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy

Subject: CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Jay/Tony -- Sorry for the short fuse, but I need to send this over tonight. Please OK ASAP. Thanks. Steve.

PLEASE PASS TO SANDY FOR NEXT MONDAY'S A-B-H LUNCH.
THANK YOU.

Background. With one notable exception, January was

a good month for CTBT. The President's State of the Union pitch for Senate approval of CTBT this year, the endorsement by the four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the lab director's endorsement during the President's trip to Los Alamos have gotten our 1998 CTBT ratification campaign off to a strong start. Moreover, over the past two weeks, an interagency team briefed senior staff from Senate Intelligence, Foreign Relations and Armed Services on CTBT, with follow-up briefings to come. That said, the months of February and March will be crucial to our ratification effort: during this time, we must work the "inside" game of breaking the CTBT-Kyoto-ABM linkage constructed by Senator Helms. This will require the engagement of Agency principals, most immediately Secretary Albright (who heretofore has been largely absent from the campaign, along with most of the Department of State) and you.

Points to be Made

- * With the notable exception of Helm's "linkage" letter, January was a good month for CTBT. The President's announcement in the State of the Union that the Treaty has been endorsed by four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, including Colin Powell, will pay big dividends down the road.

- * Bob Bell's interagency team has briefed all three Senate committee staffs, and more briefings are expected this month.

- * Moreover, the President is now personally engaged in the ratification effort: he had a good trip last week to Los Alamos, where he secured the endorsement of the 3 lab directors.

- * Need to use the next two months to work the "inside" game with Helms and Lott if we are to get this treaty through the Senate in 1998. Question is, how best to start?

- * I would suggest that you (Secretary Albright) find an opportunity as soon as you can arrange it to have a quiet conversation with Senator Helms. We need to probe to find out how "hard" this linkage really is, that is, is he positioning himself to deal (in which case we'll need to have a better sense of what he thinks is a quid pro quo), or do we need now to assume we will only be able to move this by working with Democrats to take hostage things that matter to him?

- * In either case, to succeed we will need to convince Senate Republicans there is a "price to be paid" for stonewalling on CTBT, as measured in public perceptions (i.e., the perception that Senate Republicans favor nuclear testing, which

is overwhelmingly opposed by the public) and in terms of our being able to criticize them for undercutting our broader nonproliferation agenda just as Saddam is reminding the world how dangerous the WMD threat really is.

- * For those reasons, we need to follow the President's lead and keep the CTBT issue in front of the public: we should all look for opportunities to underscore our case for why the Senate should act on this treaty this year.

- * We should also touch base next week with Daschle and Biden.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/6/98 8:34:23 PM
FROM Blinken, Antony J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreasen, Steven P.
Farrar, Jay C.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

okay by me

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

From: Andreasen, Steven
P.

Sent: Friday, February 06, 1998 6:59 PM

To: Blinken, Antony

J.; Farrar, Jay C.

Subject: FW: CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Going once...going twice...

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

From: Andreasen, Steven P.

Sent: Friday, February
06, 1998 5:29 PM

To: Farrar, Jay C.; Blinken, Antony J.; Gray, Wendy
E.

Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy

Subject: CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Jay/Tony -- Sorry for the short
fuse, but I need to send this over tonight. Please OK ASAP. Thanks.
Steve.

PLEASE PASS TO SANDY FOR NEXT MONDAY'S A-B-H LUNCH.
THANK YOU.

Background. With one notable exception, January was

a good month for CTBT. The President's State of the Union pitch for Senate approval of CTBT this year, the endorsement by the four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the lab director's endorsement during the President's trip to Los Alamos have gotten our 1998 CTBT ratification campaign off to a strong start. Moreover, over the past two weeks, an interagency team briefed senior staff from Senate Intelligence, Foreign Relations and Armed Services on CTBT, with follow-up briefings to come. That said, the months of February and March will be crucial to our ratification effort: during this time, we must work the "inside" game of breaking the CTBT-Kyoto-ABM linkage constructed by Senator Helms. This will require the engagement of Agency principals, most immediately Secretary Albright (who heretofore has been largely absent from the campaign, along with most of the Department of State) and you.

Points to be Made

- * With the notable exception of Helm's "linkage" letter, January was a good month for CTBT. The President's announcement in the State of the Union that the Treaty has been endorsed by four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, including Colin Powell, will pay big dividends down the road.

- * Bob Bell's interagency team has briefed all three Senate committee staffs, and more briefings are expected this month.

- * Moreover, the President is now personally engaged in the ratification effort: he had a good trip last week to Los Alamos, where he secured the endorsement of the 3 lab directors.

- * Need to use the next two months to work the "inside" game with Helms and Lott if we are to get this treaty through the Senate in 1998. Question is, how best to start?

- * I would suggest that you (Secretary Albright) find an opportunity as soon as you can arrange it to have a quiet conversation with Senator Helms. We need to probe to find out how "hard" this linkage really is, that is, is he positioning himself to deal (in which case we'll need to have a better sense of what he thinks is a quid pro quo), or do we need now to assume we will only be able to move this by working with Democrats to take hostage things that matter to him?

- * In either case, to succeed we will need to convince Senate Republicans there is a "price to be paid" for stonewalling on CTBT, as measured in public perceptions (i.e., the perception that Senate Republicans favor nuclear testing, which

is overwhelmingly opposed by the public) and in terms of our being able to criticize them for undercutting our broader nonproliferation agenda just as Saddam is reminding the world how dangerous the WMD threat really is.

- * For those reasons, we need to follow the President's lead and keep the CTBT issue in front of the public: we should all look for opportunities to underscore our case for why the Senate should act on this treaty this year.

- * We should also touch base next week with Daschle and Biden.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Steven Andreasen to Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley, Christina Burrell, Jay Farrar, et al. Subject: CTBT Update. (5 pages)	02/07/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/06/1998-03/12/1998]

2006-1363-F
vz5702

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 2/9/98 3:34:33 PM
FROM Hawley, Leonard R.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: UN reform [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO McEldowney, Nancy E.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY Nancy--Here is a set of talkers for Security Council and UN Arrears. Bitterlich will probably raise the SC issue. Len

-----Original
Message-----
From: McEldowney, Nancy E.
Sent: Monday, February
09, 1998 12:48 PM
To: Wechsler, William F.
Cc: Hawley, Leonard
R.
Subject: RE: UN reform [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks very much. The
main thing for Sandy will be to know where Bitterlich may press the
German agenda on this issue -- and how to respond.

-----Original
Message-----
From: Wechsler, William F.
Sent: Monday, February
09, 1998 12:47 PM
To: McEldowney, Nancy E.
Cc: Hawley, Leonard
R.
Subject: UN reform [UNCLASSIFIED]

Len Hawley will provide
you with a paragraph on UN reform by COB today.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

SRB TP's Bitterlich--UN Reform.doc

TALKING POINTS FOR BERGER-BITTERLICH MEETING

Security Council Expansion

Background: We are working with the P3&2 Group (US, UK, FR & Japan, Germany) in New York to hammer out a framework resolution for Security Council reform in 1998. Germany has pressed two contentious issues. First, size of expansion - we are holding at 21 seats, while Germany wants 24. Second, veto for new permanent members - once seated as a permanent member, Germany wants veto power. However, our view is that the veto question should not be considered until the new Council membership is determined. A third issue - timing of UNGA action - is also in play on here at home. We want to delay action on Security Council reform until later in the year to ensure timely Hill action on UN arrears legislation this Spring.

Recently, Germany agreed to defer action on the veto issue. However, it continues to press for 24 seats, and it is aggressively forming a coalition to isolate the U.S. in an attempt to bring pressure on us to yield.

Talking Points:

* We are determined to maintain momentum on Security Council expansion this year. However, rapid action on Council expansion in New York, especially if it is controversial with Congress, would jeopardize passage of UN arrears legislation this Spring. Nonetheless, we do not intend to allow this initiative to lead to a dead end.

* Therefore, we need to pace out the P3&2 process, giving us time to pass UN arrears legislation this Spring. This must be done without inducing any adverse action on Security Council reform. The process is manageable, and we will collaborate with you over the coming weeks to orchestrate our efforts.

