

# Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                                                                                 | DATE       | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 001. email               | Fulton Armstrong to Antony Blinken, Sue Bremner, Stephen Flanagan et al. Subject: FW: Helms-Burton/ (6 pages) | 08/12/1999 | P1/b(1)     |
| 002. email               | Mara Rudman to Fulton Armstrong. Subject: RE: Update: Helms-Burton/ (3 pages)                                 | 08/12/1999 | P1/b(1)     |

### COLLECTION:

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

### FOLDER TITLE:

[06/21/1999-10/28/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5709

### 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** 6/21/99 2:51:15 PM  
**FROM** Caravelli, John M.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Rudman, Mara E.

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

Good for you for standing apart from the crowd. Not my nickle but I think you have it right.

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

From: Rudman,  
Mara E.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 2:29 PM

To: Gobush, Matthew

N.; Andreasen, Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT -  
Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public  
Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: RE: Press on START/ABM  
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Doesn't work I think for several reasons:

1.  
Helms says no CTBT in its own right, but also because
2. Helms  
does not believe ABM stands in any form -- he's not likely to be  
terribly impressed with the fact that we're talking to the Russians  
about changes in a treaty that he believes no longer has any validity  
anyway; and
3. Taking Helms on directly in the press is the surest  
way to ensure that you never see any CTBT hearings, let alone moving  
the ratification through his committee. Ask Weld and Atwood if you  
want confirmation on that one.

If later on in the summer we decide  
we want to just make a public case KNOWING we will get nothing from  
the Senate, and nothing likely as long as Hlems is the chair, then  
we may want to use that kind of frontal attack. Otherwise, I don't  
think it makes a lot of sense.

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

From: Gobush,

Matthew N.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 1:05 PM

To: Andreasen,

Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs;

@LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs;

@NONPRO

- Export Controls

Subject: RE: Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Steve/Mara/Miles

- Given the way ABM discussions are playing in the press, can we use it to apply additional public pressure on Helms to hold a hearing on CTBT? Something like: We are willing to discuss ABM with the Russians - why aren't you, Senator Helms, willing to discuss CTBT in your committee? Or is this linkage too strong, suggesting that we are ultimately willing to scrap AMB if the Senate is ultimately willing to vote on CTBT? Thoughts?

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

From: Andreasen,

Steven P.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 11:37 AM

To: @DEFENSE -

Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;

@RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: Press

on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Colleagues --

Steve

Holland (Reuters) and Terence Hunt (AP) did a piece devoted (or, in Hunt's case, largely devoted) to the START/ABM angle from Cologne.

Steve

^Russia agrees to talk about ABM pact changes

(Adds

details, recasts, adds Clinton quote)

By Steve Holland

COLOGNE, Germany, June 20 (Reuters) - The United States won the agreement of Russia on Sunday to consider changes in the Anti-Ballistic

Missile treaty to enable the possible development of a ``Star Wars"-style U.S. missile defence system.

``For the first time, Russia has agreed to discuss changes in the ABM treaty that may be necessitated by a national missile defence system were we to decide to deploy one," said White House National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, hailing the deal as significant.

In exchange, the United States agreed to a resumption of negotiations on a START 3 treaty reducing long-range nuclear arms.

It had been insisting that the START 2 treaty first be ratified by Russia's opposition-controlled lower house of parliament.

The goal of START 2 is to bring warheads down to a maximum of 3,500 on each side. Under START 3 they could go down to 2,000 on each side. The U.S. Senate ratified START 2 in 1996.

The agreements were reached during a meeting between U.S.

President Bill Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin

--

evidence of a thaw in East-West relations which had been chilled by

NATO's 11-week-long bombardment of Yugoslavia.

``The summit gave us a chance to work on what we have in common," said Clinton.

The United States wants to make amendments to the 1972 ABM treaty,

which sets limits on the type of systems Russia and the United States

can deploy to intercept incoming missiles.

The changes are needed because legislation adopted by the Republican-led Congress in March commits Washington to put in place a defensive shield against limited missile attack.

Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov called the arms agreement, reached at talks held here after the Group of Eight summit, "a very important declaration."

Russia is concerned that a U.S. defensive system capable of shooting down incoming missiles would breach the ABM treaty and undermine the Cold War doctrine of mutually assured destruction. The idea at the time of the ABM Treaty was that neither side would be likely to launch a nuclear strike if they knew they had no defences to prevent the resulting catastrophe. But many military experts, diplomats and national security figures in Washington feel the ABM Treaty is a Cold War relic that has no place in a new, more dangerous world where so-called rogue states like North Korea and Iraq might attempt a missile strike against the United States.

The Clinton administration has pledged \$6.6 billion in its fiscal 2000 budget for the development of a missile defence but will delay a presidential decision on building one until June 2000.

A joint statement issued by the two countries said discussions on START 3 and the ABM treaty would begin later this summer.

They agreed to "consider possible changes in the strategic situation that have a bearing on the ABM treaty and, as appropriate, possible proposals for further increasing the viability of this treaty," it said.

Berger said the two sides would begin preliminary negotiations to determine what a START 3 treaty would look like so the government could move

swiftly on an accord should the  
Russia's Duma lower house of parliament  
ratify START 2, which  
was signed in 1993.

One problem Russia  
has with START 2 is paying to dismantle  
nuclear weapons required  
under the treaty. Some politicians also  
do not want to give up the  
status that having nuclear weapons  
provides.

^REUTERS

^Yeltsin

agrees to consider revising 1972 missile treaty with U.S.<

^By TERENCE

HUNT=

^AP White House Correspondent=

COLOGNE, Germany (AP)

Eager to mend bomb-strained ties with  
President Clinton, Russian

President Boris Yeltsin agreed Sunday  
for the first time to consider  
revising a landmark treaty banning  
American and Russian missile-defense  
systems.

``The two countries are back in business," National  
Security

Adviser Sandy Berger reported after a friendly, hour-long  
meeting

between the two presidents. Their decision to discuss the  
1972

Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty was ``very significant," Berger  
said.

Frail but feisty, Yeltsin came to the closing day of a summit of  
world

leaders even as NATO was declaring an end to the Kosovo  
conflict

and 78 days of NATO bombing that had outraged Moscow.

Striking

a conciliatory note, Yeltsin declared, ``The most  
important thing

is to mend ties after a fight." Clinton thanked

Yeltsin ``for not

giving up on our relationship" during four  
months of tension, Berger  
said.

``This entire difficulty in Kosovo has been a great test  
for the

relationship ... but it is a test I believe that both countries have passed," Clinton said in a Russian television interview. Clinton and Yeltsin agreed not to look back, but to move ahead to tackle thorny nuclear arms-control issues. Even so, Berger acknowledged, "Kosovo has left some scars, presumably on both sides." Though ailing, Yeltsin pounded his fist in disagreement with his ministers at times and wagged his finger at note-takers to write an accurate report of the meeting. He invited Clinton to come to Moscow but it was not decided when that might happen. When Clinton expressed concern about anti-Semitic statements by Russian nationalists, Yeltsin declared, "Provide me with all of the material you have and I will really sit on them," Berger recounted. Clinton described Yeltsin as "clear, concise and direct and strong." In a CNN interview, Clinton said "We got a lot done." The two presidents agreed to hold U.S.-Russian talks in the fall on deeper cuts in nuclear arms and on possibly reopening the 1972 ABM treaty, Berger said.

"This is very significant," he said, "because for the first time the Russians have agreed to discuss changes in the ABM treaty that may be necessitated by a national missile defense system, were we to decide to deploy one." Congress is pressing Clinton to deploy a shield against limited ballistic missile attack. Critics say that would require changing the ABM treaty something Moscow has opposed fiercely. Clinton has until next June to decide whether to field a system, and building

it would take an additional five years.

Clinton told Yeltsin the United States was committed to the ABM pact and would negotiate with Russia if any changes are required, Berger said. "And this ... is a recognition on the part of the Russians that they're prepared to have that discussion." While the United States considers erecting a missile shield, a financially strapped Russia wants to press ahead with deeper cuts in nuclear warheads.

Clinton agreed to preliminary discussions on more reductions but not to hold formal negotiations until Russia ratifies the 1993 START II treaty that requires cutting back to a maximum of 3,500 warheads on each side. The follow-on agreement a START III could bring warhead levels down to 2,000 for each country. There already have been some discussions looking ahead to START III. The START II treaty has languished in the Russian parliament despite repeated pledges by Yeltsin to get it approved. It appeared headed for ratification earlier this year but was shelved when NATO began bombing Yugoslavia. The U.S. Senate approved it in 1996. Yeltsin, in a show of good will, presented Clinton with information culled from Russian archives about President Kennedy and his assassination. Berger said he did not know what was in the files but it presumably concerns information about accused gunman Lee Harvey Oswald, who defected to the Soviet Union in 1959 but returned home less than three years later, disenchanted with life in the communist world. Clinton

was unable to offer Yeltsin much in the way of economic help, Berger acknowledged. The president urged Yeltsin to press Russia's parliament to approve austerity measures required by the International Monetary Fund before releasing \$4.5 billion in aid. Unless Russia adopts economic reforms, Clinton said, "the private money will not flow into Russia that will really bring it back to the position that the Russian people deserve, and that frankly the rest of the world needs."

Raising a recurring irritant, Yeltsin complained about the requirement to seek annual waivers exempting Russia from trade restrictions imposed during the Soviet era. Clinton said he wanted to repeal the measure, known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, but that there were concerns about Russian anti-Semitism.

APE- 06/20/99 14:12:00

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 6/21/99 3:02:12 PM

**FROM** Gobush, Matthew N.

**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED

**SUBJECT** RE: Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

**TO** Lackey, Miles M.  
Rudman, Mara E.  
Andreasen, Steven P.  
Andreasen, Steven P.  
Bell, Robert G.  
Bouchard, Joseph F.  
Brackman, Stella S.  
Kelly, Sandra L.  
McCausland, Jeffrey D.  
Mulligan, George D.  
Peterman, David (Brian)  
Pimentel, Betsy J.  
vonLipsey, Roderick K.  
Wasserman, Elaine P.  
Burrell, Christina L.  
Lackey, Miles M.  
Shapiro, Daniel B.  
Tavlarides, Mark J.  
Allen, Charles A.  
Baker, James E.  
DeRosa, Mary B.  
Hunerwadel, Joan S.  
Krass, Caroline D.  
Gray, Wendy E.  
Rudman, Mara E.  
Russ, Judith P.  
Crowley, Philip J.  
Gobush, Matthew N.  
Hammer, Michael A.  
Huff, Lindsey E.  
Leavy, David C.  
Sanborn, Daniel W.(Press)  
Wozniak, Natalie S.  
Caravelli, John M.  
Edwards, Joan K.  
Harris, Elisa D.  
Samore, Gary S.  
Tucker, Maureen E.

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

Wimps, all of you! Just kidding - I humbly defer to the expert Helms-handlers....

Thanks for listening!

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

From: Lackey,

Miles M.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 2:58 PM

To: Rudman, Mara

E.; Gobush, Matthew N.; Andreasen, Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;

@RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: RE:

Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

agree with mara

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

From: Rudman, Mara E.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999  
2:29 PM

To: Gobush, Matthew N.; Andreasen, Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: RE:

Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Doesn't work I think for several reasons:

1. Helms says no CTBT in its own right, but also because
2. Helms does not believe ABM stands in any form -- he's not likely to be terribly impressed with the fact that we're talking to the Russians about changes in a treaty that he believes no longer has any validity anyway; and
3. Taking Helms on directly in the press is the surest way to ensure that you never see any CTBT hearings, let alone moving the ratification through his committee. Ask Weld and Atwood if you want confirmation on that one.

