

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:04-MAY-1993 19:18:00.00

SUBJECT: Media Advisory: Meeting with Operation Hope Troops

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN
UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (98877978,ABC Affil. News Serv) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:98877978\C:ABC AffIL. News SERv\U:WMA_2\\)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97361199,AP: Broadcast) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:97361199\C:AP: Broadcast\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (96283711,Bonneville Int'l) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:96283711\C:BONNeVille Int'L\U:WMA_2\\)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (98720378,CBS News Net) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:98720378\C:CBS News Net\U:WMA_2\\)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (94675610,Conus) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:94675610\C:Conus\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97370280,COX) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:97370280\C:COX\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (98953133,Fox) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:98953133\C:Fox\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97831270,H&C) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:97831270\C:H&C\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (94570409,Hearst) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:94570409\C:Hearst\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (817039125329,News Channel 8) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:817039125329\C:NEws ChanneL 8\U:WMA_2\\)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97833455,NBC) (TLXA1MAIL_\F:97833455\C:NBC\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97831132,Potomac) (TLXA1MAIL_F:97831132\C:Potomac\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (93311055,Reg Newspaper Assn) (TLXA1MAIL_F:93311055\C:REG NEWSpaper ASSN\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97371851,States News Service) (TLXA1MAIL_F:97371851\C:StATES NEws SerVICE\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (812142433489,USA Radio Network (TLXA1MAIL_F:812142433489\C:USA RADio NETWOrK\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (95016689,USIA) (TLXA1MAIL_F:95016689\C:USIA\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (98981237,Visnews) (TLXA1MAIL_F:98981237\C:Visnews\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (96284015,WNN) (TLXA1MAIL_F:96284015\C:WNN\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (93475020,Fisher Broadcasting) (TLXA1MAIL_F:93475020\C:FISHER BRoadcasTING\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (94566409,Test Test Test Test) (TLXA1MAIL_F:94566409\C:TEST TEST Test TEST\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97836724,Post\Newsweek) (TLXA1MAIL_F:97836724\C:POSt\Newsweek\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97287358,Channel One) (TLXA1MAIL_F:97287358\C:Channel One\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (96621814,Modell News) (TLXA1MAIL_F:96621814\C:Modell News\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (96286295,Washington Bureau) (TLXA1MAIL_F:96286295\C:WASHINGton BureAU\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97834489,Tribune 'B') (TLXA1MAIL_F:97834489\C:Tribune 'B'\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (93475017,Thompson News) (TLXA1MAIL_F:93475017\C:THOmpson News\U:WMA_2\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (98638028,DNC: Kelly Lees) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:98638028\C:DNC: Kelly Lees\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (98331445,AP: White House) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:98331445\C:AP: White House\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (98286472,AP: Washington) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:98286472\C:AP: Washington\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97831955,Donrey Media Group) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:97831955\C:DOnREY Media GrOUP\\)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
THE WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF MEDIA AFFAIRS

MEDIA ADVISORY

FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY
TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1993

CONTACT: JOSH SILVERMAN
202-

456-

7150

PRESIDENT MEETS WITH COMMANDER AND STAFF OF
OPERATION RESTORE HOPE

EVENT: President Clinton meets with members of the armed
forces humanitarian relief effort in Somalia.

DATE/TIME: Wednesday, May 5, 1993
9:45 a.m. - 10:45 a.m. EDT

LOCATION: The South Lawn

COVERAGE: OPEN PRESS.

PRESS WITHOUT PERMANENT WHITE HOUSE CREDENTIALS AND THOSE SEEKING
MORE EVENT INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT THE MEDIA AFFAIRS OFFICE AT
202-456-7150.

BACKGROUND:

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE (this is a partial list):

Chairman Powell
Secretary Aspin
General Johnston

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Kathleen L. O'Neill (ONEILL_K) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:04-MAY-1993 13:14:00.00

SUBJECT: Scheduling notes 5/4

TO: Melissa G. Banks (BANKS_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Susan Brophy (BROPHY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Paul R. Carey (CAREY_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ann M. Cattalini (CATTALINI_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara C. Chow (CHOW_B) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Nestor M. Davidson (DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Hancox (HANCOX_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: LeeAnn Inadomi (INADOMI_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jocelyn Jolley (JOLLEY_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Timothy J. Keating (KEATING_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Unice B. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_U) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lorraine C. Miller (MILLER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (RICCHETTI_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Margaret C. Sherry (SHERRY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Tracey E. Thornton (THORNTON_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan (TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Angelina G. Hinojosa (HINOJOSA_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (92240291,Mike, Heather, Goody) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:92240291\C:MIKe, HEATHer, GOODy\\)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_ROMAN
COMMENTS ON SCHEDULING MEETING, 5/4