* Regarding the 21 seat limitation, we recognize we face wide-spread opposition to our firm stand to preserve the Council's efficiency. However, as we see in the continuing Iraqi-UNSCOM crisis, Security Council efficiency is a decisive factor in responding to threats to international peace and security.

* Regarding extension of the veto, we are pleased Germany recently agreed to defer this question so as to come to closure on the remaining questions.

* The P3&2 Group is making progress toward resolving those remaining questions. Hopefully, we can have a framework resolution passed in the General Assembly in 1998.

UN Arrears

Background: Germany has been very flexible regarding the UN arrears issue. They have been a moderating force in the EU, which has been calling for reopening of discussions on assessment rate changes only after the U.S. has adopted legally binding commitments to pay its arrears in full (\$1.5 billion) without condition. Although it is unlikely Bitterlich will raise this issue, we could ask for

Germany's support as we try to sell the new legislative package to the EU in June.

Talking Points

* We were upset that Congress blocked our plan to pay about \$1 billion of our UN arrears because of domestic politics. We had worked long and hard with Senator Helms and other Republicans and I thought we had a deal.

* We intend to get supplemental legislation passed before May. Our proposal includes over \$1.0 billion in arrears payments and only those conditions that all

nations would agree to--most of them involving questions of national sovereignty.

* Congress will demand reductions in our assessment rates, once the arrears legislation is passed. We are seeking less controversial scale reductions of 22% in the Regular Budget and 25% for Peacekeeping at the UN.

* Once we get the legislation passed this Spring, we will need Germany's help, especially with the EU, to have the General Assembly take action in June to allow us to pay our arrears.

* Germany's influence will be decisive. We've put a tremendous amount of effort into closing the gap between what Congress will provide and what the General Assembly will accept. It will be a contentious debate, but progress can be made if we work together.

2

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/9/98 9:26:31 PM
FROM Storey, Sharon V.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT RE: CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Andreasen, Steven P.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

CARBON_COPY Andreasen, Steven P.
Bell, Robert G.
Bouchard, Joseph F.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Langley, Janice M.
Mulligan, George D.
Seaton, James B.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Rudman, Mara E.
Benjamin, Daniel
Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.
LaFleur, Vinca S.
Leavy, David C.
Naplan, Steven J.
Widmer, Edward L.

TEXT_BODY SRB has seen and a responds: OK

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

From: Andreasen,
Steven P.

Sent: Friday, February 06, 1998 9:04 PM

To: @NSA - Natl
Security Advisor
Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat Plan & Comm
Subject: CTBT Points/Albright-Berger-Hamre
[UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

PLEASE PASS TO SANDY FOR NEXT
MONDAY'S A-B-H LUNCH. THANK YOU.

Background. With one notable exception, January was a good month for CTBT. The President's State of the Union pitch for Senate approval of CTBT this year, the endorsement by the four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the lab director's endorsement during the President's trip to Los Alamos have gotten our 1998 CTBT ratification campaign off to a strong start. Moreover, over the past two weeks, an interagency team briefed senior staff from Senate Intelligence, Foreign Relations and Armed Services on CTBT, with follow-up briefings to come. That said, the months of February and March will be crucial to our ratification effort: during this time, we must work the "inside" game of breaking the CTBT-Kyoto-ABM linkage constructed by Senator Helms. This will require the engagement of Agency principals, most immediately Secretary Albright (who heretofore has been largely absent from the campaign, along with most of the Department of State).

Points
to be Made

- * With the notable exception of Helm's "linkage" letter, January was a good month for CTBT. The President's announcement in the State of the Union that the Treaty has been endorsed by four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, including Colin Powell, will pay big dividends down the road.

- * Bob Bell's interagency team has briefed all three Senate committee staffs, and more briefings are expected this month.

- * Moreover, the President is now personally engaged in the ratification effort: he had a good trip last week to Los Alamos, where he secured the endorsement of the 3 lab directors.

- * Need to use the next two months to work the "inside" game with Helms and Lott if we are to get this treaty through the Senate in 1998. Question is, how best to start?

- * I would

suggest that you (Secretary Albright) find an opportunity as soon as you can arrange it to have a quiet conversation with Senator Helms. We need to probe to find out how "hard" this linkage really is, that is, is he positioning himself to deal (in which case we'll need to have a better sense of what he thinks is a quid pro quo), or do we need now to assume we will only be able to move this by working with Democrats to take hostage things that matter to him?

* In either case, to succeed we will need to convince Senate Republicans that it is in their interest to move on CTBT, as measured in public perceptions (i.e., the perception that Senate Republicans favor nuclear testing, which is overwhelmingly opposed by the public) and in terms of criticism to which they will be subject for undercutting our broader nonproliferation agenda just as Saddam is reminding the world how dangerous the WMD threat really is.

* For those reasons, we need to follow the President's lead and keep the CTBT issue in front of the public: we should all look for opportunities to underscore our case for why the Senate should act on this treaty this year.

* We should also touch base next week with Daschle and Biden.

* Finally, John (Hamre), you might suggest that General Shelton call Biden, to reiterate Administration support for the effort, in the hopes of further energizing him to help us work this out with Helms (FYI -- we know Biden wants to develop more of a relationship with Shelton).

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/10/98 2:09:46 PM
FROM Andreasen, Steven P.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Helms Letter [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO Bartlett, L. June
Cosgriff, Kevin J.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Elkon, Nicole L.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hurwitz, Marc I.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kerrick, Donald L.
Millison, Cathy L.
Poole, Jennifer C.
Rice, Edward A.
Davies, Glyn T.
Dejban, Donna D.
Friedrich, Mary K.
Helweg, M. Diana
Kale, Dora A.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Malley, Robert
Millison, Cathy L.
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L.
Storey, Sharon V.

CARBON_COPY Andreasen, Steven P.
Bell, Robert G.
Bouchard, Joseph F.
Kelly, Sandra L.
Langley, Janice M.
Mulligan, George D.
Seaton, James B.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Highsmith, Newell L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Rudman, Mara E.
Blinken, Antony J.

TEXT_BODY Our thanks to all who helped move the President's letter to Senator

Helms re CTBT et al over the past 24 hours. It was indeed signed by the President this morning, and Secretary Albright was alerted prior to her appearance before Foreign Relations this morning at 10:00.

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 2/10/98 8:03:58 PM
FROM Benjamin, Daniel
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: NATO Draft [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Blinken, Antony J.
Gray, Wendy E.

CARBON_COPY

TEXT_BODY I'll take this to staff secy on my way out.

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

From: Benjamin,
Daniel
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 1998 8:03 PM
To: @PLANNING
- Strat Plan & Comm; @EUROPE - European Affairs; @CEE -
Central/Eastern
Europe; @RUSSIA - Russia/Ukraine; @LEGISLAT - Legislative
Affairs
Subject: NATO
Draft [UNCLASSIFIED]
Importance: High

JS has cleared so this
is final minus up to date acknowledgments.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

natoproto4.doc
2/8/98 8:00 P.M.
PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
TRANSMITTAL OF PROTOCOLS OF ACCESSION TO NATO
FOR
POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC
STATE DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, DC
FEBRUARY 11, 1998

Acknowledgments: Vice President Gore; Senator Roth; Senator
Biden, Senator Helms
[others tk] Secretary Albright; General Shelton; Minister Kovacs

[KO-vach];
Minister Geremek [guh-REH-mek]; Minister Sedivy [SHEH-dih-vee];
Distinguished
Guests;

Today we gather in a building that has seen many negotiations and the signing of many pacts to end bloodshed. This time, we have come together not to sign another agreement to end a war but to begin a new era of security and stability for America and Europe.

In a moment, I will transmit to the Senate for its advice and consent the documents that will add Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to NATO. Their addition to the Alliance is not only a pivotal event in the quest of their

peoples for freedom and security. The enlargement of NATO is also a major stride forward for America, the Alliance, and the stability and unity of all of Europe.

As the Senate takes up consideration of these agreements in the coming weeks, the question it must answer is: How does adding these states to NATO advance America's national security?

There are three compelling reasons. First : Enlarging the Alliance will make NATO stronger. The Cold War is past, but dangers remain - conflicts like the one in Bosnia, weapons of mass destruction, threats that we cannot predict today A NATO that embraces Europe's new democracies will be more capable of carrying out its core missions of defending the territory of its members as well as addressing conflicts that threaten our common peace.