If later on in the summer we decide we want to just make a public case KNOWING we will get nothing from the Senate, and nothing likely as long as Hlems is the chair, then we may want to use that kind of frontal attack. Otherwise, I don't think it makes a lot of sense.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Gobush, Matthew N.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999

1:05 PM

To: Andreasen, Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: RE: Press on  
START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Steve/Mara/Miles - Given the way ABM discussions are playing in the press, can we use it to apply additional public pressure on Helms to hold a hearing on CTBT? Something like: We are willing to discuss ABM with the Russians - why aren't you, Senator Helms, willing to discuss CTBT in your committee? Or is this linkage too strong, suggesting that we are ultimately willing to scrap AMB if the Senate is ultimately willing to vote on CTBT? Thoughts?

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

From: Andreasen, Steven  
P.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 11:37 AM

To: @DEFENSE - Defense  
Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;  
@RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: Press  
on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

Colleagues --

Steve

Holland (Reuters) and Terence Hunt (AP) did a piece devoted (or, in Hunt's case, largely devoted) to the START/ABM angle from Cologne.

Steve

^Russia agrees to talk about ABM pact changes

(Adds  
details, recasts, adds Clinton quote)  
By Steve Holland

COLOGNE, Germany, June 20 (Reuters) - The United States won the agreement of Russia on Sunday to consider changes in the Anti-Ballistic

Missile treaty to enable the possible development of a ``Star Wars"-style

U.S. missile defence system.

``For the first time, Russia has agreed to discuss changes in the ABM treaty that may be necessitated by a national missile defence system were we to decide to deploy one," said White House National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, hailing the deal as significant.

In exchange, the United States agreed to a resumption of negotiations on a START 3 treaty reducing long-range nuclear arms.

It had been insisting that the START 2 treaty first be ratified by Russia's opposition-controlled lower house of parliament.

The goal of START 2 is to bring warheads down to a maximum of 3,500 on each side. Under START 3 they could go down to 2,000 on each side. The U.S. Senate ratified START 2 in 1996.

The agreements were reached during a meeting between U.S.

President Bill Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin

--

evidence of a thaw in East-West relations which had been chilled by

NATO's 11-week-long bombardment of Yugoslavia.

``The summit gave us a chance to work on what we have in common," said Clinton.

The United States wants to make amendments to the 1972 ABM treaty,

which sets limits on the type of systems Russia and the United States

can deploy to intercept incoming missiles.

The changes are needed because legislation adopted by the Republican-led Congress in March commits Washington to put in place a defensive shield against limited missile attack.

Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov called the arms agreement, reached at talks held here after the Group of Eight summit, "a very important declaration."

Russia is concerned that a U.S. defensive system capable of shooting down incoming missiles would breach the ABM treaty and undermine the Cold War doctrine of mutually assured destruction. The idea at the time of the ABM Treaty was that neither side would be likely to launch a nuclear strike if they knew they had no defences to prevent the resulting catastrophe. But many military experts, diplomats and national security figures in Washington feel the ABM Treaty is a Cold War relic that has no place in a new, more dangerous world where so-called rogue states like North Korea and Iraq might attempt a missile strike against the United States.

The Clinton administration has pledged \$6.6 billion in its fiscal 2000 budget for the development of a missile defence but will delay a presidential decision on building one until June 2000.

A joint statement issued by the two countries said discussions on START 3 and the ABM treaty would begin later this summer. They agreed to "consider possible changes in the strategic situation that have a bearing on the ABM treaty and, as appropriate, possible proposals for further increasing the viability of this treaty," it said.

Berger said the two sides would begin preliminary negotiations to determine what a START 3 treaty would look like so the government could move

swiftly on an accord should the  
Russia's Duma lower house of parliament  
ratify START 2, which  
was signed in 1993.

One problem Russia  
has with START 2 is paying to dismantle  
nuclear weapons required  
under the treaty. Some politicians also  
do not want to give up the  
status that having nuclear weapons  
provides.

^REUTERS

^Yeltsin

agrees to consider revising 1972 missile treaty with U.S.<

^By TERENCE

HUNT=

^AP White House Correspondent=

COLOGNE, Germany (AP)

Eager to mend bomb-strained ties with  
President Clinton, Russian

President Boris Yeltsin agreed Sunday  
for the first time to consider  
revising a landmark treaty banning  
American and Russian missile-defense  
systems.

``The two countries are back in business," National  
Security

Adviser Sandy Berger reported after a friendly, hour-long  
meeting

between the two presidents. Their decision to discuss the  
1972

Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty was ``very significant," Berger  
said.

Frail but feisty, Yeltsin came to the closing day of a summit of  
world

leaders even as NATO was declaring an end to the Kosovo  
conflict

and 78 days of NATO bombing that had outraged Moscow.

Striking

a conciliatory note, Yeltsin declared, ``The most  
important thing

is to mend ties after a fight." Clinton thanked

Yeltsin ``for not

giving up on our relationship" during four  
months of tension, Berger

said.

``This entire difficulty in Kosovo has been a great test  
for the

relationship ... but it is a test I believe that both countries have passed," Clinton said in a Russian television interview. Clinton and Yeltsin agreed not to look back, but to move ahead to tackle thorny nuclear arms-control issues. Even so, Berger acknowledged, "Kosovo has left some scars, presumably on both sides." Though ailing, Yeltsin pounded his fist in disagreement with his ministers at times and wagged his finger at note-takers to write an accurate report of the meeting. He invited Clinton to come to Moscow but it was not decided when that might happen. When Clinton expressed concern about anti-Semitic statements by Russian nationalists, Yeltsin declared, "Provide me with all of the material you have and I will really sit on them," Berger recounted. Clinton described Yeltsin as "clear, concise and direct and strong." In a CNN interview, Clinton said "We got a lot done." The two presidents agreed to hold U.S.-Russian talks in the fall on deeper cuts in nuclear arms and on possibly reopening the 1972 ABM treaty, Berger said.

"This is very significant," he said, "because for the first time the Russians have agreed to discuss changes in the ABM treaty that may be necessitated by a national missile defense system, were we to decide to deploy one." Congress is pressing Clinton to deploy a shield against limited ballistic missile attack. Critics say that would require changing the ABM treaty something Moscow has opposed fiercely. Clinton has until next June to decide whether to field a system, and building

it would take an additional five years.

Clinton told Yeltsin the United States was committed to the ABM pact and would negotiate with Russia if any changes are required, Berger said. "And this ... is a recognition on the part of the Russians that they're prepared to have that discussion." While the United States considers erecting a missile shield, a financially strapped Russia wants to press ahead with deeper cuts in nuclear warheads.

Clinton agreed to preliminary discussions on more reductions but not to hold formal negotiations until Russia ratifies the 1993 START II treaty that requires cutting back to a maximum of 3,500 warheads on each side. The follow-on agreement a START III could bring warhead levels down to 2,000 for each country. There already have been some discussions looking ahead to START III. The START II treaty has languished in the Russian parliament despite repeated pledges by Yeltsin to get it approved. It appeared headed for ratification earlier this year but was shelved when NATO began bombing Yugoslavia. The U.S. Senate approved it in 1996. Yeltsin, in a show of good will, presented Clinton with information culled from Russian archives about President Kennedy and his assassination. Berger said he did not know what was in the files but it presumably concerns information about accused gunman Lee Harvey Oswald, who defected to the Soviet Union in 1959 but returned home less than three years later, disenchanted with life in the communist world. Clinton

was unable to offer Yeltsin much in the way of economic help, Berger acknowledged. The president urged Yeltsin to press Russia's parliament to approve austerity measures required by the International Monetary Fund before releasing \$4.5 billion in aid. Unless Russia adopts economic reforms, Clinton said, "the private money will not flow into Russia that will really bring it back to the position that the Russian people deserve, and that frankly the rest of the world needs."

Raising a recurring irritant, Yeltsin complained about the requirement to seek annual waivers exempting Russia from trade restrictions imposed during the Soviet era. Clinton said he wanted to repeal the measure, known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, but that there were concerns about Russian anti-Semitism.

APE- 06/20/99 14:12:00

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 6/21/99 3:26:53 PM  
**FROM** Tucker, Maureen E.  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Crowley, Philip J.

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

You are a wise man...there are so few.....

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

From: Crowley,  
Philip J.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 3:07 PM

To: Tucker, Maureen  
E.

Subject: RE: Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Hmm, that's  
my handle for you! Now I have four women who must be obeyed, two  
in the family and two at the NSC. I'm just going to roll over and  
play dead.

PJ

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

From: Tucker, Maureen  
E.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 3:06 PM

To: Andreasen, Steven P.;

Lackey, Miles M.; Rudman, Mara E.; Gobush, Matthew N.; @DEFENSE -  
Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor;  
@RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: RE:

Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

"She Who Must Be Obeyed..."

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

From: Andreasen, Steven P.

Sent: Monday, June 21,  
1999 3:05 PM

To: Lackey, Miles M.; Rudman, Mara E.; Gobush, Matthew N.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls  
Subject: RE: Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

I've  
learned to always agree with Mara ...

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

From: Lackey,  
Miles M.  
Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 2:58 PM  
To: Rudman, Mara  
E.; Gobush, Matthew N.; Andreasen, Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls  
Subject: RE:  
Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

agree with mara

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

From: Rudman, Mara E.  
Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999  
2:29 PM  
To: Gobush, Matthew N.; Andreasen, Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls  
Subject: RE:  
Press on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Doesn't work I think for several  
reasons:

1. Helms says no CTBT in its own right, but also because

2.  
Helms does not believe ABM stands in any form -- he's not likely to be terribly impressed with the fact that we're talking to the Russians about changes in a treaty that he believes no longer has any validity anyway; and

3. Taking Helms on directly in the press  
is the surest way to ensure that you never see any CTBT hearings, let alone moving the ratification through his committee. Ask Weld and Atwood if you want confirmation on that one.

If later on in the summer we decide we want to just make a public case KNOWING we will get nothing from the Senate, and nothing likely as long as Hlems is the chair, then we may want to use that kind of frontal attack. Otherwise, I don't think it makes a lot of sense.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Gobush, Matthew N.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999

1:05 PM

To: Andreasen, Steven P.; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: RE: Press on  
START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]

Steve/Mara/Miles - Given the way ABM discussions are playing in the press, can we use it to apply additional public pressure on Helms to hold a hearing on CTBT? Something like: We are willing to discuss ABM with the Russians - why aren't you, Senator Helms, willing to discuss CTBT in your committee? Or is this linkage too strong, suggesting that we are ultimately willing to scrap AMB if the Senate is ultimately willing to vote on CTBT? Thoughts?

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

From: Andreasen, Steven

P.

Sent: Monday, June 21, 1999 11:37 AM

To: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @LEGAL - Legal Advisor; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs; @NONPRO - Export Controls

Subject: Press  
on START/ABM [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

Colleagues --

Steve

Holland (Reuters) and Terence Hunt (AP) did a piece devoted (or, in Hunt's case, largely devoted) to the START/ABM angle from Cologne.

Steve

^Russia agrees to talk about ABM pact changes  
(Adds  
details, recasts, adds Clinton quote)

By Steve Holland

COLOGNE, Germany, June 20 (Reuters) - The United States won the

agreement of Russia on Sunday to consider changes in the Anti-Ballistic

Missile treaty to enable the possible development of a ``Star Wars''-style

U.S. missile defence system.