- * Today: 10-11 am, Oval Office, Enterprise Zone conference call
 - 12 pm, drop by Sen Fulbright lunch (mess)
 - Health Care meeting may be off, no final word but it doesn't look like it's happening
 - 8 pm, leave for Congressional Dinner, VP will join him (not HRC or Tipper)
- * Wed: 9:45-10:45 am, Welcome back "Operation Restore Hope" troops from Somalia
 - 11-12 pm, Bipartisan Leadership mtg, Cabinet Room, members arriving 10:45 through NW gate, Stu is doing briefing (NOTE: Marcia has assured that HP will get 15 min in the am to brief BC before this mtg)
 - 12-1 pm, Sens Health Care lunch, Old Family Dining Room, Sgt at Arms vans arriving NW gate at 11:45, HRC AND VP STAFF NEED BRIEFING AS SOON AS IT IS COMPLETED!
 - 3:00 pm, DSCC Special Tour (contributors), potential BC drop by (NOT DEFINITE)
 - 4-4:30 pm, Nurse's Week Ceremony
 - 7:30 pm, Fulbright Dinner
 - 10:15 pm, Drop by Cinco de Mayo event, Center for Mex-Am Studies/NPR Reception for "Latino USA" at the Sequoia (Pena and Cisneros will be there as well)
- * Thurs: FYI - BROKAW IS HERE AND WE ARE TO ALL BE AWARE THAT THERE WILL BE CAMERAS AND REPORTERS WHERE THERE ARE USUALLY NOT....BE CAREFUL OUT THERE...
 - POTENTIAL - Prayer breakfast (not the one on the Hill, another smaller one) if so, he probably won't jog with the freshman (4) but Walley wants their blurbs anyway (KH is working on them)
 - 10:30-11:30 am, Export/Import Bank Conf speech at the JW Marriott
 - 12-1 pm, Repubs Health Care lunch, Old Family Dining Room, Sgt at Arms vans arriving NW gate at 11:45, HRC AND VP STAFF NEED BRIEFING AS SOON AS IT IS COMPLETED!
 - Photo-ops:
 - 4:00 Oval, Stan Musial - we may not invite anyone b/c it would be more members than invited guests...we're waiting to hear from Dawn on final size...SB said it's OK to not invite anyone
 - 4:10 Oval, Graduate of the Year, Glickman only member

invited, I will invite him and ask that he come to West Lobby at 4:00

- 4:30 Rose Garden, Air Force Academy Football, Sens Campbell and Brown, Reps. Hefley, Schroeder, Lancaster, Dicks will be invited (to Visitor's entrance btwn 4-4:15 pm)

* Fri: FYI - Rasmussen (PM, Denmark) and DeLors (Pres EC) here - working mtgs 10:30-2:30

- Health Care Mtg may be canceled

- Marine Corps Parade...where do we stand on invites to this???

Josh in Sched said that the Marine people will do it up for the ones we invite w/ special seats etc but they need to know how many we want to invite....PLEASE ADVISE!!

* NEXT WEEK: Mon - Small Business event, maybe off campus

- Wed - to NY

* Gore: Nothing new except next week travel, TN on Wed (1st time since election) and NY on Thurs (for Baseball Hall of Fame among other things...)

* HRC:

- Today she and Tipper are at the Sen spouse's lunch and she meets with Sen Labor cmte

- Wed HC lunch here, she will not be at the Nurse's week event...

- Thurs: Sen subcmte on Aging (Pryor), HC lunch here and meeting in the afternoon (5 pm) with Kassebaum, Burns, Danforth, McCurdy and Glickman (here)

Fri to Williamsburg for Business Council speech

- THEY WILL SPEND MOTHERS DAY HERE...

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:04-MAY-1993 18:09:00.00

SUBJECT: Public Schedule for May 5th, 1993

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN
UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN\62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release May 4, 1993

PUBLIC EVENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE FOR
WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1993

10:30 AM EDT THE PRESIDENT ADDRESS THE STAFF OF LT. GENERAL
ROBERT B. JOHNSTON, COMMANDER OF OPERATION RESTORE
HOPE, the South Lawn

OPEN PRESS

11:00 AM EDT THE PRESIDENT MEETS WITH CONGRESSIONAL BIPARTISAN
LEADERSHIP, the Cabinet Room

POOL PRESS

4:00 PM EDT THE PRESIDENT RECOGNIZES NATIONAL NURSES WEEK, the
Rose Garden

OPEN PHOTO, WRITING POOL

7:45 PM EDT THE PRESIDENT ATTENDS A TRIBUTE TO SEN. J. WILLIAM
FULBRIGHT, ANA Hotel

POOL PRESS

9:45 PM EDT THE PRESIDENT ATTENDS "LATINO USA" RECEPTION ON
THE OCCASION OF CINCO DE MAYO, Sequioas Restaurant

POOL PRESS

UPCOMING EVENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S

SCHEDULE

Friday, May 7 The President meets with EC
President Jacques Delores

Saturday, May 8 The President Delivers Weekly
Radio Address to the Nation

July 7 -

9 The President Attends the
Annual G-

7 Economic Summit,
Tokyo, Japan
###

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: David Leavy (LEAVY_D) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-JUN-1993 15:41:00.00