These three states will add some 200,000 troops to the Alliance. A larger NATO will be a better deterrent against the aggressors of the future and deepen the ranks of those who will stand with us should deterrence ever fail. I am pleased that just last week, 60 of America's top retired military leaders - including

five former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff - underscored that message when they said that these three states will make NATO stronger. They are right, and we have already seen the proof. The Czechs, Poles and Hungarians served beside us in the Gulf War. Their troops are also participating as we speak in NATO's peacekeeping effort in Bosnia. They have made a significant contribution to our success in these missions.

Second: Enlarging NATO will make Europe more stable. NATO can do for Europe's east what it did for Europe's west after World War II -- provide a secure climate in which democracy and prosperity can grow. Enlarging NATO will encourage prospective members to resolve their differences peacefully. Already, the prospect of NATO membership has helped convince countries in Central Europe to improve ties with their neighbors, settle border and ethnic disputes -- any one of which could have led to a future conflict. Enlargement will make all of Europe more stable.

Finally, NATO's growth will erase the artificial line in Europe that Stalin drew. Behind me is a picture of the wall that for so long represented the false and forced division of that continent. It has been nearly ten years since that wall was torn down by brave people on both sides. Countries once confined by it are now truly free, with strong democracies, vibrant market economies, and a proven track record of standing up for peace and security beyond their own borders. NATO cannot maintain the old Iron Curtain as its permanent eastern frontier. It must and can bring Europe together in security, not keep it apart in instability.

In the 20th century, we have learned the hard way just how vital Europe's security is for our own. Enlarging NATO will make America safer.

Our goal is and remains the creation of an undivided, democratic peaceful Europe for the first time in history. Bringing these three nations into the Alliance will advance this effort. So will the NATO's new Founding Act with Russia and the broad new relationship we are building with Moscow - which is helping us move forward on arms control...build peace in Bosnia...and achieve progress on a wide range of security challenges. So will the Partnership for Peace ... the EuroAtlantic Partnership Council...the Charter with Ukraine and the Charter of Partnership I signed last month with the Presidents of the three Baltic states and our Southeast Europe Action Plan, which I announced yesterday with President Stoyanov of Bulgaria. Our effort to build a new Europe also depends on keeping NATO's door open to other qualified European democracies. History teaches us that the realm of freedom in Europe has no fixed frontiers. The United States is determined that the divisions of the past not circumscribe the boundaries of the future.

As the Senate begins its deliberations, I want to salute the indispensable role that members of both parties in both chambers in Congress have already played in bringing us to this day. I was especially pleased that a bipartisan group of members joined me at last summer's NATO summit in Madrid as part of America's delegation. The wide-ranging debate on this issue within Congress and across our nation is a model of the kind of thoughtful, non-partisan discussion we need -- and I commend Congress for helping to lead it. Now the decision rests with the United States Senate. I know it is in good hands.

In this room named for Benjamin Franklin -- America's first envoy in Europe after independence -- I am reminded of the comment he made at the close of the Constitutional Convention. He noted that on the chair of the Convention's president, George Washington, was painted a figure of the sun -- a

symbol, he
thought, of our new republic. He said "I have the happiness to know it
is a
rising and not a setting sun."

In the wake of the Cold War, some wondered whether the Alliance
had a future.
With the step we take today - and the decision I am confident the
Senate will
take in the days ahead - I know that our historic partnership of nations
also is
a rising sun and that its ascendance will bring a more stable, more
democratic,
more peaceful future for all who live on both sides of the Atlantic.

###

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Jeffery DeLaurentis to Michael Orfini. Subject: Action Memorandum to the President. (7 pages)	02/24/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/06/1998-03/12/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5702

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	Anne Witkowski to Robert Bell. Subject: I'm in the Pink. (3 pages)	02/25/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/06/1998-03/12/1998]

2006-1363-F
vz5702

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 3/2/98 4:42:42 PM
FROM Letts, Kelly J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Action Memorandum for NSC [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Busby, Scott W.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT cedawl.doc

February 26, 1997

ACTION**MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER**

FROM: ERIC SCHWARTZ

SUBJECT: International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)

Purpose: To obtain your approval of a course of action to encourage Senate consent to ratification of CEDAW.

Background: Adopted in 1979 and signed by the United States in 1980, CEDAW sets out basic standards of non-discrimination and equal rights for women. It would have no domestic legal effect, but would have a powerful impact on our effort to encourage better treatment of women around the world. We have included it as a top priority in our Treaty Priority List, and the President and First Lady have made public appeals for Senate consent. (CEDAW was approved by the SFRC in 1994, but did not receive Senate consent before the end of the session.)

The First Lady will be eager to make a commitment to CEDAW a cornerstone of a March 11 International Women's Day event which is now on the President's schedule.

Public Support for the Treaty: A wide coalition of national organizations has endorsed CEDAW, from AARP to B'nai Brith to the League of Women Voters. At the present time, we are unaware of any substantial organized opposition to CEDAW.

Congress: Some 53 Senators have indicated support for the Treaty, though several (3-5) are less than solid. Six Senators have come out against CEDAW, with another five listed as "leaning against." The remaining 36 are undecided.

A critical factor, of course, is the attitude of Senator Helms. He voted against the Treaty when it was considered in Committee in 1994, and Mara points out that we are already pushing uphill with him on CTBT. Moreover, I'm told that in a conversation with you and Madeleine, Sen. Helms criticized family planning advocacy groups, which he may link with CEDAW. On the other hand, there are some indications the Senator is less than adamantly opposed to CEDAW. He did not mount vigorous opposition to the Treaty in 1994, and his correspondence with constituents on CEDAW simply restates his opposition and notes that "treaties must be considered very carefully." Finally, while a letter he sent to Madeleine on our treaty priorities expressed strong opposition to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, it did not express opposition to CEDAW.

NGO Strategy for Ratification: CEDAW is the first human rights treaty pending before the SFRC linked to an important constituency - and in which opposition to the Treaty may come at political costs to opponents. Thus, NGOs are increasingly prepared to paint those who are reluctant to support the Treaty as unresponsive

on women's rights issues, and have been engaged in constituency-based efforts to urge Senators to endorse CEDAW prior to International Women's Day on March 8.

Administration Strategy for Ratification: We recommend an Administration strategy that involves both public and quiet efforts.

The Public Side: There are three important dates to consider: March 8, International Women's Day; mid-July, when the First Lady and/or the Secretary of State are expected at the Sesquicentennial Celebration of the first American Women's Conference at Seneca Falls (which launched the suffrage movement); and the September - November end of congressional session.

Lead-up to March 8: The President and other senior Administration officials encourage members of Congress to express their support for CEDAW by March 8.

March 8 (White House event March 11): Senior Administration officials make statements of support for CEDAW, urge those Senators who have not yet committed to endorse the Treaty to do so. President makes statement encouraging the Senate to act on this Treaty by the time of the Seneca Falls Convention.

July: If Treaty has not been acted upon, senior Administration officials use the Seneca Falls event to criticize lack of Senate action, and to urge Senate to move in the period prior to the end of the congressional session.

The Private Side: In the lead-up to March 8, senior Administration officials speak to the Congressional leadership, emphasizing our desire to avoid making this a partisan issue, but indicating our determination to work hard for ratification.

Activities up to and including March 8-11: The timeline below would take us through March 11, International Women's Day, at which point we would reassess and plan activities leading toward the Spring-Summer.

End of February: Secretary Albright calls Senator Helms, expresses the Administration's strong desire to move on this Treaty and desire to avoid a confrontation. Acknowledges his discomfort with the Treaty, but asks that he permit it at least to be considered prior to the Seneca Falls Conference. Emphasizes that this could be done quickly, with or without hearings. Chief of Staff or APNSA makes similar call to Majority Leader Lott, with the same request, asks that Senator Lott speak to Senator Helms about moving the Treaty. Other senior Administration officials make calls as appropriate.

End of February - March 8: State briefings of uncommitted Senate offices, emphasizing Administration effort to obtain commitment prior to March 8.

March 3-4: Letter from the President to all Members of the Senate, requesting commitments of support by March 8, as well as commitment to move Treaty by the Seneca Falls Conference.

March 11: President hosts White House event, thanks those Members who have endorsed the Treaty, encourages others to come on board and to move the Treaty prior to the July Conference.