``For the first time, Russia has

agreed to discuss changes in

the ABM treaty that may be necessitated

by a national missile

defence system were we to decide to deploy

one," said White

House National Security Adviser Sandy Berger,

hailing the deal

as significant.

In exchange, the United States

agreed to a resumption of

negotiations on a START 3 treaty reducing

long-range nuclear

arms.

It had been insisting that the START

2 treaty first be

ratified by Russia's opposition-controlled lower

house of

parliament.

The goal of START 2 is to bring warheads

down to a maximum

of 3,500 on each side. Under START 3 they could

go down to 2,000

on each side. The U.S. Senate ratified START 2

in 1996.

The agreements were reached during a meeting between U.S.

President Bill Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin

--

evidence of a thaw in East-West relations which had been chilled by

NATO's 11-week-long bombardment of Yugoslavia.

``The summit

gave us a chance to work on what we have in

common," said Clinton.

The United States wants to make amendments to the 1972 ABM treaty,

which sets limits on the type of systems Russia and the

United States

can deploy to intercept incoming missiles.

The changes are needed because legislation adopted by the Republican-led Congress in March commits Washington to put in place a defensive shield against limited missile attack. Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov called the arms agreement, reached at talks held here after the Group of Eight summit, "a very important declaration." Russia is concerned that a U.S. defensive system capable of shooting down incoming missiles would breach the ABM treaty and undermine the Cold War doctrine of mutually assured destruction. The idea at the time of the ABM Treaty was that neither side would be likely to launch a nuclear strike if they knew they had no defences to prevent the resulting catastrophe. But many military experts, diplomats and national security figures in Washington feel the ABM Treaty is a Cold War relic that has no place in a new, more dangerous world where so-called rogue states like North Korea and Iraq might attempt a missile strike against the United States. The Clinton administration has pledged \$6.6 billion in its fiscal 2000 budget for the development of a missile defence but will delay a presidential decision on building one until June 2000. A joint statement issued by the two countries said discussions on START 3 and the ABM treaty would begin later this summer. They agreed to "consider possible changes in the strategic situation that have a bearing on the ABM treaty and, as appropriate, possible proposals for further increasing the

viability of this treaty," it said.

Berger

said the two sides would begin preliminary negotiations to determine what a START 3 treaty would look like so the government could move swiftly on an accord should the Russia's Duma lower house of parliament ratify START 2, which was signed in 1993.

One problem Russia has with START 2 is paying to dismantle nuclear weapons required under the treaty. Some politicians also do not want to give up the status that having nuclear weapons provides.

^REUTERS

^Yeltsin

agrees to consider revising 1972 missile treaty with U.S.<

^By TERENCE

HUNT=

^AP White House Correspondent=

COLOGNE, Germany (AP)

Eager to mend bomb-strained ties with President Clinton, Russian President Boris Yeltsin agreed Sunday for the first time to consider revising a landmark treaty banning American and Russian missile-defense systems.

``The two countries are back in business," National Security

Adviser Sandy Berger reported after a friendly, hour-long meeting

between the two presidents. Their decision to discuss the 1972

Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty was ``very significant," Berger said.

Frail but feisty, Yeltsin came to the closing day of a summit of world

leaders even as NATO was declaring an end to the Kosovo conflict

and 78 days of NATO bombing that had outraged Moscow.

Striking

a conciliatory note, Yeltsin declared, ``The most important thing

is to mend ties after a fight." Clinton thanked

Yeltsin ``for not giving up on our relationship" during four months of tension, Berger said.

``This entire difficulty in Kosovo has been a great test for the relationship ... but it is a test I believe that both countries have passed," Clinton said in a Russian television interview. Clinton and Yeltsin agreed not to look back, but to move ahead to tackle thorny nuclear arms-control issues. Even so, Berger acknowledged, ``Kosovo has left some scars, presumably on both sides."

Though ailing, Yeltsin pounded his fist in disagreement with his ministers at times and wagged his finger at note-takers to write an accurate report of the meeting. He invited Clinton to come to Moscow but it was not decided when that might happen.

When Clinton expressed concern about anti-Semitic statements by Russian nationalists, Yeltsin declared, ``Provide me with all of the material you have and I will really sit on them," Berger recounted.

Clinton described Yeltsin as ``clear, concise and direct and strong." In a CNN interview, Clinton said ``We got a lot done." The two presidents agreed to hold U.S.-Russian talks in the fall on deeper cuts in nuclear arms and on possibly reopening the 1972 ABM treaty, Berger said.

``This is very significant," he said, ``because for the first time the Russians have agreed to discuss changes in the ABM treaty that may be necessitated by a national missile defense system, were we to decide to deploy one."

Congress is pressing Clinton to deploy a shield against limited

ballistic missile attack. Critics say that would require changing the ABM treaty something Moscow has opposed fiercely. Clinton has until next June to decide whether to field a system, and building it would take an additional five years.

Clinton told Yeltsin the United States was committed to the ABM pact and would negotiate with Russia if any changes are required, Berger said. "And this ... is a recognition on the part of the Russians that they're prepared to have that discussion." While the United States considers erecting a missile shield, a financially strapped Russia wants to press ahead with deeper cuts in nuclear warheads.

Clinton agreed to preliminary discussions on more reductions but not to hold formal negotiations until Russia ratifies the 1993 START II treaty that requires cutting back to a maximum of 3,500 warheads on each side. The follow-on agreement a START III could bring warhead levels down to 2,000 for each country. There already have been some discussions looking ahead to START III. The START II treaty has languished in the Russian parliament despite repeated pledges by Yeltsin to get it approved. It appeared headed for ratification earlier this year but was shelved when NATO began bombing Yugoslavia. The U.S. Senate approved it in 1996. Yeltsin, in a show of good will, presented Clinton with information culled from Russian archives about President Kennedy and his assassination. Berger said he did not know what was in the files but it presumably concerns information about accused gunman Lee Harvey

Oswald, who defected to the Soviet Union in 1959 but returned home less than three years later, disenchanted with life in the communist world.

Clinton was unable to offer Yeltsin much in the way of economic help, Berger acknowledged. The president urged Yeltsin to press Russia's parliament to approve austerity measures required by the International Monetary Fund before releasing \$4.5 billion in aid.

Unless Russia adopts economic reforms, Clinton said, "the private money will not flow into Russia that will really bring it back to the position that the Russian people deserve, and that frankly the rest of the world needs."

Raising a recurring irritant, Yeltsin complained about the requirement to seek annual waivers exempting Russia from trade restrictions imposed during the Soviet era. Clinton said he wanted to repeal the measure, known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, but that there were concerns about Russian anti-Semitism.

APE- 06/20/99 14:12:00

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 7/20/99 10:21:42 AM  
**FROM** Andreassen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** FW: CTBT Q/As [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

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

From: Andreassen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)

Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 1999 10:18 AM

To: @PRESS - Public Affairs

Cc: @DEFENSE

- Defense Policy

Subject: CTBT Q/As [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

CTBT Questions and Answers.doc

CTBT Questions and Answers

Why do you think you can move this treaty now?

\* First, it's the right thing to do to make America safer, today and for our children.

\* Second, the Treaty's importance has recently been highlighted by fighting in Kashmir, where tensions between two states with nuclear weapons capabilities rose, and the world nervously watched.

\* Third, concerns over nuclear espionage have led many to draw the right conclusion that this Treaty can constrain states from developing

advanced nuclear  
weapons capabilities.

\* Fourth, a conference of states that have ratified the Treaty will take place this October if the Treaty has not entered into force; America needs to be a full participant at that conference, and we need to ratify ourselves to do so.

\* Finally, the American public overwhelmingly supports ratification.

What about Senator Helms' demand that you first submit the Kyoto Treaty and certain ABM and START-related accords?

\* We have made our position on Kyoto clear: we will not submit that Treaty until developing nations have agreed to meaningful participation in this important environmental regime.

\* With respect to the ABM agreements, I have made clear that I will submit that package as soon as the Russian Duma ratifies the START II Treaty, a goal to which President Yeltsin recommitted himself earlier this month.

\* So the time for the Senate to act on the CTBT is now.

What will happen if the Treaty remains stalled in the Foreign Relations Committee?

\* The U.S. leadership role in the world on arms control and nonproliferation issues will be weakened, and we will miss an opportunity to enhance our national security.

Are you confident we can maintain a reliable nuclear deterrent absent actual nuclear tests?

\* Yes.

\* I have been assured by the directors of our nuclear labs that we can meet this challenge.



# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 7/20/99 10:29:23 AM  
**FROM** Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** FW: CTBT Questions and Answers [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Leavy, David C. (PRESS)

**CARBON\_COPY**

Crocker, Bathsheba N. (NSA)  
Dejban, Donna D. (NSA)  
Jacobson, Tracey A. (ADMIN)  
Kerrick, Donald L. (NSA)  
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)  
Moretz, Sheila K. (NSA)  
Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)  
Sargeant, Stephen T. (EXSEC)  
Scott-Perez, Marilyn L. (NSA)  
Storey, Sharon V. (NSA)  
Sutphen, Mona K. (NSA)  
Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Bell, Robert G. (DEFENSE)  
Bouchard, Joseph F. (DEFENSE)  
Brackman, Stella S. (DEFENSE)  
Kelly, Sandra L. (DEFENSE)  
McCausland, Jeffrey D. (DEFENSE)  
Mitchell, Rebecca (Julie) J. (NSA)  
Mulligan, George D. (DEFENSE)  
Peterman, David (Brian) (DEFENSE)  
Pimentel, Betsy J. (DEFENSE)  
vonLipsey, Roderick K. (DEFENSE)  
Wasserman, Elaine P. (DEFENSE)  
Witkowski, Anne A.  
Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)  
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)  
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)  
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)  
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)  
Sanborn, Daniel W. (Press)  
Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)  
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Gray, Wendy E. (SPCHW/CNSLR)

Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)

**TEXT\_BODY**

Please see revisions.

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

From: Leavy,

David C. (PRESS)

Sent: Tuesday, July 20, 1999 10:26 AM

To: @NSA

- Natl Security Advisor; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @PRESS -  
Public  
Affairs

Subject: CTBT Questions and Answers [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance:

High

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

CTBT Questions and Answers\_.doc  
CTBT Questions and Answers

Why are you adding this event on quickly and making a big push on this treaty now?

\* Foreign policy priority of my administration. I signed treaty in Sept. '96 and listed in State of the Union as important to our national security interests.

\* Treaty's importance has recently been highlighted by fighting in Kashmir, where tensions between two states with nuclear weapons capabilities rose threatening our interests.

\* Concerns over nuclear espionage have led many to draw the right conclusion that this Treaty can constrain states from developing advanced nuclear weapons capabilities.

\* Fourth, a conference of states that have ratified the Treaty will take place this October if the Treaty has not entered into force; for America to be a full participant at that conference, and we need to ratify ourselves.

\* Finally, the American public overwhelmingly supports ratification.

What about Senator Helms' demand that you first submit the Kyoto

Treaty and  
certain ABM and START-related accords?

\* We have made our position on Kyoto clear: we will not submit that Treaty until developing nations have agreed to meaningful participation in this important environmental regime.

\* With respect to the ABM agreements, I have made clear that I will submit that package as soon as the Russian Duma ratifies the START II Treaty, a goal to which President Yeltsin recommitted himself earlier this month.

\*

\* The Senate should consider CTBT on its own and on its merits.