SUBJECT: Message to Congress on Somalia

TO: Ricki Seidman (SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Keith Boykin (BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ken Chitester (CHITESTER_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jason Solomon (SOLOMON_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Boorstin (BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Waldman (WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne Walker (WALKER_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Meeghan E. Prunty (PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Carter Wilkie (WILKIE_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eric Berman (BERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly Tilley (TILLEY_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Caputo (CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marla Romash (ROMASH_M) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Dreyer (DREYER_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan M. Prince (PRINCE_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: S. Collier Andress (ANDRESS_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Kennedy at PROFS (PR_U=SKENNEDY@PR_L=CPUB@MRP@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Heather Beckel (BECKEL_H) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: WHITE HOUSE NATIONAL SERVICE (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill (ONEILL_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: G. N. Lattimore (LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Paul R. Carey (CAREY_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Laurie L. Labuda (LABUDA_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Rabinowitz (RABINOWITZ_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: David Seldin (SELDIN_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Debra D. Bird (BIRD_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly M. Baker (BAKER_BM) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Dee Dee Myers (MYERS_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven A. Cohen (COHEN_SA) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeremy Gaines READ: UNKNOWN	(GAINES_J)(WHO)
TO: Nancy L. Ward READ: UNKNOWN	(WARD_N)(WHO)
TO: Chad H. Griffin READ: UNKNOWN	(GRIFFIN_C)(WHO)
TO: Jeffrey L. Eller READ: UNKNOWN	(ELLER_J)(WHO)
TO: Jonathan P. Gill READ: UNKNOWN	(GILL_J)(WHO)
TO: Margaret A. Offit READ: UNKNOWN	(OFFIT_M)(WHO)
TO: Ernest D. Gibble READ: UNKNOWN	(GIBBLE_E)(WHO)
TO: Lavora R. Barnes READ: UNKNOWN	(BARNES_L)(WHO)
TO: Lisa Mortman READ: UNKNOWN	(MORTMAN_L)(WHO)
TO: Patricia A. Enright READ: UNKNOWN	(ENRIGHT_P)(WHO)
TO: Janis F. Kearney READ: UNKNOWN	(KEARNEY_J)(WHO)
TO: Maria M. Tio READ: UNKNOWN	(TIO_M)(WHO)
TO: Joshua N. Silverman READ: UNKNOWN	(SILVERMAN_J)(WHO)
TO: Richard Strauss READ: UNKNOWN	(STRAUSS_R)(WHO)
TO: C. Patricia Cogdell READ: UNKNOWN	(COGDELL_C)(WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L)(WHO)
TO: Margaret A. Williams READ: UNKNOWN	(WILLIAMS_MA)(WHO)
TO: Evelyn Lieberman READ: UNKNOWN	(LIEBERMAN_E)(WHO)

TO: Melanne Verveer READ: UNKNOWN	(VERVEER_M) (WHO)
TO: Karen Finney READ: UNKNOWN	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Anne Walley READ: UNKNOWN	(WALLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Stephanie Streett READ: UNKNOWN	(STREETT_S) (WHO)
TO: Isabelle R. Tapia READ: UNKNOWN	(TAPIA_I) (WHO)
TO: Patti Solis READ: UNKNOWN	(SOLIS_P) (WHO)
TO: Marcia Hale READ: UNKNOWN	(HALE_M) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Hancox READ: UNKNOWN	(HANCOX_K) (WHO)
TO: Steve Ricchetti READ: UNKNOWN	(RICCHETTI_S) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine C. Miller READ: UNKNOWN	(MILLER_L) (WHO)
TO: Barbara C. Chow READ: UNKNOWN	(CHOW_B) (WHO)
TO: Unice B. Lieberman READ: UNKNOWN	(LIEBERMAN_U) (WHO)
TO: Ann M. Cattalini READ: UNKNOWN	(CATTALINI_A) (WHO)
TO: Cathleen L. O'Neil READ: UNKNOWN	(ONEIL_C) (WHO)
TO: Nestor M. Davidson READ: UNKNOWN	(DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan READ: UNKNOWN	(TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ: UNKNOWN	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Regina Montoya READ: UNKNOWN	(MONTOYA_R) (WHO)

TO: Jeff Watson READ: UNKNOWN	(WATSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Loretta Avent READ: UNKNOWN	(AVENT_L) (WHO)
TO: Alexis Herman READ: UNKNOWN	(HERMAN_A) (WHO)
TO: Doris Matsui READ: UNKNOWN	(MATSUI_D) (WHO)
TO: Mike Lux READ: UNKNOWN	(LUX_M) (WHO)
TO: Amy Zisook READ: UNKNOWN	(ZISOOK_A) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ: UNKNOWN	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Joan Baggett READ: UNKNOWN	(BAGGETT_J) (WHO)
TO: Carolyn Huber READ: UNKNOWN	(HUBER_C) (WHO)
TO: Stephen B. Silverman READ: UNKNOWN	(SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
TO: Joshua A. King READ: UNKNOWN	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ: UNKNOWN	(VOLES_L) (WHO)
TO: Remote Addressee READ: UNKNOWN	(ARACELI RUANO@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
TO: Ethan J. Zindler READ: UNKNOWN	(ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
TO: Anne M. Edwards READ: UNKNOWN	(EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
TO: Arthur L. Jones READ: UNKNOWN	(JONES_A) (WHO)
TO: Steve Rabinowitz READ: UNKNOWN	(RABINOWITZ_S) (WHO)
TO: Ilizabeth S. Gonchar READ: UNKNOWN	(GONCHAR_I) (WHO)