Concurrence by: Mara Rudman, Tony Blinken

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve the strategy described above; that you raise this issue with the Chief of Staff; and that, before the March 11 event, you hold a meeting on this issue that includes the Offices of the First Lady, the Chief of Staff and Legislative Affairs.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

1464

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/2/98 5:37:07 PM
FROM Busby, Scott W.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT CEDAW memo to Bowles [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Schwartz, Eric P.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT CEDAW Memo to Bowles.doc

March 2, 1998

ACTION**MEMORANDUM FOR ERSKINE BOWLES**

FROM: SAMUEL R. BERGER

SUBJECT: Ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)

Purpose: To obtain your approval of a course of action to encourage Senate consent to ratification of CEDAW.

Background: Adopted in 1979 and signed by the United States in 1980, CEDAW sets out basic standards of non-discrimination and equal rights for women. (CEDAW was approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC) in 1994, but did not receive Senate consent before the end of the session.) It would have no domestic legal effect, but would have a powerful impact on our effort to encourage better treatment of women around the world. We have included it as a top priority in our Treaty Priority List, and the President and First Lady have made public

appeals for Senate consent. The President most recently did so on Human Rights Day, December 10, 1997.

Ratification of CEDAW will be a cornerstone of a March 11 International Women's Day event which is now on the President's schedule.

Public Support for the Treaty: A wide coalition of national organizations has endorsed CEDAW, from AARP to B'nai Brith to the League of Women Voters. At the present time, we are unaware of any substantial organized opposition to CEDAW.

Congress: Some 53 Senators have indicated support for the Treaty, though several (3-5) are less than solid. Six Senators have come out against CEDAW, with another five listed as "leaning against." The remaining 36 are undecided.

A critical factor, of course, is the attitude of Senator Helms. He voted against the Treaty when it was considered in Committee in 1994. Moreover, in a conversation with Madeleine and me, he criticized family planning advocacy groups, which he appeared to link with CEDAW. On the other hand, there are some indications the Senator is less than adamantly opposed to the Treaty. He did not mount vigorous opposition in 1994, and his correspondence with constituents on CEDAW simply restates his opposition and notes that "treaties must be considered very carefully." Finally, a letter he sent to Madeleine on our treaty priorities expressed strong opposition to the Convention on the Rights of the Child but did not express opposition to CEDAW.

NGO Strategy for Ratification: CEDAW is the first human rights treaty pending before the SFRC linked to an important constituency - and in which opposition to the Treaty may come at political costs to opponents. Thus, NGOs are increasingly prepared to paint those who are reluctant to support the Treaty as unresponsive

on women's rights issues, and have been engaged in constituency-based efforts to urge Senators to endorse CEDAW prior to International Women's Day on March 8.

Administration Strategy for Ratification: We recommend an Administration strategy that involves both public and quiet efforts.

The Public Side: There are three important dates: March 8, International Women's Day; mid-July, when the First Lady and/or the Secretary of State are expected at the Sesquicentennial Celebration of the first American Women's Conference at Seneca Falls (which launched the suffrage movement); and the September - November end of congressional session. We propose the following timetable:

Lead-up to March 8: The President and other senior Administration officials encourage members of Congress to express their support for CEDAW by March 8. This would include a letter from the President to Members of the Senate.

March 8 (White House event March 11): Senior Administration officials make statements of support for CEDAW, urge those Senators who have not yet committed to endorse the Treaty to do so. President makes statement encouraging the Senate to act on this Treaty by the time of the Seneca Falls Convention.

July: If Treaty has not been acted upon, senior Administration officials use the Seneca Falls event to criticize lack of Senate action, and to urge Senate to move in the period prior to the end of the congressional session.

The Private Side: In the lead-up to March 8, senior Administration officials speak to the Congressional leadership, emphasizing our desire to avoid making this a partisan issue, but indicating our determination to work hard for ratification. Secretary Albright will call Senator Helms to express the Administration's strong

desire to move on this Treaty and to avoid a confrontation. I recommend that you or I make a similar call to Majority Leader Lott.

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve the strategy described above. I also recommend we hold a brief meeting with Larry Stein and Madeline prior to March 11 to ensure that we are all in agreement on this course of action.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/10/98 7:02:00 PM
FROM Farrar, Jay C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT POTUS Action Memo and Call Memo [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY Abercrombie-Winstanley, Gina K.
Burrell, Christina L.
Farrar, Jay C.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Rudman, Mara E.

TEXT_BODY Attached is my rough shot at this one:

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT NATOPOTUS.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Calls on NATO Enlargement

Purpose

Call Senators Lott and Daschle to ensure floor schedule, and call Senators Bumpers and Hollings to solidify support for the Resolution of Ratification.

Background

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC) completed its mark-

up and vote on
the Resolution of Ratification for NATO Enlargement on Tuesday,
March 3. The vote
was 16 to 2, in favor of the Resolution. We now anticipate the matter
could be
brought to the Senate floor as early as March 16 - 19, for debate and
vote.

In whip counting meetings last week with Republican and Democratic
leadership
staff, the overall vote count appeared strong for passage. However, an
exact
tally remains elusive, and votes may be somewhat weaker on the
Democratic side.
Calls from you to Senators Lott and Daschle should be made over the
course of
this weekend to ensure the measure stays on schedule to go to the
floor. And
calls to Senators Hollings and Bumpers should be made into next
week to ensure
the margin of victory on final passage.

RECOMMENDATION

That you make the phone calls, beginning this weekend.

Attachments

Tab A [Enter brief description of attachment]

2

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT NATOPOTUS2.doc
RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL

TO:
Senators Lott, Daschle, Bumpers and Hollings

DATE:

March 11, 1998

RECOMMENDED BY:

SAMUEL R. BERGER

LARRY STEIN

PURPOSE:

To enlist support from Leaders Lott and Daschle to keep NATO Expansion Vote on schedule, and to request support ("yes" vote) for the Resolution of Ratification from Senators Bumpers and Hollings.

BACKGROUND:

Leaders Lott and Daschle have put tremendous energy into bringing the NATO Resolution of Ratification to the Senate floor for an early vote. This follows Senator Helms' effort to have the Resolution favorably voted out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 3, 1998, by a 16 to 2 margin.

Currently, the Resolution of Ratification is stacked up behind ISTEAA and Education legislation. We believe it will come to the floor next week (March 16 - 20), for a vote.

Senators Bumpers and Hollings remain undecided on how they will cast their votes, and have indicated a willingness to remain open-minded until the Resolution goes to the floor for a vote.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

Talking points are attached at Tab A for the calls to Senators Lott and Daschle, and at Tab B for Bumpers and Hollings.

**CONTACT PERSON AND
TELEPHONE NUMBERS:**

Mara Rudman, x69171

Jeremy Rosner, 647-9003

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

[Leave blank]

Attachments

Tab A Points to be made to Senators Lott and Daschle

Tab B Points to be made to Senators Bumpers and Hollings

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

NATOPOTUS3.doc

**POINTS TO BE MADE FOR TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS
WITH LEADERS CONCERNING NATO RESOLUTION OF
RATIFICATION**

* I want to thank you for your efforts to keep the NATO Expansion Resolution of Ratification moving forward toward an early conclusion.

* Thanks also for the time you've taken to work with Madeleine, Bill and Sandy.
We very much appreciate your views and your willingness to work with us on this one.

* It is important that our NATO allies see the United States leading in this effort to welcome new members into the alliance.

* The vote out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a tremendous sign of the efforts expended by your colleagues to support NATO Enlargement. (Vote was 16 to 2, in favor)

* Moving ahead with the full Senate vote will send a strong signal to the world that we are firmly behind membership for countries that once never thought they could stand with the West.

* April 4th is the 49th anniversary of NATO and Senate approval of the Resolution of Ratification would be a tremendous reaffirmation of the Washington Treaty

signed so many years ago.

* Your time and energy in bringing this to fruition is greatly appreciated - by me and by our NATO allies who see this as a sign of alliance solidarity.

* Is there anything you'd like me to do on the upcoming vote to assist your efforts?

**POINTS TO BE MADE FOR
TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS WITH SENATORS BUMPERS
AND HOLLINGS CONCERNING THE
UPCOMING FULL SENATE VOTE ON NATO ENLARGEMENT**

* I'm calling about the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification that may come to the floor for a vote as soon as next week. (March 16, 17, 18, 19)

* This is one of the most important foreign policy votes affecting our national security this decade.

* Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO will:

- * Strengthen NATO, with well over 300,000 troops.
- * Bolster Central European stability and democracy.
- * Help erase the Cold War dividing line.
- * Deter European conflicts that could draw us in.

* I'm concerned about Senator Warner's proposal to mandate a three year pause in the enlargement process after admission of the first three new members.

* A move to limit new members undermines Article 10 of the Treaty and NATO's declared open door policy - a key to reform in Central and Eastern Europe.

* It would also contradict the Washington Treaty, and NATO's core principle of remaining open to qualified members.

* It is also unnecessary, the Senate will have advice and consent over any future admissions.

* The U.S. will not support the entry of any new countries until they and NATO are ready.

Core Functions/New Missions

- * Believe there's some confusion about NATO's strategic concept; where Alliance is headed in coming years.
- * There is no intention to abandon NATO's core mission of collective defense and replace it with Peacekeeping, as has been suggested, nor are we driving it toward world-wide interventions in Africa, or the Pacific Rim.
- * As outlined in Article V of Washington Treaty, NATO's core function remains collective defense of member territory,
- * This is essential cohesive element of NATO; ensures its effectiveness, and will continue to do so.
- * We will not allow Article V to be weakened or undermined.

Costs

- * NATO's estimate is \$1.5B in common costs over 10 years. Our share will be around \$40M annually. Clearly this is manageable, for us and our allies, and we will share these costs equitably.
- * Believe NATO study last December produced very solid results. GAO review concluded NATO study is "reasonable."
- * Both General Shelton and Secretary Cohen testified to veracity of SHAPE analysis -- military experts visited/studied the three states (on the ground) and examined their facilities.
- * NATO's cost study is based on this SHAPE analysis -- it is militarily sound and will be operationally effective.
- * Don't believe that Senator Stevens' recent proposal to lower U.S. contribution of common budgets from 25% to about 20% is right approach.
- * If we paid on basis of relative national income our share would be

over 40%.

* Currently, over 30% of the funds go to projects at American bases in Europe and the U.S.

* I hope you will vote for the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification, and vote against Sen. Warner's Pause amendment, or any amendments on cost or mission.
Can we count on your vote?

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. email	Michael Hamel to Michael Roberts. Subject: March 10, 1998. (12 pages)	03/11/1998	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/06/1998-03/12/1998]

2006-1363-F

vz5702

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 3/11/98 9:31:07 AM
FROM Rudman, Mara E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: POTUS Action Memo and Call Memo [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Farrar, Jay C.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Jay-- I've made adjustments to the first two docs -- instead of my going into the points now, why don't you go in and adjust to fit the other two. Biggest differences: the thrust of the Lott/Daschle conversations (Daschle should differ from Lott in more freedom to discuss schedule as it related to Africa trip); separate points under separate tabs for each call; effort to tailor as much as possible each call to person being called -- which may mean need for more intel on undecideds. Changes in who should be called -- figured three straight from undecided column, not all Dems, but am open to suggestion on that -- still seems like we're picking far too randomly for POTUS calls, but not sure how else to do it.

Let me see revised
before we try for sending it around. Or if window tightens, try paging and we can discuss by phone and then send around for clearance.
(Jeremy and then internal NSC directorates should be the drill.
We can do the internal by email to get quicker clearance, I'd think.)

-----Original

Message-----

From: Farrar, Jay C.

Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 1998

7:02 PM

To: Rudman, Mara E.

Cc: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs

Subject: POTUS

Action Memo and Call Memo [UNCLASSIFIED]

Attached is my rough
shot at this one:

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

NATOPOTUS.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Calls on NATO Enlargement

Purpose

Call Senators Lott and Daschle to thank them for their efforts thus far in support of NATO enlargement ratification, and to discuss additional work to be done to ensure successful ratification vote. Call Senators Bumpers, Chafee and Kerrey to solidify their support for the Resolution of Ratification.

Background

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC) approved the the Resolution of Ratification for NATO Enlargement on Tuesday, March 3 by a vote of 16 to 2. We now anticipate the matter will be brought to the Senate floor sometime during the week of March 16. We are not sure that debate will be completed that week.

In whip counting meetings last week with Republican and Democratic leadership staff, the overall vote count appeared strong for passage. However, an exact tally remains elusive, and votes may be somewhat weaker on the Democratic side. We think your calls to Senators Lott and Daschle should be made over the course of this weekend to thank them for their efforts, underscore your continuing close attention to Senate ratification, and discuss work necessary to defeat problematic amendments, ensure a successful final vote, and to try to complete action by March 20. Calls to Senators Bumpers, Kerrey and Chafee,

who are listed
as undecided, are to request their support.

RECOMMENDATION

That you make the phone calls, beginning this weekend.

Attachments

Tab A Talking points for Senator Lott

Tab B Talking points for Senator Daschle

Tab C Talking points for Senator Kerrey

Tab D Talking points for Senator Chafee

Tab E Talking points for Senator Bumpers

2

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT NATOPOTUS2.doc
RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL

TO:
Senators Lott, Daschle, Bumpers, Kerrey, and Chafee

DATE:
March 11, 1998

RECOMMENDED BY:
SAMUEL R. BERGER
LARRY STEIN

PURPOSE:
For Lott and Daschle, thank them for their efforts, underscore your
continuing
close attention to Senate ratification, and discuss work necessary to
defeat

problematic amendments, ensure a successful final vote, and to try to complete action by March 20. Calls to Senators Bumpers, Kerrey and Chafee, who are listed as undecided, are to request their support.

BACKGROUND:

Leaders Lott and Daschle have put tremendous energy into bringing the NATO Resolution of Ratification to the Senate floor for an early vote. This follows Senator Helms' effort to have the Resolution favorably voted out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 3, 1998, by a 16 to 2 margin.

Currently, the Resolution of Ratification is stacked up behind ISTEAs and Education legislation. We believe it will come to the floor next week (March 16 - 20), not sure will complete debate next week.

Senators Bumpers, Kerrey, and Chafee remain undecided on how they will cast their votes, and have indicated a willingness to remain open-minded until the Resolution goes to the floor for a vote.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

Talking points are attached at Tab A - E, specifically tailored to each Senator.

**CONTACT PERSON AND
TELEPHONE NUMBERS:**

Mara Rudman, x69171
Jeremy Rosner, 647-9003

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

[Leave blank]

Attachments [readjust to parallel first memo - separate tab for each]
Tab A Points to be made to Senators Lott and Daschle
Tab B Points to be made to Senators Bumpers and Hollings

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

NATOPOTUS3.doc

POINTS TO BE MADE FOR TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS
WITH LEADERS CONCERNING NATO RESOLUTION OF
RATIFICATION

* I want to thank you for your efforts to keep the NATO Expansion Resolution of Ratification moving forward toward an early conclusion.

* Thanks also for the time you've taken to work with Madeleine, Bill and Sandy.
We very much appreciate your views and your willingness to work with us on this one.

* It is important that our NATO allies see the United States leading in this effort to welcome new members into the alliance.

* The vote out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a tremendous sign of the efforts expended by your colleagues to support NATO Enlargement. (Vote was 16 to 2, in favor)

* Moving ahead with the full Senate vote will send a strong signal to the world that we are firmly behind membership for countries that once never thought they could stand with the West.

* April 4th is the 49th anniversary of NATO and Senate approval of the Resolution of Ratification would be a tremendous reaffirmation of the Washington Treaty signed so many years ago.

* Your time and energy in bringing this to fruition is greatly appreciated - by me and by our NATO allies who see this as a sign of alliance solidarity.

* Is there anything you'd like me to do on the upcoming vote to assist your

efforts?

POINTS TO BE MADE FOR
TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS WITH SENATORS BUMPERS
AND HOLLINGS CONCERNING THE
UPCOMING FULL SENATE VOTE ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

* I'm calling about the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification that may come to the floor for a vote as soon as next week. (March 16, 17, 18, 19)

* This is one of the most important foreign policy votes affecting our national security this decade.

* Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO will:

- * Strengthen NATO, with well over 300,000 troops.
- * Bolster Central European stability and democracy.
- * Help erase the Cold War dividing line.
- * Deter European conflicts that could draw us in.