What will happen if the Treaty remains stalled in the Foreign Relations Committee?

\* The U.S. leadership role in the world on arms control and nonproliferation issues will be weakened, and we will miss an opportunity to enhance our own national security.

Are you confident we can maintain a reliable nuclear deterrent absent actual nuclear tests?

\* Yes.

\* I have been assured by the directors of our nuclear labs that we can meet this challenge.

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 7/20/99 1:19:38 PM

**FROM** Gray, Wendy E. (SPCHW/CNSLR)

**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED

**SUBJECT** SBTP On the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Rose Garden  
[UNCLASSIFIED]

**TO** Crowley, Philip J. (PRESS)  
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)  
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)  
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)  
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)  
Sanborn, Daniel W. (Press)  
Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)  
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)  
Gray, Wendy E. (SPCHW/CNSLR)  
Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)  
Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)  
Orzulak, Paul K. (SPCHW)  
Widmer, Edward L. (Ted) (SPCHW)  
Gray, Wendy E. (SPCHW/CNSLR)  
Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)

**CARBON\_COPY** Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Bell, Robert G. (DEFENSE)  
Bouchard, Joseph F. (DEFENSE)  
Brackman, Stella S. (DEFENSE)  
Kelly, Sandra L. (DEFENSE)  
McCausland, Jeffrey D. (DEFENSE)  
Mitchell, Rebecca (Julie) J. (NSA)  
Mulligan, George D. (DEFENSE)  
Peterman, David (Brian) (DEFENSE)  
Pimentel, Betsy J. (DEFENSE)  
vonLipsey, Roderick K. (DEFENSE)  
Wasserman, Elaine P. (DEFENSE)  
Witkowsky, Anne A.  
Caravelli, John M. (NONPRO)  
Edwards, Joan K. (NONPRO)  
Harris, Elisa D. (NONPRO)  
Samore, Gary S. (NONPRO)  
Tucker, Maureen E. (NONPRO)

**TEXT\_BODY**

Statement by the President  
SBTP On the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,  
Rose Garden

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

CTBT Statement 7-20-99.doc  
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release July 20, 1999

**STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT  
ON THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY**

Rose Garden

11:43 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: I have just had the privilege of meeting with the three Apollo

11 astronauts, who, 30 years ago, carried out the first landing on the moon. Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins. They and everyone at NASA over

the years have made an extraordinary contribution to our nation and to humanity.

I am very grateful to them.

President Kennedy, who set a goal of putting a man on the moon by the end of the 1960s, was committed to using technology to unlock the mysteries of the heavens.

But President Kennedy was also concerned that technology, if misused,

could destroy life on Earth. So another goal he vigorously pursued was to

propose, by President Eisenhower, a treaty to ban for all time testing of the most destructive weapons ever devised -- nuclear weapons.

As a first step, President Kennedy negotiated a limited test ban treaty to ban nuclear tests except those conducted underground. But for far too long we failed to heed the call to ban all nuclear tests. More countries sought to acquire nuclear weapons and to develop ever more destructive weapons. This threatened America's security and that of our friends and allies. It made our world a more dangerous place.

Since I have been President, I have made ending nuclear tests one of my goals. And in 1996, we concluded a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty -- countries have now signed it, and 41, including many of our allies, have ratified it. Today on Capitol Hill, a bipartisan group of senators is speaking out on the importance of the treaty. They include Senators Jeffords, Specter, Daschle, Biden, Bingaman, Dorgan, Bob Kerrey, Levin, and Murray. I am grateful for their leadership and their support of this critical agreement.

And today I want to express again my strong determination to obtain ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. America already has stopped nuclear testing. We have, today, a robust nuclear force and nuclear experts affirm we can maintain a safe and reliable deterrent without nuclear tests.

The question now is whether we will adopt or whether we will lose a treaty that will bar other nations from testing nuclear weapons. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty will strengthen our national security by constraining the development of more advanced and more destructive nuclear weapons, and by limiting the possibilities for more countries to acquire nuclear weapons. It will also enhance our ability to detect suspicious activities by other nations.

With or without a test ban treaty, we must monitor such activities. The treaty gives us new means to pursue this important mission -- a global network of sensors and the right to request short notice, on-site inspections in other countries. Four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- David Joins, William Crowe, Colin Powell and John Shalikashvili -- plus the current Chairman, Hugh Shelton, all agree the treaty is in our national interests. Other national leaders, such as former Senators John Glenn and Nancy Kassebaum Bailey, also agree.

Unfortunately, the Test Ban Treaty is now imperiled by the refusal of some senators even to consider it. If our Senate fails to act, the treaty cannot enter into force for any country. Think of that. We're not testing now. Over a hundred and fifty-two countries have signed, 41 have ratified, but if our Senate fails to act, this treaty and all the protections and increased safety it offers the American people cannot enter into force for any country. That would make it harder to prevent further nuclear arms competition, and as we have seen in example, in the nuclear tests in India and Pakistan.

Do we want these countries and other regional rivals to join a test ban treaty or do we want them to stop nuclear testing? Do we want to scrap a treaty that could constrain them? The major nuclear powers, Britain and France, Russia, and China, have signed the treaty. Do we want to walk away from a treaty under which

those countries and scores of others have agreed not to conduct nuclear. I believe it is strongly in our interest to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The American people consistently have supported it for more than 40 years now.

At a minimum, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings this

fall. Hearings would allow each side to make its case for and against the treaty, and allow the Senate to decide this matter on the merits. We have a chance right now to end nuclear testing forever. It would be a tragedy for security and for our children's future to let this opportunity slip away.

I thank those senators from both parties who today are announcing their intention not to do that. Thank you.

Q Mr. President, did Jiang Zemin tell you that he would use force to control Taiwan's independence? And would you use force in Taiwan's defense?

THE PRESIDENT: First let me tell you I'm going to have a press conference tomorrow and I will answer a lot of questions. The answer to that question we had a conversation in which I restated our strong support of the one China policy and our strong support for the cross-strait dialogue, and I made it clear that our policy had not changed, including our view under the Taiwan Relations Act

that it would be -- we would take very seriously any abridgement of the peaceful cross-strait dialogue.

China knows very well what our policy is, and we know quite well what our policy is. I believe that the action of the United States in affirming our support of the one China policy and encouraging Taiwan to support that

framework within which dialogue has occurred will be helpful in easing of the tensions. And that was the context in which our conversation occurred.

So I thought it was a very positive conversation, far more positive than negative. And that is the light in which I meant it to unfold, and I think that is the shape it is taking. So --

Q The Chinese seemed to make it clear that he would use force --

Q On the treaty, Senator Helms says that he would be happy to hold hearings. Would you send up the ABM Treaty and the Kyoto Treaty. Will you?

THE PRESIDENT: Look, the ABM Treaty -- we have to conclude START first.

That's in our national interest. The Kyoto Treaty -- all the people who say they're not for the Kyoto Treaty insist that we involve the developing nations

it. I agree with them -- even the people who are against the Kyoto Treaty. In any circumstances say, well, if you're going to have it you've got to have the developing nations in there. So it's inconsistent for me to send it up when we're out there working ourselves to death to try to get the developing nations to participate.

Now, this is a relatively new issue, the Kyoto Treaty. And the other issue is not ripe yet -- clearly, not ripe yet. So to take a matter that has been a matter of national debate for 40 years now, and it is finally a reality -- a treaty that has been ratified by 40 other countries, the prospect of dramatically increasing the safety of the American people in the future -- and hold it

to two matters that are literally not ripe for presentation to the Senate would be a grave error, I think. And I hope that we can find a way around

Thank you.

Q Are the Chinese still upset about the embassy bombing?

Q -- test ban, there have been some that say that the Cox report shows that we should actually be developing weapons to stay ahead of proliferators. Is that your comment on that?

Q He's gone.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 11:55 A.M. EDT

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 7/29/99 2:50:11 PM

**FROM** Keith, James R. (ASIA)

**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED

**SUBJECT** Response to Helms, Lott, and others on Taiwan Arms Sales  
[UNCLASSIFIED]

**TO** Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)  
Bouchard, Joseph F. (DEFENSE)  
Lieberthal, Kenneth G. (ASIA)

**CARBON\_COPY** Gray, Wendy E. (SPCHW/CNSLR)  
Rudman, Mara E. (CNSLR)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Bell, Robert G. (DEFENSE)  
Bouchard, Joseph F. (DEFENSE)  
Brackman, Stella S. (DEFENSE)  
Kelly, Sandra L. (DEFENSE)  
McCausland, Jeffrey D. (DEFENSE)  
Mitchell, Rebecca (Julie) J. (NSA)  
Mulligan, George D. (DEFENSE)  
Peterman, David (Brian) (DEFENSE)  
Pimentel, Betsy J. (DEFENSE)  
vonLipsey, Roderick K. (DEFENSE)  
Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)  
Witkowsky, Anne A.

**TEXT\_BODY** Assuming there is a third notification (just arose, suddenly) would propose to fold it into the other two. Am told the third case is valued at \$3 million, i.e. very small. Concur?

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT** 0000 potus~helms.doc

Dear Senator Helms:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning recent developments in the cross-Strait relationship between Taipei and Beijing and U.S. policy toward China. I am sure you are aware an informal notification of two Taiwan arms sales cases was sent to Congress this week; I am grateful to you and your colleagues for working with us to receive these notifications before the August recess. You can rest assured that the Administration is not delaying or suspending any arms sales notifications to Congress.

I appreciate the strength of your convictions regarding the proper course of U.S.-China relations. We will continue to promote broad U.S. interests in the region while helping our friends in Taiwan to prosper.

Thank you again for your giving me the benefit of your views.  
Sincerely,

[Name/Title in Initial Caps]  
[Title/Senate/House in Initial Caps]  
[Organization/Position - Initial Caps]  
[Address - Initial Caps]

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 0000 to srb.doc

July 29, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: KENNETH LIEBERTHAL

FROM: JAMES KEITH

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on  
Taiwan Arms Sales  
Notifications

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a  
response to Senator  
Helms, Lott, and other Members.

We have just been informed this afternoon of a third notification for  
the sale of  
parts for Chinook helicopters to Taiwan. The Defense Security  
Assistance Agency  
(DSAA) informed State this afternoon that this additional case was  
ready for  
"pre-consultation" with the Congress. DSAA staff informed State at  
the same time  
that the Hill staff were already aware of the case and had levied a  
demand that  
this case also be notified to Congress asap.

Concurrence by: Miles Lackey, Joe Bouchard, Mara Rudman

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I.

#### Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Response to Senator Helms et al

1

## ACTION

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on Taiwan Arms Sales

## Purpose

Respond to Senator Helms' letter complaining about pressure on Taiwan in the wake of President Lee Teng-hui's July 9 statement.

## Background

Senators Helms, Lott, and 24 other Members wrote to complain about alleged postponement of arms sales notifications to Taiwan and to press the Administration not to take punitive measures against Taiwan. The letter also expresses dismay that we appear to be engaged in a "verbal tilt" toward Beijing's view of "one China" in the imbroglio that has developed since Lee Teng-hui disrupted the status quo on July 9.

Lee's statement surfaced just as we were in the process of notifying Congress about two upcoming arms sales to Taiwan. We provided informal notification to Congress on those cases this week, before receipt of Helms' letter. A third case has arisen July 29. In cooperation with Congress we have arranged to provide formal notification of all three cases Friday, July 30.