TO: Kathleen M. Neugold (NEUGOLD_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: John Podesta (PODESTA_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 10, 1993

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT
TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

June 10, 1993

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

On December 10, 1992, President Bush reported to the Congress that U.S. Armed Forces had been deployed to Somalia to assist the United Nations effort to deal with the human catastrophe in that country, to avert related threats to international peace and security, and to protect the safety of Americans and others engaged in relief operations. This action was part of a multilateral response to U.N. Security Council Resolution 794, which authorized Member States, under Chapter VII of the U.N.

Charter, to use all necessary means to establish a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.

Since that time, my Administration and its predecessor have endeavored, through briefings and other means, to keep you informed about the progress of U.S. efforts in Somalia. I am providing this further report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, in light of the passage of 6 months since President Bush's initial report on the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces to Somalia.

As you are aware, the U.S.-led operation, known as Operation Restore Hope, was responsible for stemming the tragic situation and saving many lives by ensuring that desperately needed relief efforts in behalf of the civilian population could proceed.

Owing in large measure to the success of the U.S.-led Unified Task Force in Somalia (UNITAF), the responsibility for the continuing operation was transferred in an orderly fashion to the operational control of the U.N. Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II) on May 4, 1993, pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 814. This Resolution similarly invoked Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter and endowed UNOSOM II with the right to use force to ensure that the mandate is implemented.

The United States continues to support U.N. efforts in Somalia by providing approximately 3,000 U.S. logistics and other

support personnel under the operational control of UNOSOM II. In addition, approximately 1,100 U.S. troops remain in the area as a Quick Reaction Force (QRF), under the operational control of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command, for use in emergency situations. The UNOSOM II deputy commander, a U.S. Army general who is the U.S. contingent commander, is authorized to send the QRF into action as may be necessary. On June 5, 1993, UNOSOM II forces operating in Mogadishu encountered attacks instigated by one of Somalia's factional leaders, resulting in the deaths of 23 Pakistani military more

(OVER)

2

personnel. Three U.S. military personnel assigned to UNOSOM II sustained minor injuries. As envisioned in response to such situations, the QRF was called upon to assist in quelling the violence against the lawful activities of UNOSOM II in implementing the U.N. mandate. On June 6, 1993, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 837, reaffirming the authority of UNOSOM II to take all necessary measures against those responsible for these armed attacks.

Our forces will remain equipped and prepared to accomplish their humanitarian mission and defend themselves, if necessary; they also will be provided such additional U.S. support as may be necessary to ensure their safety and the accomplishment of their mission.

I have continued the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces to Somalia pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive and in accordance with applicable treaties and laws. This deployment is consistent with S.J. Res. 45, as adopted by the Senate on February 4, 1993, and as modified and adopted by the House on May 25, 1993.

Effective U.S. foreign policy requires close cooperation between the President and the Congress, and this imperative is particularly important regarding issues surrounding the use of our Nation's Armed Forces. I remain committed to ensuring that the Congress is kept fully informed on these matters and that the public good is served through constructive discussions and cooperation between our two branches.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

###

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 17-JUN-1993 21:19:00.00

SUBJECT: The President's Press Conference 6.17.93

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Christian M. Baldia (BALDIA_C) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Handal (HANDAL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822\JGILL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Liz Bowyer (BOWYER_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Alan J. Stone (STONE_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas O. Levenberg (LEVENBERG_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=WESTERN
UNION@3=@5=EASYLINK@*ELN62955104@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=COMPUSERVE@3=CSMAIL@*ID\73030,21@MRX@EOPMRX)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JACK BELCHER@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (BULLETIN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (MATT GELMAN@1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=HOUSE@MRX@EOPMRX)
(DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\WH-OUTBOX-DISTR(A)LEX-LUTHOR.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JCMA(A)REAGAN.AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\HES(A)AI.MIT.EDU@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (ALEXIS
BYRNE@1=US@2=ATTMAIL@3=GOV+USDA.SIES@5=SIESNET@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\JPOLEY(A)ESUSDA.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\DLYTEL(A)NSF.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Mortman (MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ernest D. Gible (GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia A. Enright (ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard Strauss (STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Maria M. Tio (TIO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Joshua N. Silverman (SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jess Sarmiento (SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Lavora R. Barnes READ: UNKNOWN	(BARNES_L) (WHO)
TO: C. Patricia Cogdell READ: UNKNOWN	(COGDELL_C) (WHO)
TO: Kimberly S. Hopper READ: UNKNOWN	(HOPPER_K) (WHO)
TO: Margaret C. Sherry READ: UNKNOWN	(SHERRY_M) (WHO)
TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein READ: UNKNOWN	(BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
TO: Carolyn Curiel READ: UNKNOWN	(CURIEL_C) (WHO)
TO: David B. Anderson READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
TO: Laura D. Schwartz READ: UNKNOWN	(SCHWARTZ_L) (WHO)
TO: Roy Neel READ: UNKNOWN	(NEEL_R) (VPO)
TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr READ: UNKNOWN	(MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
TO: Greg Simon READ: UNKNOWN	(SIMON_G) (VPO)
TO: Remote Addressee READ: UNKNOWN	(MARLA E. ROMASH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
TO: Leon Fuerth READ: UNKNOWN	(FUERTH_L) (VPO)
TO: Jack Quinn READ: UNKNOWN	(QUINN_J) (VPO)
TO: Katie McGinty READ: UNKNOWN	(MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
TO: Remote Addressee READ: UNKNOWN	(SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
TO: Kukis, Heidi READ: UNKNOWN	(HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
TO: Remote Addressee READ: UNKNOWN	(JIM KOHLENBERGER@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)