* I'm concerned about Senator Warner's proposal to mandate a three year pause in the enlargement process after admission of the first three new members.

* A move to limit new members undermines Article 10 of the Treaty and NATO's declared open door policy - a key to reform in Central and Eastern Europe.

* It would also contradict the Washington Treaty, and NATO's core principle of remaining open to qualified members.

* It is also unnecessary, the Senate will have advice and consent over any future admissions.

* The U.S. will not support the entry of any new countries until they and NATO are ready.

Core Functions/New Missions

* Believe there's some confusion about NATO's strategic concept; where Alliance is headed in coming years.

* There is no intention to abandon NATO's core mission of collective defense and

replace it with Peacekeeping, as has been suggested, nor are we driving it toward world-wide interventions in Africa, or the Pacific Rim.

* As outlined in Article V of Washington Treaty, NATO's core function remains collective defense of member territory,

* This is essential cohesive element of NATO; ensures its effectiveness, and will continue to do so.

* We will not allow Article V to be weakened or undermined.

Costs

* NATO's estimate is \$1.5B in common costs over 10 years. Our share will be around \$40M annually. Clearly this is manageable, for us and our allies, and we will share these costs equitably.

* Believe NATO study last December produced very solid results. GAO review concluded NATO study is "reasonable."

* Both General Shelton and Secretary Cohen testified to veracity of SHAPE analysis -- military experts visited/studied the three states (on the ground) and examined their facilities.

* NATO's cost study is based on this SHAPE analysis -- it is militarily sound and will be operationally effective.

* Don't believe that Senator Stevens' recent proposal to lower U.S. contribution of common budgets from 25% to about 20% is right approach.

* If we paid on basis of relative national income our share would be over 40%.

* Currently, over 30% of the funds go to projects at American bases in Europe and the U.S.

* I hope you will vote for the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification, and

vote against Sen. Warner's Pause amendment, or any amendments on cost or mission.
Can we count on your vote?

2

Exchange Mail

DATE-TIME 3/12/98 3:58:57 PM
FROM Farrar, Jay C.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT FW: POTUS NATO Calls [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Rudman, Mara E.

CARBON_COPY**TEXT_BODY**

Mara,

This contains all of the changes I've had suggested so far
- not many.

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

From: Farrar, Jay C.

Sent: Thursday,

March 12, 1998 8:11 AM

To: Flanagan, Stephen J.; McEldowney, Nancy

E.; Bandler, Donald K.; Blinken, Antony J.; Highsmith, Newell L.

Cc: @EUROPE

- European Affairs; @CEE - Central/Eastern Europe; @LEGAL -
Legal

Advisor; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @PLANNING - Strat
Plan

& Comm

Subject: FW: POTUS NATO Calls [UNCLASSIFIED]

We're coming
to closure on this package - please review knowing that the window
for NATO-E vote is slipping - but want to close this out by 12:00
today.

Also, I'd like to keep the points less expansive, rather
than more so - unless there is something SO important that it MUST
be included.

FYI - SASC is probably going to have a NATO-E hearing
on 17 or 19 March with Howard Baker and Sam Nunn as witnesses.
We've
suggested a few other people for the other side of the argument.

Thanks
for your help/patience - we're getting there.

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT NATOPOTUS.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Calls on NATO Enlargement

Purpose

Call Senators Lott and Daschle to thank them for their efforts thus far in support of NATO enlargement ratification, and to discuss additional work to be done to ensure successful ratification vote. Call Senators Bumpers, Hollings, Harkin, Leahy and Bingaman to solidify their support for the Resolution of Ratification.

Background

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC) approved the Resolution of Ratification for NATO Enlargement on Tuesday, March 3 by a vote of 16 to 2. We now anticipate the matter will be brought to the Senate floor sometime during the week of March 16. We are not sure that debate will be completed that week.

In whip counting meetings last week with Republican and Democratic leadership staff, the overall vote count appeared strong for passage. However, an exact tally remains elusive, and votes may be somewhat weaker on the Democratic side.

We think your calls to Senators Lott and Daschle should be made over the course of this weekend to thank them for their efforts, underscore your continuing close attention to Senate ratification, discuss work necessary to defeat problematic amendments, ensure a successful final vote, and to try to complete action by March 20. Calls to Senators Bumpers, Hollings, Harkin, Leahy and Bingaman, who are listed as undecided, are to request their support.

RECOMMENDATION

That you make the phone calls, beginning this weekend.

Attachments

Tab A Talking points for Senator Lott

Tab B Talking points for Senator Daschle

Tab C Talking points for Senator Bumpers

Tab D Talking points for Senator Hollings

Tab E Talking points for Senator Harkin

Tab F Talking points for Senator Leahy

Tab G Talking points for Senator Bingaman

2

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT NATOPOTUS2.doc
RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL

TO:
Senators Lott, Daschle, Bumpers, Hollings, Harkin, Leahy and
Bingaman

DATE:

March 11, 1998

RECOMMENDED BY:

SAMUEL R. BERGER

LARRY STEIN

PURPOSE:

For Lott and Daschle, thank them for their efforts, underscore your continuing close attention to Senate ratification, and discuss work necessary to defeat problematic amendments, ensure a successful final vote, and to try to complete action by March 20. Calls to Senators Bumpers, Hollings, Harkin, Leahy and Bingaman, who are listed as undecided, are to request their support.

BACKGROUND:

Leaders Lott and Daschle have put tremendous energy into bringing the NATO Resolution of Ratification to the Senate floor for an early vote. This follows Senator Helms' effort to have the Resolution favorably voted out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 3, 1998, by a 16 to 2 margin.

Currently, the Resolution of Ratification is stacked up behind ISTEAA and Education legislation. We believe it will come to the floor next week (March 16 - 20), not sure will complete debate next week.

Senators Bumpers, Hollings, Harkin and Bingaman remain undecided on how they will cast their votes, and have indicated a willingness to remain open-minded until the Resolution goes to the floor for a vote.

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

Talking points are attached at Tab A - G, specifically tailored to each Senator.

**CONTACT PERSON AND
TELEPHONE NUMBERS:**

Mara Rudman, x69171

Jeremy Rosner, 647-9003

DATE OF SUBMISSION:

[Leave blank]

Attachments

Tab A Talking points for Senator Lott

Tab B Talking points for Senator Daschle

Tab C Talking points for Senator Bumpers

Tab D Talking points for Senator Hollings

Tab E Talking points for Senator Harkin

Tab F Talking points for Senator Leahy

Tab G Talking points for Senator Bingaman

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT POTUSDASCHLE.doc
POINTS TO BE MADE FOR TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS
WITH SENATOR DASCHLE CONCERNING NATO
RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION

* Appreciate all your efforts on NATO-Enlargement. Vote count looks good overall; I understand a little weaker than we all would like on Democratic side.
Some amendments may be problems. Know you're working it hard.

* Your time and energy in bringing this to fruition is greatly appreciated - by me and by our NATO allies who see this as a sign of alliance solidarity.

* The vote out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a tremendous sign of the efforts expended by your colleagues to support NATO

Enlargement. (Vote was
16 to 2, in favor)

* Moving ahead with the full Senate vote will send a strong signal to the world that we are firmly behind membership for countries that once never thought they could stand with the West.

* Looking forward to our meeting next week; will continue to do whatever you think most helpful.

* On the timing question, know Lott received a letter asking him to put off debate until June. Understand despite that letter, he's inclined to stick as closely as possible to original schedule, bringing it up next week. But also have to get through ISTEIA debate; and apparently start and finish Coverdell education bill, before we start on NATO debate.

* You know I leave for Africa March 22 to April 2. We would really like to have final passage vote before departing the country. It would be a tremendous send-off for the group if we could complete the vote before I depart - what do think the chances are of that happening?

* It is important that our NATO allies see the United States leading in this effort to welcome new members into the alliance.

* April 4th is the 49th anniversary of NATO and Senate approval of the Resolution of Ratification would be a tremendous reaffirmation of the Washington Treaty signed so many years ago.

* Is there anything you'd like me to do on the upcoming vote to assist your efforts?