Your response informs the Senators that contrary to the concerns expressed in their letter we are not delaying or suspending arms sales to Taiwan. It affirms that the current framework for U.S.-Beijing-Taipei relations is working to protect and promote not only U.S. but also Taiwan interests.

## RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter at Tab A.

Attachment

Tab A Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and others

2

cc: Vice President  
Chief of Staff

Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 7/29/99 4:19:45 PM  
**FROM** Keith, James R. (ASIA)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** New package [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)

**CARBON\_COPY**

**TEXT\_BODY** MW: could you please get a log number and put this set in final for me? I'll give you the copy of the incoming I have--not yet assigned by records. jk

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT** 0000 potus~helms.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning recent developments in the cross-Strait relationship between Taipei and Beijing and U.S. policy toward China. I am sure you are aware notifications of Taiwan arms sales cases were sent to Congress last week. I am grateful to you and your colleagues for working with us to receive these notifications before the August recess. You can rest assured that the Administration is not delaying or suspending any arms sales notifications to Congress.

I appreciate the strength of your convictions regarding the proper course of

U.S.-China relations. We will continue to promote broad U.S. interests in the region while helping our friends in Taiwan to prosper.

Thank you again for your giving me the benefit of your views.  
Sincerely,

[Name/Title in Initial Caps]  
[Title/Senate/House in Initial Caps]  
[Organization/Position - Initial Caps]  
[Address - Initial Caps]

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 0000 srb~potus.doc

## ACTION

### MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER  
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on Taiwan Arms Sales

#### Purpose

Respond to Senator Helms' letter complaining about pressure on Taiwan in the wake of President Lee Teng-hui's July 9 statement.

#### Background

Senators Helms, Lott, and 24 other Members wrote to complain about alleged postponement of arms sales notifications to Taiwan and to press the Administration not to take punitive measures against Taiwan. The letter also expresses dismay that we appear to be engaged in a "verbal tilt" toward Beijing's view of "one China" in the imbroglio that has developed since Lee Teng-hui.

disrupted the status quo on July 9.

Lee's statement surfaced just as we were in the process of notifying Congress about two upcoming arms sales to Taiwan. We provided informal notification to Congress on those cases this week, before receipt of Helms' letter. A third case has arisen July 29. In cooperation with Congress we have arranged to provide formal notification of all three cases Friday, July 30.

Your response informs the Senators that contrary to the concerns expressed in their letter we are not delaying or suspending arms sales to Taiwan. It affirms that the current framework for U.S.-Beijing-Taipei relations is working to protect and promote not only U.S. but also Taiwan interests.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter at Tab A.

Attachment

Tab A Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and others

2

cc: Vice President  
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 0000 to srb.doc

July 29, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: KENNETH LIEBERTHAL

FROM: JAMES KEITH

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on  
Taiwan Arms Sales  
Notifications

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a  
response to Senator  
Helms, Lott, and other Members.

We have just been informed this afternoon of a third notification for  
sale of a  
radar detector for CH-47 helicopters to Taiwan. This is an amendment  
to a  
previous case worth a total of \$3 million. The case is already in the  
"pre-consultation" phase with Congress, therefore it would be best to  
wrap it in  
with the other two cases (which are far larger in dollar terms in any  
event).

Concurrence by: Miles Lackey, Joe Bouchard, Mara Rudman

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I.

#### Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Response to Senator Helms et al

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 7/30/99 11:49:53 AM  
**FROM** Keith, James R. (ASIA)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** FW: Helms Letter on Taiwan Arms Sales [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

Mary: this has changed a bit since you worked on it yesterday. Would you be able to put it in final again? Would you also check the format? I added inside address and inserted the log number into the two memos. I have your folder with the incoming up here. It needs two red dots. Jim

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

From: Keith,  
James R. (ASIA)  
Sent: Friday, July 30, 1999 10:40 AM  
To: @RUDMAN;  
@LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs  
Cc: Keith, James R. (ASIA)  
Subject: Helms  
Letter on Taiwan Arms Sales [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

This  
is ready to go after your final review. Will need guidance on how hard to push the system on this--ok for Monday? must go for the weekend?

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

0000 to srb.doc

July 30, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: KENNETH LIEBERTHAL

FROM: JAMES KEITH

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on  
Taiwan Arms Sales  
Notifications

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a  
response to Senator  
Helms, Lott, and other Members.

On Tuesday, July 27 we provided informal notification to Congress  
on the two arms  
sales cases that have attracted Helms' attention. (We received Helms'  
letter  
Wednesday, July 28.) We plan to provide formal notification this  
afternoon,  
Friday, July 30.

We were informed July 29 of a third notification for sale of a radar  
detector for  
CH-47 helicopters to Taiwan. This third case is an amendment to a  
previous arms  
sales case, notified last fall. Its value is small, a total of \$3 million.  
The  
case is in the "pre-consultation" phase with Congress, i.e. we have not  
been able  
to elicit a green light yet from Hill Democrats to provide formal  
notification.  
This one additional case will likely be ready for notification next  
week, before  
Congress goes out.

Concurrence by: Miles Lackey, Joe Bouchard, Mara Rudman

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I.

#### Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Response to Senator Helms et al

5775

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 0000 srb~potus.doc

## ACTION

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER  
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on  
Taiwan Arms Sales

## Purpose

Respond to Senator Helms' letter complaining about pressure on  
Taiwan in the wake  
of President Lee Teng-hui's July 9 statement.

## Background

Senators Helms, Lott, and 24 other Members wrote to complain about  
alleged  
postponement of arms sales notifications to Taiwan and to press the  
Administration not to take punitive measures against Taiwan. The  
letter also  
expresses dismay that we appear to be engaged in a "verbal tilt"  
toward Beijing's  
view of "one China" in the imbroglio that has developed since Lee  
Teng-hui  
disrupted the status quo on July 9.

Lee's statement surfaced just as we were in the process of notifying  
Congress  
about two upcoming arms sales to Taiwan. We provided informal  
notification to  
Congress on those cases this week, before receipt of Helms' letter. In  
cooperation with Congress we arranged to provide formal notification  
on Friday,  
July 30.

Your response informs the Senators that contrary to the concerns expressed in their letter we are not delaying or suspending arms sales to Taiwan. It affirms that the current framework for U.S.-Beijing-Taipei relations is working to protect and promote not only U.S. but also Taiwan interests.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter at Tab A.

Attachment  
Tab A Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and others

2

5775

cc: Vice President  
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 0000 potus~helms.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter concerning recent developments in the cross-Strait relationship between Taipei and Beijing and U.S. policy toward China. I am sure you are aware notifications of Taiwan arms sales cases were sent to Congress last week. I am grateful to you and your colleagues for working with us to receive these notifications before the August recess. You can rest assured that the Administration is not delaying or suspending any arms sales notifications to

Congress.

I appreciate the strength of your convictions regarding the proper course of U.S.-China relations. We will continue to promote broad U.S. interests in the region while helping our friends in Taiwan to prosper.

Thank you again for your giving me the benefit of your views.  
Sincerely,

[Name/Title in Initial Caps]  
[Title/Senate/House in Initial Caps]  
[Organization/Position - Initial Caps]  
[Address - Initial Caps]

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 7/30/99 4:19:08 PM  
**FROM** Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Heads-Up: ILO Convention (Number 182) on the Worst Forms of Child Labor  
[UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Stromseth, Jane E. (MULTI)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

yes i have it  
thanks  
miles

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

From: Stromseth,  
Jane E. (MULTI)  
Sent: Friday, July 30, 1999 4:17 PM  
To: @LEGISLAT  
- Legislative Affairs  
Subject: RE: Heads-Up: ILO Convention (Number  
182) on the Worst Forms of Child Labor [UNCLASSIFIED]

Miles:

Sarah Rosen Wartell of NEC and I have been working on this convention, and Sarah said she sent an advance copy of the package to your office. Let me know if you haven't received it. Also, Sarah seeks your guidance on a press release she is working on for (probably) mid next week, in particular, whether the guidance should say something positive about Helms such as "we look forward to working with Senator Helms on this." Sarah will be in touch by unclass e-mail, but I wanted to give you this heads-up. Thanks for your help on this.

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

From: Stromseth, Jane E. (MULTI)  
  
Sent: Friday, July 30, 1999 3:54 PM  
To: @RECORDS & ACCESS MGMT;

@WWD - West Wing Desk

Cc: Sargeant, Stephen T. (EXSEC); Schwartz,  
Eric P. (MULTI); @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs

Subject: Heads-Up:

ILO Convention (Number 182) on the Worst Forms of Child Labor  
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

My

counterpart at State just informed me that State expects to send over a package on the ILO Convention on the worst forms of child labor very soon (probably this afternoon), with attached materials needed for the President to submit the convention to the Senate for ratification. The President expressed strong support for this convention when he spoke before the ILO in June and said that he planned to submit it to the Senate for ratification when he returned home. The NEC has coordinated the preparation of the supporting documents, contained in the package, with the aim of having the treaty submitted to the Senate before it goes into recess next week. The NEC and NSC have worked together on a memo to the President from Samuel Berger, Gene Sperling and Larry Stein that will accompany the package as it moves forward. In addition, NSC will draft a cover memo for Samuel Berger.

Your help in expediting this package would be greatly appreciated! Steve Sargeant and I have discussed this and recommend handling it as a red dot package. I am the action officer on this package for the NSC, and we will need the concurrence of our LEGAL office (Jamie Baker) and our LEGIS office (Miles Lackey). Thanks very much for your help on this!

## Exchange Mail

**DATE-TIME** 8/2/99 11:33:21 AM  
**FROM** Lieberthal, Kenneth G. (ASIA)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** FW: Redo of Letter to Helms: Double Red Dot [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Keith, James R. (ASIA)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

I agree that this is a much better version. Please do insert a brief reference to the third arms sale, and then send this along. Thanks.

-----Original

Message-----

From: Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)

Sent: Monday, August

02, 1999 11:21 AM

To: Keith, James R. (ASIA)

Cc: Lieberthal, Kenneth

G. (ASIA); @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs

Subject: FW: Redo of

Letter to Helms: Double Red Dot [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Jim

-- I've made some edits to the memo based on new information --

HIRC

marks up TSEA Thursday, and the third arms sale is cleared and will probably be notified tomorrow. Also made a couple minor edits to the letter.

Do you think the letter should include reference to the third arms sale? It's so minor, and the point is made by the first two, that I think it can be left out. Let me know if you see it differently.

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

From: Keith, James

R. (ASIA)

Sent: Monday, August 02, 1999 10:45 AM

To: Lieberthal,

Kenneth G. (ASIA); Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)

Subject: Redo of Letter to Helms: Double Red Dot

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

JBS

wanted a statement of our policy to be added to the letter to Helms, Lott, et al.

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 5775 to srb REDO.doc

August 2, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: KENNETH LIEBERTHAL

FROM: JAMES KEITH

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on Taiwan Arms Sales Notifications

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a response to Senator Helms, Lott, and other Members. It is urgent because Helms and Torrecelli are co-sponsoring the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, which is gathering momentum in Congress. The House version is expected to be marked up by the HIRC on Thursday, August 5..

On Tuesday, July 27 we provided informal notification to Congress on the two arms sales cases that have attracted Helms' attention. (We received Helms' letter Wednesday, July 28.) We provided formal notification this afternoon, Friday, July 30.

We were informed July 29 of a third notification for sale of a radar detector for CH-47 helicopters to Taiwan. This third case is an amendment to a previous arms sales case, notified last fall. Its value is small, a total of \$3 million.