TO: Ulrich, Christopher R (CHRISTopHER R. ULRIcH@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ethan J. Zindler (ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (I=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-
822\KIM_WINN(A)SCC.SENATE.GOV@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release June 17, 1993

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT

The East Room

8:02 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, first I want to speak with you about a situation that all of us have followed very closely in the last week, and that is the United Nations' action in Somalia.

General Powell reported to me this afternoon that this operation is over and that it was a success. The United Nations, acting with the United States and other nations, has crippled the forces in Mogadishu of warlord Aideed, and remains on guard against further provocation. Aideed's forces were responsible for the worst attack on U.N. peacekeepers in three decades. We could not let it go unpunished.

Our objectives were clear: The U.N. sought to preserve the credibility of peacekeeping in Somalia and around the world, to get the food moving again, and to restore security. I want to congratulate the American and the United Nations' forces who took part in this operation. In this battle, heroism knew no flag. And in this era, our nation must and will continue to exert global leadership as we have done this week in Somalia.

Here at home, America is on the move. These past few days have been an impressive and important series of victories for the American people. Congress has taken major steps to limit the influence of special interest and their money in our lawmaking and in our campaigns. Congressional committees have also approved my plan for more college loans for the American people and to enable tens of thousands of them to pay their loans off by community service through

their states and nation.

But the most important thing I want to discuss is the progress that is being made, the remarkable progress, on the economic plan. Last month the House of Representatives passed the plan to reduce the deficit, the first step toward creating jobs and increasing incomes. Yesterday, the Senate Finance Committee cleared the way for action by the full Senate.

Make no mistake about it, this means that we are putting our economic house in order. Getting the economy back on track depends upon Congress passing this economic plan. It's necessary; it's fair; and it will work.

I propose, indeed, I have insisted upon \$500 billion in deficit reduction to be locked away in a deficit reduction trust fund. We will be making historic cuts in the deficit by making historic cuts first in government spending, then by making high-

income Americans pay their fair share so middle-

class Americans will be treated fairly in the tax burden, for a change.

Seventy-

five percent of the new taxes proposed fall on the top six percent of the American people -

-

those with incomes above \$100,000. Now, some of the critics of this plan in Congress prefer instead to cut Social Security or health care or tax benefits for elderly people just above the poverty line, or working people just above the poverty line so that the wealthy won't pay so much. I'm here tonight to say to you and to the American people that I will draw the line here. We have to reduce the deficit by reducing the unfairness of the tax patterns of the 1980s and, once again, asking all Americans to do what is right and fair. We can't simply balance the budget on the backs of the old, the sick, the veterans and those who work hard, but are just barely making ends meet. It's not right.

Let's look at what's at stake here. First of all, this chart shows that if we do nothing, the inherited deficit, what we found when I came into office, will go up by 1998 to about \$400 billion a year. If this deficit reduction plan is passed, we will cut \$500 billion out of the deficit. That's the difference in this line and that.

As all of you know, and as you've pointed out in various ways in the last few weeks, I just got here. And I may have a lot to learn, but I didn't create the red line. What I'm trying to do is to

change the red line and bring the yellow line in. And let me say, to get the yellow line down here, we have to bring about an affordable health care plan for every American. And that's the next big step.

But look what this deficit reduction plan alone will do. I want to emphasize once again, because there's been so much talk about taxes, that this is the most progressive tax plan this country has seen in decades. Two-

thirds of the money will be paid by people with incomes above \$200,000. Seventy percent of the economic gains of the last decade went to the top one percent of the American people. They are in a position now to pay more to help make this economy move again, and they will.

This is the monthly payment, if my full economic plan is passed, by people with incomes above \$200,000. And you can see what happens here to the plan with an actual modest break for people at the bottom end of the income scale. This is a very progressive and fair plan.

Now, finally, let me say there's been a lot of talk about spending cuts here. If you look at this plan, for every \$10 in deficit reduction, \$5, half of it, comes in spending cuts; \$3.75 of the \$10 comes in tax increases on the highest income Americans, the upper six percent; and \$1.25 comes in taxes from the middle class, people with incomes below \$100,000 but roughly above \$30,000. Families with incomes below \$30,000 are held harmless in this program.