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT POTUSLOTT.doc
POINTS TO BE MADE FOR TELEPHONE CONVERSATION
WITH SENATOR LOTT CONCERNING NATO RESOLUTION OF
RATIFICATION

- * I want to thank you for your efforts to keep the NATO Expansion Resolution of Ratification moving forward toward an early conclusion.
- * Thanks also for the time you've taken to work with Madeleine, Bill and Sandy.
We very much appreciate your views and your willingness to work with us on this one.
- * It is important that our NATO allies see the United States leading in this effort to welcome new members into the alliance.
- * The vote out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a tremendous sign of the efforts expended by your colleagues to support NATO Enlargement. (Vote was 16 to 2, in favor)
- * Moving ahead with the full Senate vote will send a strong signal to the world that we are firmly behind membership for countries that once never thought they could stand with the West.
- * April 4th is the 49th anniversary of NATO and Senate approval of the Resolution of Ratification would be a tremendous reaffirmation of the Washington Treaty signed so many years ago.
- * It would be nice to return from Africa and be able to sign the Resolution - celebrating President Truman's original ceremony in 1949.
- * Your time and energy in bringing this to fruition is greatly appreciated - by me and by our NATO allies who see this as a sign of alliance solidarity.
- * Is there anything you'd like me to do on the upcoming vote to assist your

efforts?

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

POTUSHARKIN.doc

POINTS TO BE MADE FOR TELEPHONE CONVERSATION
WITH

SENATOR HARKIN ON THE UPCOMING FULL SENATE VOTE
ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

* I'm calling about the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification that may come to the floor for a vote as soon as next week. (March 16, 17, 18, 19)

* This is one of the most important foreign policy votes affecting our national security this decade.

* Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO will:

* Strengthen NATO, with well over 300,000 troops.

* Bolster Central European stability and democracy.

* Help erase the Cold War dividing line.

* NATO enlargement poses no military threat to Russia. Russian concerns have been taken into consideration. Since 1990, the United States has done more than any other country to bolster Russia's efforts to embrace democracy and a free-market economy.

* Parallel to seeking NATO Enlargement, the United States and NATO are building a constructive relationship with Russia as evidenced by the NATO-Russia Charter and permanent consultative mechanism in the PJC.

* By bolstering Central European stability through enlargement of NATO, we will be making Russia's borders more secure, not less. We will be supporting the forces for change in Russia, versus those who still view the world in terms of spheres of influence.

WARNER PAUSE AMENDMENT

- * I'm concerned about Senator Warner's proposal to mandate a three year pause in the enlargement process after admission of the first three new members.
- * A move to limit new members undermines Article 10 of the Treaty and NATO's declared open door policy - a key to reform in Central and Eastern Europe.
- * It would also contradict the Washington Treaty, and NATO's core principle of remaining open to qualified members.
- * It is also unnecessary, the Senate will have advice and consent over any future admissions.
- * The U.S. will not support the entry of any new countries until they and NATO are ready.

Core Functions/New Missions

- * Senator Ashcroft's recent remarks on NATO's mission are causing some confusion about NATO's strategic concept; where Alliance is headed in coming years.
- * There is no intention to abandon NATO's core mission of collective defense and replace it with Peacekeeping, as has been suggested, nor are we driving it toward world-wide interventions in Africa, or the Pacific Rim.
- * Article V of the Washington Treaty states that NATO's core function remains collective defense of member territory,
- * This is essential cohesive element of NATO; ensures its effectiveness, and will continue to do so.
- * We will not allow Article V to be weakened or undermined.

Costs

- * NATO's estimate is \$1.5B in common costs over 10 years. Our share will be around \$40M annually. Clearly this is manageable, for us and our allies, and we will share these costs equitably.

- * GAO review concluded NATO cost study is "reasonable."
- * Both General Shelton and Secretary Cohen testified to veracity of SHAPE analysis, on which the NATO cost study is based:
- * military experts visited/studied the three states (on the ground); examined their facilities; determined those facilities that could meet NATO military needs; determined costs to bring those facilities up to NATO specifications; aligned costs with contributions from NATO member countries.

US CONTRIBUTION TO NATO

- * Don't believe that Senator Stevens' recent proposal to lower U.S. contribution of common budgets from 25% to about 20% is right approach.
- * If we paid on basis of relative national income our share would be over 40%.
- * Currently, over 30% of the funds go to projects at American bases in Europe and the U.S.
- * I hope you will vote for the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification, and vote against Sen. Warner's Pause amendment, or any amendments on cost or mission.
Can we count on your vote?

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

POTUSLEAHY.doc
POINTS TO BE MADE FOR TELEPHONE CONVERSATION
WITH
SENATOR LEAHY ON THE UPCOMING FULL SENATE VOTE
ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

- * I'm calling about the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification that may come to the floor for a vote as soon as next week. (March 16, 17, 18, 19)
- * This is one of the most important foreign policy votes affecting our national

security this decade.

- * Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO will:

- * Strengthen NATO, with well over 300,000 troops.

- * Bolster Central European stability and democracy.

- * Help erase the Cold War dividing line.

- * NATO enlargement poses no military threat to Russia. By bolstering Central

European stability through enlargement of NATO, Russia's borders become more

secure, not less. And since 1990, the United States has done more than any other

country to bolster Russia's efforts to embrace democracy and a free-market economy.

- * Parallel to seeking Enlargement, the United States and NATO are building a

constructive relationship with Russia as evidenced by the NATO-Russia Charter and

permanent consultative mechanism in the PJC.

WARNER PAUSE AMENDMENT

- * I'm concerned about Senator Warner's proposal to mandate a three year pause in

the enlargement process after admission of the first three new members.

- * A move to limit new members undermines Article 10 of the Treaty and NATO's

declared open door policy - a key to reform in Central and Eastern Europe.

- * It would also contradict the Washington Treaty, and NATO's core principle of

remaining open to qualified members.

- * It is unnecessary, the Senate will have advice and consent over any future admissions.

Core Functions/New Missions

- * Senator Ashcroft's recent remarks on NATO's mission are causing some confusion

about NATO's strategic concept; where Alliance is headed in coming years.

- * There is no intention to abandon NATO's core mission of collective

defense and
replace it with Peacekeeping, as has been suggested, nor are we
driving it toward
world-wide interventions in Africa, or the Pacific Rim.

* Article V of the Washington Treaty states that NATO's core
function remains
collective defense of member territory,

* This is essential cohesive element of NATO; ensures its
effectiveness, and
will continue to do so.

* We will not allow Article V to be weakened or undermined.

Costs

* NATO's estimate is \$1.5B in common costs over 10 years. Our
share will be
around \$40M annually. Clearly this is manageable, for us and our
allies, and we
will share these costs equitably.

* GAO review concluded NATO cost study is "reasonable."

* Both General Shelton and Secretary Cohen testified to
veracity of SHAPE analysis, which the NATO cost study is based on -
it is
militarily sound:

* military experts visited/studied the three countries (on the ground);
examined
their facilities; determined those facilities that could meet NATO
military
needs; determined costs to bring those facilities up to NATO
specifications;
aligned costs with contributions from NATO member countries.

* Don't believe that Senator Stevens' recent proposal to lower U.S.
contribution
of common budgets from 25% to about 20% is right approach.

* If we paid on basis of relative national income our share would be
over 40%.

* Currently, over 30% of the funds go to projects at American bases in
Europe
and the U.S.

* I hope you will vote for the NATO Enlargement Resolution of
Ratification, and

vote against Sen. Warner's Pause amendment, or any amendments on cost or mission.

Can we count on your vote?

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

POTUSHOLLINGS.doc
POINTS TO BE MADE FOR TELEPHONE CONVERSATION
WITH
SENATOR HOLLINGS ON THE UPCOMING FULL SENATE
VOTE ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

* I'm calling about the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification that may come to the floor for a vote as soon as next week. (March 16, 17, 18, 19)

* This is one of the most important foreign policy votes affecting our national security this decade.

* Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO will:

- * Strengthen NATO, with well over 300,000 troops.
- * Bolster Central European stability and democracy.
- * Help erase the Cold War dividing line.

* NATO enlargement poses no military threat to Russia. In fact, by bolstering Central European stability through enlargement of NATO, we will be making Russia's borders more secure, not less.

* Parallel to seeking NATO Enlargement, the United States and NATO are building a constructive relationship with Russia as evidenced by the NATO-Russia Charter and permanent consultative mechanism in the PJC.