The case is in the "pre-consultation" phase with Congress. This one additional case will likely be ready for notification this week, before Congress goes out.

Concurrence by: Miles Lackey, Joe Bouchard, Mara Rudman

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I.

#### Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Response to Senator Helms et al

Tab B Incoming Correspondence

2

5775 REDO

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 5775 srb~potus REDO.doc

#### ACTION

#### MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER  
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on Taiwan Arms Sales

#### Purpose

Respond to Senator Helms' letter complaining about pressure on Taiwan in the wake of President Lee Teng-hui's July 9 statement.

#### Background

Senators Helms, Lott, and 24 other Members wrote to complain about

alleged  
postponement of arms sales notifications to Taiwan and to press the  
Administration not to take punitive measures against Taiwan. The  
letter also  
expresses dismay that we appear to be engaged in a "verbal tilt"  
toward Beijing's  
view of "one China" in the imbroglio that has developed since Lee  
Teng-hui  
disrupted the status quo on July 9.

Lee's statement surfaced just as we were in the process of notifying  
Congress  
about two upcoming arms sales to Taiwan. We provided informal  
notification to  
Congress on those cases this week, before receipt of Helms' letter. In  
cooperation with Congress we arranged to provide formal notification  
on Friday,  
July 30.

Your response informs the Senators that, contrary to the concerns  
expressed in  
their letter, we are not delaying or suspending arms sales to Taiwan. It  
affirms  
that the current framework for U.S.-Beijing-Taipei relations is  
working to  
protect and promote not only U.S. but also Taiwan interests.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter at Tab A.

#### Attachments

Tab A Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and others  
Tab B Incoming Correspondence

2

5775 REDO

cc: Vice President  
Chief of Staff

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter concerning recent developments in the cross-Strait relationship between Taipei and Beijing and U.S. policy toward China.

As you may know, we provided official notification of two Taiwan arms sales cases on July 30. I am grateful to you and your colleagues for working with us to accept these notifications before the August recess. Be assured that the

Administration is not delaying or suspending any arms sales notifications to Congress.

I appreciate the strength of your convictions regarding the proper course of U.S.-China relations. We will continue to promote broad U.S. interests in the region while at the same time helping our friends in Taiwan prosper. Taiwan could not have accomplished so much over the past two decades if not for the success of our "one China" framework in creating a stable and secure environment. We intend to maintain our "one China" policy, make clear our abiding interest in peaceful resolution of differences between Chinese on both sides of the Taiwan Strait, and encourage Taipei and Beijing to sustain cross-Strait dialogue.

Thank you again for sharing your views. This is clearly an issue that the Administration will continue to watch with high priority.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse A. Helms  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

## Exchange Mail

**DATE-TIME** 8/2/99 4:40:41 PM  
**FROM** Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** FW: Package 5775 Double Red Dot [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Bartlett, L. June (EXSEC)  
Dejban, Donna D. (NSA)  
Hilliard, Brenda I. (EXSEC)  
Joshi, M. Kay (EXSEC)  
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)  
Snip, Sarah E. (EXSEC/INTERN)  
Wasserman, Elaine P. (EXSEC)

**CARBON\_COPY**

**TEXT\_BODY** Taken care of

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

From: Keith, James R.  
(ASIA)

Sent: Monday, August 02, 1999 11:47 AM

To: @EXECSEC -

Executive Secretary; Crocker, Bathsheba N. (NSA); @APNSA

Cc: @LEGAL

- Legal Advisor; @ASIA - Asian Affairs; @RUDMAN

Subject: Package

5775 Double Red Dot [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Back to you

with changes in tracking as requested, cleared by Leg, Legal and Rudman clearance pending. Will send hard copy of previous version and disk with changes incorporated below back to you. Given that you wanted the changes in tracking, am I right to assume that you do not want a new hard copy of the package?

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

5775 to srb REDO.doc

August 2, 1999

## ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: KENNETH LIEBERTHAL

FROM: JAMES KEITH

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on  
Taiwan Arms Sales  
Notifications

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a response to Senator Helms, Lott, and other Members. It is urgent because Helms and Torrecelli are co-sponsoring the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, which is gathering momentum in Congress. The House version is expected to be marked up by the HIRC on Thursday, August 5..

On Tuesday, July 27 we provided informal notification to Congress on the two arms sales cases that have attracted Helms' attention. (We received Helms' letter Wednesday, July 28.) We provided formal notification this afternoon, Friday, July 30.

We were informed July 29 of a third notification for sale of a radar detector for CH-47 helicopters to Taiwan. This third case is an amendment to a previous arms sales case, notified last fall. Its value is small, a total of \$3 million. The case is in the "pre-consultation" phase with Congress. This one additional case will likely be ready for notification this week, before Congress goes out.

Concurrence by: Miles Lackey, Joe Bouchard, Mara Rudman

## RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I.

Attachments  
Tab I Memorandum to the President

Tab A Response to Senator Helms et al  
Tab B Incoming Correspondence  
2

5775 REDO

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 5775 srb~potus REDO.doc

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER  
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and Other Members on  
Taiwan Arms Sales

Purpose

Respond to Senator Helms' letter complaining about pressure on  
Taiwan in the wake  
of President Lee Teng-hui's July 9 statement.

Background

Senators Helms, Lott, and 24 other Members wrote to complain about  
alleged  
postponement of arms sales notifications to Taiwan and to press the  
Administration not to take punitive measures against Taiwan. The  
letter also  
expresses dismay that we appear to be engaged in a "verbal tilt"  
toward Beijing's  
view of "one China" in the imbroglio that has developed since Lee  
Teng-hui  
disrupted the status quo on July 9.

Lee's statement surfaced just as we were in the process of notifying  
Congress  
about two upcoming arms sales to Taiwan. We provided informal  
notification to

Congress on those cases this week, before receipt of Helms' letter. In cooperation with Congress we arranged to provide formal notification on Friday, July 30 and will notify Congress of a third, much smaller arms sale this week.

Your response informs the Senators that, contrary to the concerns expressed in their letter, we are not delaying or suspending arms sales to Taiwan. It affirms that the current framework for U.S.-Beijing-Taipei relations is working to protect and promote not only U.S. but also Taiwan interests.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter at Tab A.

#### Attachments

Tab A Response to Senators Helms, Lott, and others  
Tab B Incoming Correspondence

2

5775 REDO

cc: Vice President  
Chief of Staff

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT** 5775 potus~helms REDO.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter concerning recent developments in the cross-Strait relationship between Taipei and Beijing and U.S. policy toward China.

As you may know, we provided official notification of two Taiwan

arms sales cases  
on July 30. I am grateful to you and your colleagues for working with  
us to  
accept these notifications before the August recess. Be assured that the

Administration is not delaying or suspending any arms sales  
notifications to  
Congress.

I appreciate the strength of your convictions regarding the proper  
course of  
U.S.-China relations. We will continue to promote broad U.S.  
interests in the  
region while at the same time helping our friends in Taiwan prosper.  
Taiwan  
could not have accomplished so much over the past two decades if not  
for the  
success of our "one China" framework in creating a stable and secure  
environment.  
We intend to maintain our "one China" policy, make clear our abiding  
interest in  
peaceful resolution of differences between Chinese on both sides of  
the Taiwan  
Strait, and encourage Taipei and Beijing to sustain cross-Strait  
dialogue.

Thank you again for sharing your views. This is clearly an issue that  
the  
Administration will continue to watch with high priority.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse A. Helms  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

# Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

## Clinton Library

| DOCUMENT NO.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                                                                                    | DATE       | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 001. email               | Fulton Armstrong to Antony Blinken, Sue Bremner, Stephen Flanagan<br>et al. Subject: FW: Helms-Burton/ (6 pages) | 08/12/1999 | P1/b(1)     |

### COLLECTION:

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

### FOLDER TITLE:

[06/21/1999-10/28/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5709

### 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.<br>AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                                                 | DATE       | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| 002. email               | Mara Rudman to Fulton Armstrong. Subject: RE: Update: Helms-Burton/ (3 pages) | 08/12/1999 | P1/b(1)     |

### COLLECTION:

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

### FOLDER TITLE:

[06/21/1999-10/28/1999]

2006-1363-F

vz5709

### 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** 8/30/99 12:01:23 PM  
**FROM** Fallin, James (PRESS)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** FW: CTBT Q/A Package [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Barnett, Cheryl E. (RUE)  
Elkind, Jonathan H. (RUE)  
Harris, Cody S. (RUE/INTERN)  
Kaufman, Stuart J. (RUE)  
Pascual, Carlos E. (RUE)  
Segal, Jack D. (RUE)  
Silva, Mary Ann T. (RUE)  
Tedstrom, John E. (RUE)  
Weiss, Andrew S. (RUE)

**CARBON\_COPY** Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Bell, Robert G. (DEFENSE)  
Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE)  
Bouchard, Joseph F. (DEFENSE)  
Brackman, Stella S. (DEFENSE)  
Kelly, Sandra L. (DEFENSE)  
Mitchell, Rebecca (Julie) J. (NSA)  
Mulligan, George D. (DEFENSE)  
Peterman, David (Brian) (DEFENSE)  
Pimentel, Betsy J. (DEFENSE)  
Witkowsky, Anne A.  
Fallin, James (PRESS)  
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)  
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)  
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)  
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)  
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

**TEXT\_BODY** FOR ANDREASEN: Steve, STATE briefing at 1300 today. They are looking for our latest guidance on CTBT (see below) and START II/STARTIII numbers.

FOR RUSSIA: FYI, STATE intends to use last week's guidance in Russia/VP. Any additional thoughts.

Jim

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

From: Wozniak,  
Natalie S. (PRESS)  
Sent: Monday, August 30, 1999 11:55 AM  
To: Fallin,  
James (PRESS)  
Cc: Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)  
Subject: FW: CTBT  
Q/A Package [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

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

From: Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Sent: Tuesday,  
July 20, 1999 3:03 PM  
To: @PRESS - Public Affairs; @DEFENSE - Defense  
Policy; @RUDMAN; @NONPRO - Export Controls; @LEGISLAT -  
Legislative  
Affairs  
Subject: CTBT Q/A Package [UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

Colleagues

--

Somewhat revised and extended from this morning ... comments  
and suggested additional q/a's welcome ... will update throughout  
the course of the day, if needed.

Steve

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

CTBT July 20 press guidance.doc  
COMPEHENSIVE NUCLEAR  
TEST BAN TREATY  
JULY 20, 1999

CONTEXT: On Tuesday (July 20), President Clinton made a  
statement calling for the  
Senate to give its advice and consent to the Comprehensive Nuclear  
Test Ban  
(CTBT) Treaty. A bipartisan group of nine Senators is scheduled to  
hold a press  
conference this afternoon in support of Senate action on CTBT.  
President Clinton

was the first world leader to sign the CTBT in September, 1996; 152 nations have now signed, and 41 have ratified. The Treaty was sent to the Senate for approval in September, 1997 - almost two years ago - but is still pending a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Chairman Helms has said he will not schedule hearings on the CTBT until the Administration submits the Kyoto Protocol and 1997 agreements on the ABM Treaty to his committee for advice and consent.

## POLICY

- \* U.S. is committed to the early entry into force of the CTBT.

- \* In his July 20 statement, the President said that "at a minimum, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings this fall" to allow each side to make its case and allow the Senate to decide this matter on the merits.

Why is the Administration making a big push on this treaty now?

- \* The President said again today that ending nuclear testing was one of his top foreign policy goals, since the beginning of his administration. The President signed the Treaty in September '96 and listed it in the State of the Union as important to our national security interests.