Now, that's the way this program works. Five dollars in spending cuts, \$3.75 in taxes from the wealthiest Americans, \$1.25 in taxes from the middle class. It's fair and it's balanced. And I hope that the Congress will adopt it.

Let me say that as I open the floor to questions, the real issue here is whether we will reverse the pattern of the last 12 years where Presidents send budgets to Congress that are never seriously considered and everybody is afraid to talk about taxes because they're afraid, no matter what happens, that will dominate the agenda, nobody will know about spending cuts, nobody will know about deficit reduction, nobody will know about fairness. I've tried to tell the truth to the American people. And if this plan passes, you will see a continuation of what's happened already in the last five months. Low interest rates, increased housing sales, more jobs coming into the economy.

In the four first months of this economy alone we had a bigger growth in construction employment, 130,000 people, than we have had in nine years. Why? Because we're serious about bringing the deficit down. That's what this last week means. It means continued victory for the American people if we can stay on this road.

Q Since Vance-

Owen is dead, will the United States approve of a partition of Bosnia if the three factions meeting in Geneva actually approve it? And also, isn't NATO really obsolescent now? I mean, hasn't it outlived -

-
it can't stop the slaughter in Europe, it won't be the policeman in Europe?

THE PRESIDENT: There's two separate questions. First of all, as you know, my preference was for a multi-

ethnic state in Bosnia. But if the parties themselves, including the Bosnian government, agree -

-
genuinely and honestly agree to a different solution -

-
then the United States would have to look at it very seriously.

Secondly, I do not agree that NATO is dead. NATO was limited in what it could do in this instance because there was no agreement among the NATO partners, first of all, and because any organization of states was limited by the rules that the United Nations imposed in the former Yugoslavia -

-
on the arms embargo, for example.

The clearest example I know to give you that NATO is not dead was provided by the leaders of all the Eastern European countries that used to be communist that aren't anymore. When they came here a few weeks ago for the Holocaust dedication, every one of those Presidents said that their number one priority was to get into NATO. They know it will provide a security umbrella for the people who are members. And I think we need to continue to be involved in it.

Q Who's the enemy?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there will be different enemies. The enemy will be anybody that threatens the security and the peace of the member nations, the values that we hold important. There are

all kinds of possible problems in the years ahead, from terrorism, from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, from yet unforeseen developments in countries around NATO. So I don't think it's time to dismantle NATO. I think it's very, very important.

Q Mr. President, doesn't this plan for carving up Bosnia send a dangerous message to separatists around the world, particularly in the former Soviet Union, that military aggression pays?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that this plan shows that a civil war which has roots going back centuries -

-

literally centuries

-

-

based on ethnic and religious differences has not been resolved in the way that I certainly would have hoped. I think Serbian aggression has been rewarded to the extent that the United Nations resolution permitted the Serbs to send arms to the Bosnian Serbs and permitted the Croats that were next door to Croatia to have access to more weapons than the Bosnian government, predominantly Muslim, had. And I think that was a mistake. But I don't think that anybody should overlearn that lesson. Everyone who looks at this concedes that this is perhaps our most difficult foreign policy problem.

Q Mr. President, getting back to your pie chart, you said that a \$1.25 from the tax increase will hurt the middle class. During the campaign -

-

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think it will hurt the middle class. I think that it will help the middle class because it will be a way of bringing the deficit down.

Q A dollar and a quarter out of that tax bite will hit the middle class. In the PBS debate during the campaign, you said the only thing Paul Tsongas has recommended that I haven't is a three-

to five-

cent-

a-

year gas tax increase, and I'll be darned if I

understand why we should do that without giving some offsetting tax relief. Then, in Putting People First, which was your campaign manifesto, you said you opposed a federal excise gas tax -

-

I quote
-- "instead of a back-

breaking federal gas tax, we should try
conservation."

Why are you now willing to go along with the Senate plan to keep it moving through the Senate for a gasoline tax? Do you think you can defeat it in conference, and if you do, will you try to restore the Btu tax, as your Budget Director suggested today? And if so, won't you then lose Senators Boren and Breaux and all the other opponents when it gets back to the Senate? Isn't it a no-

win
situation?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I think it is a win-

win
situation if the Senate passes a budget that has \$500 billion in deficit reduction, locks the spending cuts away in a trust fund, and asks the highest-

income Americans to pay their fair share. I think
that's a win-

win situation because I think we'll go to conference and we'll get a plan that will meet those criteria and will also be fairer to middle-

class people and to the working poor. There's also a lot of important provisions in there that I care about that will help to encourage people to move from welfare to work.

The Senate bill is very different. It does have a 4.3 percent fuel tax in it. That is very different from \$.03 a year which is \$.15 over five years; or \$.05 cents a year, which is \$.25 over five years. A 4.3 percent tax flat is not nearly as onerous as that. I wish we didn't have to do that. But I would remind you that after the election and before I took office the aggregate deficit over the next five years was written up by \$165 billion. I'm doing the best I can to use very conservative, hard-

headed revenue
estimates to get the deficit down, keep interest rates down, so that people in the middle class can save more money than they'll pay if they refinance a car loan or a home loan or take out a business loan with lower interest rates.