* Don't forget, since 1990, the United States has done more than any other country to bolster Russia's efforts to embrace democracy and a free-market economy.

Core Functions/New Missions

* Senator Ashcroft's recent remarks on NATO's mission are causing

some confusion
about NATO's strategic concept; where Alliance is headed in coming
years.

* There is no intention to abandon NATO's core mission of collective
defense and
replace it with Peacekeeping, as has been suggested, nor are we
driving it toward
world-wide interventions in Africa, or the Pacific Rim.

* Article V of the Washington Treaty states that NATO's core
function remains
collective defense of member territory,

* This is essential cohesive element of NATO; ensures its
effectiveness, and
will continue to do so.

* We will not allow Article V to be weakened or undermined.

WARNER PAUSE AMENDMENT

* I'm concerned about Senator Warner's proposal to mandate a three
year pause in
the enlargement process after admission of the first three new
members.

* A move to limit new members undermines Article 10 of the Treaty
and NATO's
declared open door policy - a key to reform in Central and Eastern
Europe.

* It would also contradict the Washington Treaty, and NATO's core
principle of
remaining open to qualified members.

* It is unnecessary, the Senate will have advice and consent over any
future
admissions.

Costs

* NATO's estimate is \$1.5B in common costs over 10 years. Our
share will be
around \$40M annually. Clearly this is manageable, for us and our
allies, and we
will share these costs equitably.

- * GAO review concluded NATO cost study is "reasonable."
- * Both General Shelton and Secretary Cohen testified to veracity of SHAPE analysis, which the NATO cost study is based on - it is militarily sound:
 - * military experts visited/studied the three countries (on the ground); examined their facilities; determined those facilities that could meet NATO military needs; determined costs to bring those facilities up to NATO specifications; aligned costs with contributions from NATO member countries.
- * Don't believe that Senator Stevens' recent proposal to lower U.S. contribution of common budgets from 25% to about 20% is right approach.
- * If we paid on basis of relative national income our share would be over 40%.
- * Currently, over 30% of the funds go to projects at American bases in Europe and the U.S.
- * I hope you will vote for the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification, and vote against Sen. Warner's Pause amendment, or any amendments on cost or mission.
Can we count on your vote?

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT

POTUSBUMPERS.doc
POINTS TO BE MADE FOR
TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS WITH SENATOR BUMPERS
CONCERNING THE UPCOMING FULL SENATE
VOTE ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

- * I'm calling about the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification that may come to the floor for a vote as soon as next week. (March 16, 17, 18, 19)
- * This is one of the most important foreign policy votes affecting our national

security this decade.

- * Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO will:

- * Strengthen NATO, with well over 300,000 troops.

- * Bolster Central European stability and democracy.

- * Help erase the Cold War dividing line.

- * NATO enlargement poses no military threat to Russia. We have worked hard over the past 6-years to assist her with her security concerns. In fact, since 1990, the United States has done more than any other country to bolster Russia's efforts to embrace democracy and a free-market economy.

- * Parallel to seeking NATO Enlargement, the United States and NATO are building a constructive relationship with Russia as evidenced by the NATO-Russia Charter and permanent consultative mechanism in the PJC.

WARNER PAUSE AMENDMENT

- * I'm concerned about Senator Warner's proposal to mandate a three year pause in the enlargement process after admission of the first three new members.

- * A move to limit new members undermines Article 10 of the Treaty and NATO's declared open door policy - a key to reform in Central and Eastern Europe.

- * It would also contradict the Washington Treaty, and NATO's core principle of remaining open to qualified members.

- * It is also unnecessary, the Senate will have advice and consent over any future admissions.

Core Functions/New Missions

- * Believe there's some confusion about NATO's strategic concept; where Alliance is headed in coming years.

- * Let me assure you, there is no intention to abandon NATO's core

mission of
collective defense and replace it with Peacekeeping. I know this has
been
suggested by some. But we have intention of driving NATO toward
world-wide
interventions in Africa, or the Pacific Rim.

* As outlined in Article V of Washington Treaty, NATO's core
function remains
collective defense of member territory,

* This is essential cohesive element of NATO; ensures its
effectiveness, and
will continue to do so.

* We will not allow Article V to be weakened or undermined.

Costs

* NATO's estimate is \$1.5B in common costs over 10 years. Our
share will be
around \$40M annually. Clearly this is manageable, for us and our
allies, and we
will share these costs equitably.

* GAO review concluded NATO cost study is "reasonable."

* Both General Shelton and Secretary Cohen testified to
veracity of SHAPE analysis, on which the NATO cost study is based:

* military experts visited/studied the three states (on the ground);
examined
their facilities; surveyed those facilities that could meet NATO
military needs;
determined costs to bring those facilities up to NATO specifications;
aligned
costs with contributions from NATO member countries.

* Don't believe that Senator Stevens' recent proposal to lower U.S.
contribution
of common budgets from 25% to about 20% is right approach.

* If we paid on basis of relative national income our share would be
over 40%.

* Currently, over 30% of the funds go to projects at American bases in
Europe
and the U.S.

* I hope you will vote for the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification, and vote against Sen. Warner's Pause amendment, or any amendments on cost or mission.
Can we count on your vote?

2

TRANSLATED_ATTACHMENT POTUSBINGAMAN.doc
POINTS TO BE MADE FOR
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION WITH SENATOR BINGAMAN
CONCERNING THE UPCOMING FULL SENATE
VOTE ON NATO ENLARGEMENT

* I'm calling about the NATO Enlargement Resolution of Ratification that may come to the floor for a vote as soon as next week. (March 16, 17, 18, 19)

* This is one of the most important foreign policy votes affecting our national security this decade.

* Adding Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to NATO will:

- * Strengthen NATO, with well over 300,000 troops.
- * Bolster Central European stability and democracy.
- * Help erase the Cold War dividing line.
- * Deter European conflicts that could draw us in.

* NATO enlargement poses no military threat to Russia. And by bolstering Central European stability through enlargement of NATO, we will be making Russia's borders more secure, not less.

* Since 1990, the United States has done more than any other country to bolster Russia's efforts to embrace democracy and a free-market economy. Besides, the United States and NATO are building a constructive relationship with Russia as evidenced by the NATO-Russia Charter and permanent consultative mechanism in the

PJC.

WARNER PAUSE AMENDMENT

- * I'm concerned about Senator Warner's proposal to mandate a three year pause in the enlargement process after admission of the first three new members.
- * A move to limit new members undermines Article 10 of the Treaty and NATO's declared open door policy - a key to reform in Central and Eastern Europe.
- * It would also contradict the Washington Treaty, and NATO's core principle of remaining open to qualified members.
- * It is also unnecessary, the Senate will have advice and consent over any future admissions.
- * The U.S. will not support the entry of any new countries until they and NATO are ready.

Core Functions/New Missions

- * Believe there's some confusion about NATO's strategic concept; where Alliance is headed in coming years.
- * There is no intention to abandon NATO's core mission of collective defense and replace it with Peacekeeping, as has been suggested, nor are we driving it toward world-wide interventions in Africa, or the Pacific Rim.
- * As outlined in Article V of Washington Treaty, NATO's core function remains collective defense of member territory,
- * This is essential cohesive element of NATO; ensures its effectiveness, and will continue to do so.
- * We will not allow Article V to be weakened or undermined.

Costs

- * NATO's estimate is \$1.5B in common costs over 10 years. Our share will be around \$40M annually. Clearly this is manageable, for us and our

allies, and we
will share these costs equitably.

* Believe NATO study last December produced very solid results.
GAO review
concluded NATO study is "reasonable."

* Both General Shelton and Secretary Cohen testified to veracity of
SHAPE
analysis -- military experts visited/studied the three states (on the
ground) and
examined their facilities.

* NATO's cost study is based on this SHAPE analysis -- it is militarily
sound and
will be operationally effective.

* Don't believe that Senator Stevens' recent proposal to lower U.S.
contribution
of common budgets from 25% to about 20% is right approach.

* If we paid on basis of relative national income our share would be
over 40%.

* Currently, over 30% of the funds go to projects at American bases in
Europe and
the U.S.

* I hope you will vote for the NATO Enlargement Resolution of
Ratification, and
vote against Sen. Warner's Pause amendment, or any amendments on
cost or mission.
Can we count on your vote?