- \* Treaty's importance has recently been highlighted by fighting in Kashmir, where tensions between two states with nuclear weapons capabilities rose, threatening our interests.

- \* Concerns over nuclear espionage have led many to draw the right conclusion that this Treaty can constrain states from developing advanced nuclear weapons capabilities.

- \* A conference of states that have ratified the Treaty will take place this October if the Treaty has not entered into force; for America to be a full participant at that conference, and we need to ratify ourselves.

\* Finally, the American public overwhelmingly supports ratification.

What about Senator Helms' demand that you first submit the Kyoto Treaty and certain ABM and START-related accords?

\* We have made our position on Kyoto clear: we will not submit that Treaty until developing nations have agreed to meaningful participation in this important environmental regime.

\* With respect to the ABM agreements, the President has made clear that he will submit that package as soon as the Russian Duma ratifies the START II Treaty, a goal to which President Yeltsin recommitted himself earlier this month.

\* The Senate should consider CTBT on its own and on its merits.

What will happen if the Treaty remains stalled in the Foreign Relations Committee?

\* The U.S. leadership role in the world on arms control and nonproliferation issues will be weakened, and we will miss an opportunity to enhance our own national security.

Are you confident we can maintain a reliable nuclear deterrent absent actual nuclear tests?

\* Yes.

\* The Secretaries of Defense and Energy - supported by the Directors of the National Weapons Laboratories, the Commander in Chief, United States Strategic Command, and the Nuclear Weapons Council - have certified for the past three years that nuclear tests are not required, and that our program of stockpile stewardship is working to maintain our deterrent in the absence of nuclear testing.

Some say that the Cox report shows that you should actually be developing new nuclear weapons to stay ahead of proliferators.

\* Believe the concerns over nuclear espionage discussed in the Cox report have led many to draw the right conclusion that the CTBT can constrain states such as China and others from developing more advanced nuclear weapons capabilities.

\* The report itself notes that testing in violation of the CTBT could further accelerate China's nuclear development. Thus, it is in our interest to bring CTBT, which China has signed, but not ratified, into force.

\* More broadly, the United States today maintains a nuclear deterrent second to none; CTBT, combined with our stockpile stewardship program, will preserve, not preclude, our maintaining this position.

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 9/10/99 8:24:12 PM  
**FROM** Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Dorgan-Lott Exchange on CTBT; Dorgan-Specter Op Ed [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Andreassen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Bell, Robert G. (DEFENSE)  
Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE)  
Rudman, Mara E. (NSA)  
Crocker, Bathsheba N. (NSA)  
Sutphen, Mona K. (NSA)  
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)  
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)  
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)  
Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)

**CARBON\_COPY** Andreassen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Bell, Robert G. (DEFENSE)  
Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE)  
Bouchard, Joseph F. (DEFENSE)  
Brackman, Stella S. (DEFENSE)  
Kelly, Sandra L. (DEFENSE)  
Mitchell, Rebecca (Julie) J. (NSA)  
Mulligan, George D. (DEFENSE)  
Peterman, David (Brian) (DEFENSE)  
Pimentel, Betsy J. (DEFENSE)  
Witkowsky, Anne A. (DEFENSE)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)

**TEXT\_BODY** yes I saw it -- Lott even mentioned his phone call with Sandy during the exchange.

On a less encouraging note, Biden is reported in today's CQ as follows: "... Biden told a group of reporters that his colleagues may not resort to filibustering other legislation in order to bring up the test ban. He said democrats are concerned such a move might chew up valuable end-of-session floor time on their other valuable priorities, such as health care."

-----Original

Message-----

From: Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)

Sent: Friday,

September 10, 1999 7:38 PM

To: Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Bell,

Robert G. (DEFENSE); Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE);

Rudman, Mara E. (NSA); Crocker, Bathsheba N. (NSA); Sutphen, Mona

K. (NSA); Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS); Leavy, David C. (PRESS); Gobush,

Matthew N. (PRESS); Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)

Cc: @DEFENSE -

Defense Policy

Subject: Dorgan-Lott Exchange on CTBT; Dorgan-Specter

Op Ed [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Colleagues --

In case

you missed it this morning (and I did), Senators Lott and Dorgan had an exchange on the Senate floor this morning on CTBT. Dorgan inquired as to when the Senate might schedule CTBT for consideration. Lott replied that he would discuss the matter with Helms next week and have a reply for Dorgan then. Dorgan stated it was his interpretation that Lott had agreed to encourage Senator Helms to hold hearings on CTBT. Lott -- I'm told -- also made reference to the possibility of Schlesinger testifying against the Treaty, and waved the Krauthammer piece. Miles: we need to talk.

FYI -- USA Today will run an

Op Ed on Monday from Senators Dorgan and Specter, including a chart with the latest polling numbers from Melman. I also understand that Grass Roots groups plan to rally on the capitol steps.

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 9/12/99 3:53:32 PM  
**FROM** Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Dorgan-Lott Exchange on CTBT; Dorgan-Specter Op Ed [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

Biden's comments do not surprise me. There is some bluffing going on. Hans

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

From: Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

Sent: Friday, September 10, 1999 8:24 PM

To: Andreasen, Steven

P. (DEFENSE); Bell, Robert G. (DEFENSE); Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE); Rudman, Mara E. (NSA); Crocker, Bathsheba N. (NSA); Sutphen, Mona K. (NSA); Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS); Leavy, David C. (PRESS); Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS); Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)

Cc: @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs

Subject: RE: Dorgan-Lott Exchange on CTBT; Dorgan-Specter Op Ed [UNCLASSIFIED]

yes I saw it -- Lott even mentioned his phone call with Sandy during the exchange.

On a less encouraging note,  
Biden is reported in today's CQ as follows: "... Biden told a group of reporters that his colleagues may not resort to filibustering other legislation in order to bring up the test ban. He said democrats are concerned such a move might chew up valuable end-of-session floor time on their other valuable priorities, such as health care."

-----Original

Message-----

From: Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)

Sent: Friday,

September 10, 1999 7:38 PM

To: Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS); Bell,

Robert G. (DEFENSE); Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE);

Rudman, Mara E. (NSA); Crocker, Bathsheba N. (NSA); Sutphen, Mona K. (NSA); Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS); Leavy, David C. (PRESS); Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS); Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)

Cc: @DEFENSE -

Defense Policy

Subject: Dorgan-Lott Exchange on CTBT; Dorgan-Specter

Op Ed [UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Colleagues --

In case

you missed it this morning (and I did), Senators Lott and Dorgan had an exchange on the Senate floor this morning on CTBT. Dorgan inquired as to when the Senate might schedule CTBT for consideration. Lott replied that he would discuss the matter with Helms next week and have a reply for Dorgan then. Dorgan stated it was his interpretation that Lott had agreed to encourage Senator Helms to hold hearings on CTBT. Lott -- I'm told -- also made reference to the possibility of Schlesinger testifying against the Treaty, and waved the Krauthammer piece. Miles: we need to talk.

FYI -- USA Today will run an

Op Ed on Monday from Senators Dorgan and Specter, including a chart with the latest polling numbers from Melman. I also understand that Grass Roots groups plan to rally on the capitol steps.

## Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 9/20/99 10:00:25 AM  
**FROM** Keith, James R. (ASIA)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** FW: Response to Helms on POTUS Meeting with Jiang in Auckland  
[UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)

**CARBON\_COPY**

**TEXT\_BODY** Lackey has cleared. Would you please put this package in final?  
I'll sign for JP, who is in New York for most of the day today.  
Thanks, Jim

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

From: Keith, James R.  
(ASIA)

Sent: Friday, September 17, 1999 5:06 PM

To: Lackey, Miles

M. (LEGIS); @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs

Subject: Response to

Helms on POTUS Meeting with Jiang in Auckland

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

for  
your review and comment:

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

6702 jk~srb.doc

September 20, 1999

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL BERGER

THROUGH: JACK PRITCHARD, ACTING

FROM: JAMES KEITH

SUBJECT: Response to Senator Helms Concerning POTUS' Meeting

with Chinese  
President Jiang Zemin

Attached at Tab I is a memorandum to the President covering a response to Senator Helms regarding the President's meeting with Chinese President Jiang Zemin in Auckland.

The NSC received the incoming correspondence on 10 September 1999.

Concurrence by: Miles Lackey

#### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum to the President at Tab I.

Attachments  
Tab I Memorandum to the President  
Tab A Response to Senator Helms  
Tab B Incoming Correspondence  
1

6702

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 6702 srb~potus.doc

#### ACTION

#### MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: SAMUEL BERGER  
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Response to Senator Helms Concerning Your Meeting with Chinese President Jiang Zemin

### Purpose

Respond to Helms' letter urging you to avoid tilting toward Beijing during your meeting with Jiang in Auckland.

### Background

Senator Helms wrote to you to caution against advancing U.S.-China relations at the expense of Taiwan. Helms alleges that the Administration is already tilting toward Beijing and advocates a reversal of that alleged position by warning Jiang that any PRC use of force in the dispute with Taiwan will trigger U.S. intervention; that the Administration refrain from pressuring Taiwan to enter into negotiation with Beijing; that you avoid any kind of joint statement with Jiang in Auckland; and that you say nothing to Jiang on arms sales to Taiwan other than to restate the obligations of the Taiwan Relations Act.

Your response underlines broad agreement with Helm's main points; reiterates our commitment to "one China," and indicates that your discussion with Jiang was entirely consistent with the fundamental principles that guide our relations with the PRC and Taiwan.

### RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter to Helms at Tab A.

### Attachments

Tab A Letter to Senator Helms  
Tab B Incoming Correspondence

2

6702

cc: Vice President  
Chief of Staff

TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT 6702 potus~helms.doc

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter concerning my meeting with Chinese President Jiang in Auckland. You should rest assured that we are in broad agreement:

- \* Advances in U.S.-PRC relations will not come at Taiwan's expense.
- \* The United States must refrain from mediating issues that should be addressed directly by Taiwan and the People's Republic of China (PRC).
- \* There must be absolute clarity regarding the U.S. position that differences between Chinese on both sides of the Strait must be resolved peacefully and without outside pressure.
- \* Our legal obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act must be clearly and consistently implemented.

I am determined uphold these principles and to maintain our longstanding "one China" policy because it remains the best means to advance the interests of the American people in regional peace, stability, and increasing prosperity. I can assure you that everything I said to President Jiang in Auckland was consistent with the foregoing and with the additional fundamental principles that guide our ties with the PRC and Taiwan.

As always, I am grateful to you for your forthright insight and advice.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Jesse A. Helms  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 9/24/99 8:41:38 AM  
**FROM** Segal, Jack D. (RUE)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** "gameplan" [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Black, Steven K. (VP)

**CARBON\_COPY**

**TEXT\_BODY** I sent this around 9 days ago. Given the sensitivity of the Israel point, I really think a short meeting is in order. I note that Carlos has 9:45-10:00 with Leon. Any chance to squeeze this issue into that meeting? JS

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

091599 rev 4 lott-lieberman note for SRB\_.doc  
Note for SRB  
From Gary, Miles and Carlos  
(Leon concurs)

Subject: Next steps on Iran Missile Sanctions Legislation

The House version (HR1883) passed with a convincing 419-0 vote. It is not yet clear when the Senate will take up the Bill, and no formal legislation has been introduced. The draft Lott-Lieberman bill isn't much better than HR 1883, but could move quickly with a similar outcome.