And tonight, there will be millions of people who will either watch us or hear about this tomorrow who have refinanced their homes just since November -

-

with interest rates dropping, they'll save more money in one year than they'll pay in five years under this program. So I still think, on balance, it is the right thing to do.

Q You say this Somalia operation has been a success. Does that mean that the United States and U.N. forces have captured the Somalia warlord, General Mohamed Farah Aideed, and his associates including Colonel Omar Jess? And if you haven't captured them, what are you planning on doing with them if you do capture them? Are they going to be put on war crimes tribunal or anything like that?

THE PRESIDENT: No, they have not been arrested. The purpose of the operation was to undermine the capacity of Aideed to wreak military havoc in Mogadishu. He murdered 23 U.N. peacekeepers. And I would remind you that before the United States and the United Nations showed up, he was responsible for the deaths of countless Somalis -

-

from starvation, from disease, and from killing.

The back -

-

the military back of Aideed has been broken. A warrant has been issued for his arrest. If he is, in fact, arrested, then the United Nations will have to determine what appropriate action to take. That is the decision the United States is leaving to the United Nations, and one I believe we should.

Q Mr. President, the original deadline for the unveiling of your -

-

THE PRESIDENT: I'm sorry, that's a great tie. I just lost it for a moment there. (Laughter.) I wish the American people could see this tie. (Laughter.) Go ahead. I'm sorry.

Q Some people believe that that's what the White House press corps is all about, Mr. President, Mickey Mouse. (Laughter.)

The original deadline for your -

-
the unveiling of your health care reform plan has come and gone. When will the plan be unveiled? What are the prospects for congressional passage this year? And if you don't get it done this year, won't it be very difficult to do so next year because of the congressional elections?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me answer the first question. The task force has made its report to me. They have given me a number of options from which I must choose before I can finalize a bill. The White House is continuing to consult with people who know a lot about this issue. My wife, as you know, went to speak to the American Medical Association just a few days ago.

Is he trying to give me some water? (Laughter.) Let me answer the question first. Thank you, John. He always wanted to be on television. I hope his mother -

-
(laughter.)

The American -

-
my wife talked to the American Medical Association recently. We are consulting regularly with both the Democratic and Republican members of Congress. She also had a long meeting with several Republican House members just a couple of days ago.

We have determined that -

-
first -

-
and I, personally, am getting quite close to making the final choices from among the options there. I do not believe we can make any serious attempt to go forward with this until the economic plan and the budget is in place; then we will go forward with it.

I think because of all the consultation which has been done and all the work that's been done, there's a real shot we can act on it this year. I do not share the view that there's no chance Congress will act next year, although I believe we can do it this year, because I expect a lot of Republican as well as Democratic

support for this.

And I think that this issue affects the American people so deeply -

-

there are millions of families out there who are terrified they're going to lose their health insurance, who are terrified they can't afford it, who are terrified because somebody's been sick in their family, if they have to change jobs they'll be without it; as well as all those who are working for a living without health insurance; as well as all the businesses that are afraid they're going to go for broke, that the impetus behind doing something will be very great. I think it will be good, not bad, for the American political system to act on this.

So I think whenever the debate really begins in earnest, you will see the prospects of passage intensify, not diminish.

Q If that does go over until next year, sir, will that become the issue in congressional elections?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that and the condition of the economy will be the big issues. And whether we are actually facing up to our responsibilities in this new global economy. But that wouldn't be the worse thing in the world, except I hope and believe that the plan will pass before all that political season starts.

Q Mr. President, Mrs. Clinton recently said that she hopes to tackle welfare reform as her next priority. Will she head the administration's welfare reform effort? And do you expect to get that done this year, too, or is that something that will have to wait until 1994?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that, again, is a subject that I expect we'll have broad bipartisan support on. And I would expect that all of us will be involved in it. My wife is very interested in this because it affects children.

But let me say that the first big block of the welfare reform package is now being considered by Congress, and that is the earned income tax credit. Most Americans don't know what that is, but basically it is a change in the tax code that will permit us to say to working families if you work 40 hours a week and have a child in your house, you can be lifted out of poverty. That will remove all the financial incentive to prefer welfare to work if we can then pass in the health care reform health coverage for all children, like every other country does, so we remove that incentive.

But we expect to have a welfare reform package that will literally end welfare as we know it -

-

that will put a time limit on welfare and, after that, people who have been through the education and training programs will have to work. And I, again, would like that if it could be done this year. That will depend on how warmly embraced it is by Congress.

Let me just make one other point. The national service bill, which will provide more college loans and the opportunity to work them off with service, is moving through Congress more quickly than most people thought because we were able to get good bipartisan support and work out a lot of the details. If we can do that on welfare reform, I think we can do it this year.

Q Mr. President, going back to the budget for a moment, if you manage to get the budget passed, as it seems to be heading, you will have achieved two major objectives: deficit reduction and getting the wealthy to pay a larger share of the cost of government. But there was a third major objective that you talked about in the campaign and early on in your administration as crucial for the health of the economy, which was your investment package, your new spending that you proposed, which does not seem to be faring well in Congress at all. So you seem to be in a position where you've managed to overturn Reaganomics, but not enact Clintonomics.