We have agreed with the Israelis to conduct a review of Russian performance at the end of October. Our immediate goal should be to use the House legislation to create a sword of Damocles that could provide useful leverage with the Russians. In addition to alerting key figures in the Senate to the October review, we should solicit help from the Israelis to delay further action until after the review. We recommend that you or Leon contact Yatom. It would also be helpful to make a parallel request to AIPAC.

In the meantime, we should move on several fronts to follow-up on

POTUS and

Berger conversations with Putin at APEC. Key steps include:

- \* a VP letter to Putin calling for the Russians to use new export control tools and to take visible, effective actions against violators (week of September 20)
- \* follow-up meeting between Amb. Collins and Igor Sechin, Putin's chief of staff
- \* Collins contacts with FSB Director Patrushev, PA Chief Voloshin, Justice Minister
- \* contacts between COS Moscow and FSB about enforcement actions (COS and FSB don't talk, but they should!)
- \* visit to Moscow by Gallucci/Timbie/Segal (early- to mid-October)
- \* outreach to major U.S. companies that cooperate with Russian aerospace sector, urging complementary high-level contacts with Russian leadership.
- \* internal work to identify additional Russian entities that should be sanctioned under the E.O.

[defer to leg on the rest of this ...]

Our one hope for influencing this legislation is to get Senator Helms [or Lott??]

to agree to put the bill on "hold" as long as possible in this session.

We

would hope to persuade Helms that the current situation (unanimous House support,

but Senate action pending) gives us maximum leverage on the Russians. We would

deliver the message that they must seriously go after the Iran proliferation

problem and we would need to see unambiguous and comprehensive action against the

violators prior to the recess (late October). Absent such clear evidence of

progress, the Administration would withdraw its veto threat.



# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 10/4/99 5:43:45 PM  
**FROM** Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: CTBT hearings [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Andreassen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Andreassen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Binnendijk, Johannes A. (Hans) (DEFENSE)  
Bouchard, Joseph F. (DEFENSE)  
Brackman, Stella S. (DEFENSE)  
Kelly, Sandra L. (DEFENSE)  
Mitchell, Rebecca (Julie) J. (DEFENSE)  
Mulligan, George D. (DEFENSE)  
Peterman, David (Brian) (DEFENSE)  
Pimentel, Betsy J. (DEFENSE)  
Witkowsky, Anne A. (DEFENSE)  
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)  
Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)  
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)  
Rudman, Mara E. (NSA)  
Fallin, James (PRESS)  
Gobush, Matthew N. (PRESS)  
Hammer, Michael A. (PRESS)  
Huff, Lindsey E. (PRESS)  
Leavy, David C. (PRESS)  
Williams, Mary C. (ADMIN)  
Wozniak, Natalie S. (PRESS)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

He just said former Admin officials and arms control experts who oppose the treaty. Presumably minority will provide some witnesses on the other side.

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

From: Andreassen,  
Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Sent: Monday, October 04, 1999 5:41 PM  
To: Tavlarides,

Mark J. (LEGIS); @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @DEFENSE - Defense Policy; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs  
Subject: RE: CTBT hearings  
[UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

Do we know who the "others" are?

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

From: Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Sent: Monday,  
October 04, 1999 5:26 PM  
To: @LEGISLAT - Legislative Affairs; @DEFENSE  
- Defense Policy; @RUDMAN; @PRESS - Public Affairs  
Subject: CTBT  
hearings [UNCLASSIFIED]

Senator Helms just announced that SFRC  
will hold a CTBT hearing with MKA and others on Thursday.

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 10/6/99 9:39:48 AM  
**FROM** Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Press Briefing by John Holum, Ted Warner, Ernie Moniz and Bob Bell, The Briefing Room, October 5, 1999 [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

yeah right

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

From: Burrell, Christina

L. (LEGIS)

Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 1999 9:31 AM

To: Gray,

Wendy E. (NSA)

Subject: RE: Press Briefing by John Holum, Ted Warner,  
Ernie Moniz and

Bob Bell, The Briefing Room, October 5, 1999 [UNCLASSIFIED]

So

now you are getting like Senator Helms and holding up those nominations.  
Feel the power!

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

From: Gray, Wendy

E. (NSA)

Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 1999 6:06 PM

To: Burrell,

Christina L. (LEGIS)

Subject: RE: Press Briefing by John Holum,  
Ted Warner, Ernie Moniz and

Bob Bell, The Briefing Room, October  
5, 1999 [UNCLASSIFIED]

I was only in to the first 5 minutes  
of work on this and I realized how hateful these are!!!! Haven't  
seen anything on Ralston but that could be because the package is  
still in this office

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

From: Burrell,  
Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 1999 4:56 PM  
To:  
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)  
Subject: RE: Press Briefing by John Holum,  
Ted Warner, Ernie Moniz and  
Bob Bell, The Briefing Room, October  
5, 1999 [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thank you--glad to see you got your old  
job back! I was looking on internet for Gen. Ralston nomination--do  
you see it?

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

From: Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)  
  
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 1999 4:55 PM  
To: @RELEASE - Press Release  
Subject:  
Press Briefing by John Holum, Ted Warner, Ernie Moniz and Bob  
Bell,  
The Briefing Room, October 5, 1999 [UNCLASSIFIED]

The document  
Press Briefing by John Holum, Ted Warner, Ernie Moniz and Bob Bell,  
The Briefing Room, October 5, 1999 has been posted to the Press Release  
Public Folder.

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 10/8/99 3:31:33 PM  
**FROM** Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Questions on CTBT "Side Agreements" [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

looks good to me

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

From: Andreasen,  
Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
Sent: Friday, October 08, 1999 3:18 PM  
To: @LEGISLAT  
- Legislative Affairs  
Subject: Questions on CTBT "Side Agreements"  
[UNCLASSIFIED]  
Importance: High

Miles -- for your comment. Steve.

PLEASE PASS TO SANDY ASAP. THANK YOU.

During testimony yesterday, our CTBT negotiator Steve Ledogar made reference to a "side agreement" among the Western Group of states relating to representation on the 51 member Executive Council. In effect, the Western Group agreed that three of its members -- the U.S., UK and France -- would always be represented on the Council. This agreement is documented in the negotiating record (i.e., an official cable) as well as an associated matrix.

Senator Helms followed up later in the day with a question to Secretary Albright asking if there were any side agreements associated with the Treaty. Albright -- believing the reference was to a confidential letter among the P-5 relating to the "zero yield" issue (whose substance was included in our article by article

analysis submitted to the Senate for advice and consent) -- noted there had been consultations among the P-5 on questions relating to the "scope" of the Treaty's prohibition, and said we would be happy to let the Senator review the results of those communications.

Chris

Williams on Senator Lott's staff has now called about the secret "side agreements." Holum has told Williams that we will be sending someone up this afternoon to brief him on both the Executive Council and Scope understandings. We are also preparing a package for the SFRC.

Steve/Miles

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 10/8/99 3:37:22 PM  
**FROM** Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** RE: Questions on CTBT "Side Agreements" [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)

**CARBON\_COPY****TEXT\_BODY**

Teri Lodge just called me to ask if we were prepared to hand the docs over ... heard that Lott was about to go to the floor to scream about "secret docs." Have you worked this out with Kay?

-----Original

Message-----

From: Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)

Sent: Friday, October

08, 1999 3:32 PM

To: Andreasen, Steven P. (DEFENSE); @LEGISLAT

- Legislative Affairs

Subject: RE: Questions on CTBT "Side Agreements"  
[UNCLASSIFIED]

looks good to me

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

From: Andreasen,

Steven P. (DEFENSE)

Sent: Friday, October 08, 1999 3:18 PM

To: @LEGISLAT

- Legislative Affairs

Subject: Questions on CTBT "Side Agreements"  
[UNCLASSIFIED]

Importance: High

Miles -- for your comment. Steve.

PLEASE PASS TO SANDY ASAP. THANK YOU.

During testimony yesterday, our CTBT negotiator Steve Ledogar made reference to a "side agreement" among the Western Group of states relating to representation on the 51 member Executive Council. In effect, the Western Group agreed that three of its members -- the U.S., UK and France -- would always be represented on the Council. This agreement is documented in the negotiating record (i.e., an official cable) as well as an associated matrix.

Senator Helms followed up later in the day with a question to Secretary Albright asking if there were any side agreements associated with the Treaty. Albright -- believing the reference was to a confidential letter among the P-5 relating to the "zero yield" issue (whose substance was included in our article by article analysis submitted to the Senate for advice and consent) -- noted there had been consultations among the P-5 on questions relating to the "scope" of the Treaty's prohibition, and said we would be happy to let the Senator review the results of those communications.

Chris

Williams on Senator Lott's staff has now called about the secret "side agreements." Holum has told Williams that we will be sending someone up this afternoon to brief him on both the Executive Council and Scope understandings. We are also preparing a package for the SFRC.

Steve/Miles

# Exchange Mail

---

**DATE-TIME** 10/28/99 10:48:45 AM  
**FROM** Busby, Scott W. (MULTI)  
**CLASSIFICATION** UNCLASSIFIED  
**SUBJECT** CEDAW guidance [UNCLASSIFIED]  
**TO** Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)  
Rudman, Mara E. (NSA)

**CARBON\_COPY** Allen, Charles A. (LEGAL)  
Baker, James E. (LEGAL)  
DeRosa, Mary B. (LEGAL)  
Hunerwadel, Joan S. (LEGAL)  
Krass, Caroline D. (LEGAL)  
Burrell, Christina L. (LEGIS)  
Lackey, Miles M. (LEGIS)  
Shapiro, Daniel B. (LEGIS)  
Tavlarides, Mark J. (LEGIS)  
Busby, Scott W. (MULTI)  
Feldman, Daniel F. (MULTI)  
Guarnieri, Valerie N. (MULTI)  
Hill, Roseanne M. (MULTI)  
Kale, Dora A. (MULTI)  
Naplan, Steven J. (MULTI)  
Schwartz, Eric P. (MULTI)  
Stromseth, Jane E. (MULTI)  
Vaccaro, Jonathan M. (Matt) (MULTI)  
Gray, Wendy E. (NSA)  
Matthews, Sonyia (ADMIN)  
Millison, Cathy L. (EXSEC)  
Rudman, Mara E. (NSA)

**TEXT\_BODY**

Please clear.

**TRANSLATED\_ATTACHMENT**

CEDAW guidance 10 28 99.doc  
CEDAW  
October 28, 1999

Context: Ten women Members of the House attempted to present

during a hearing on  
China a letter to Chairman Helms yesterday urging him to support the  
ratification  
of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against  
Women (CEDAW)  
(SEE-daw). Helms rebuffed them and had them removed from the  
hearing. Ann Lewis  
will be hosting a meeting this morning with these Members.

What is the Administration position on CEDAW?

\* As the President and Secretary of State have made clear on  
numerous occasions,  
we are deeply committed to the ratification of CEDAW. In fact, we  
have  
communicated to the Senate that CEDAW ratification is a high  
priority for the  
Administration - indeed, it is our top priority among human rights  
treaties still  
in need of the Senate's advice and consent.

\* We are one the few countries in the world that has not ratified  
CEDAW.  
Although ratification would not require changes to U.S. law, it would  
significantly enhance our efforts to advance the rights of women  
around the  
world.

What is the Administration doing to achieve ratification of CEDAW?

\* We continue to raise our support for CEDAW ratification at every  
appropriate  
opportunity.

\* We believe that Senator Helms should hold hearings on CEDAW to  
permit all views  
about the treaty to be heard.