So let me ask you two things about that. One is why? What's your analysis of why your spending programs have not been successful? And, second, what do you propose to do about it?

THE PRESIDENT: If you look at the budgets, if you look at where we're going with the budgets, we had to cut back all spending in the first two years of this five-

year budget period to deal with the fact that the deficit was higher than we thought it would be. And I had to do that as well. But this is a five-

year budget for long-

term growth of the American economy.

Over the long run, we do have to increase investment. Let me also say that just because we are freezing all domestic discretionary spending for five years doesn't mean there aren't changes within those categories. We're cutting a lot of stuff so that we can increase investment in things like Head Start for children and job training for workers and new technologies to help convert from a defense to a domestic economy. A lot of that new investment is in there.

Secondly, I expect this bill to treat the other part of my investment budget, that is, the private sector part, quite well.

I think there will be an increase in the expensing allowance for small business, which will really help small businesspeople to hire more workers. I think there will be an empowerment zone proposal in the final bill which will finally test whether free enterprise can to into depressed cities and rural areas and put people to work and invest and start businesses. I believe it can.

I think those are the kinds of things that you will see there. I think the earned income tax credit again will pass so that we can lift the working poor out of poverty. So I expect a big portion of the investment program to pass and I'll be surprised if it doesn't.

Q Mr. President, I'm surprised that for the first four months you came into office you were saying how bad the economy was and how important it was for your program to be enacted to grow the economy. Now, we hear you in the last week or so talking up the economy, saying how well things are going, and yet, your program hasn't passed. What are we to make of this? Why have you changed your mind about the economy?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I think the economy is still bad for most Americans. But the trends are good and the trends are plainly tied to the determination of this administration to bring the deficit down. We began to see a substantial drop in long-

term

interest rates after the election when Secretary of the Treasury Bentsen announced that we were going to have a serious deficit reduction plan that would include entitlement cuts, other budget cuts, tax increases on the wealthy, and an energy tax. We saw that. And every student of this, starting with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who's testified before Congress to this effect, has said that if we continue and pass this, we will get interest rates down. So those things have been coming down.

That's why the Home Builders Association of America -- not a Democratic group, presumably largely a Republican group -

-

came

from all over the country to Maryland a few days ago to endorse the economic program, because it is already beginning to bring interest rates down

So are most people affected by the economic recovery? No. But is it a good thing that you have 755,000 private sector jobs in the first five months; that you have 130,000 jobs in the construction industry, the biggest gain in a four-

month period in

nine years? Yes it is. So the point I'm trying to make is we're taking the right direction, but we've still got a lot of changes to

make.

Q Mr. President, you said a few minutes ago that you've broken the back of the Somali warlords in Somalia. However, Mohamed Aided is still at large. This brings to mind the same problem that happened with the previous administration with Saddam Hussein. How can you assure the American people that you're not going to get sucked into an ever-

growing vortex of war in Somalia?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there's a big difference there. Aided is not in control of the government of Somalia. The United Nations force is there, they're still promoting peace. They're now going to be able to deliver food, medicine, do their work and try to help engage in the long-

term process of nation building. And we never, ever, the United Nations and the United States never listed getting rid of Aided as one of our objectives. In fact, as long as he was willing to cooperate with the United Nations, he was able to live and work in peace right there in Mogadishu.

So what happens from now on in will be a function of, number one, what the United Nations thinks is appropriate for his conduct to date, and, number two, what he does in the future.

Q Mr. President, I have an easy problem for you, and it's domestic, too.

THE PRESIDENT: There are none. (Laughter.)

Q This one's very easy. A lot of Americans are not wildly pronuclear and thought the U.S. may have overreacted in past years in its very heavy-

handed treatment of New Zealand. Would you consider meeting now with a New Zealand leader and discussing the situation? Isn't there some way that a compromise can be reached so you can agree to disagree, but still restore the political and security relationship?

THE PRESIDENT: I've given absolutely no thought to that question. (Laughter.) And I'm afraid if I give an answer to it, I'll be in more trouble tomorrow than I can figure out. (Laughter.)

Q Mr. President, as you point out, your economic plan would reduce the budget deficit by \$500 billion over five years, which is a significant improvement over what we've seen in the past. But your critics would point out that the budget deficit would continue to mount by hundreds of billions of dollars a year; and that your attack on the deficit is limited to lowering projected spending increases, rather than taking the much harder tack of making real cutbacks in the budget. Can't you do more to deal with the problem

of this deficit and runaway spending?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me have the chart again. The answer to that question -

-

first of all, let me answer it. You asked two questions, not one. It is absolutely true that if this whole thing is adopted or any other deficit reduction plan that has been presented to date is adopted, by the fifth year the deficit starts to inch up again and you don't get down to zero.

Now, that is true, but why is that? That is because primarily of the projected exploding costs in medical care through Medicare and Medicaid. And because we have programs like Social Security and other retirement programs where people are given cost of living increases year-

in and year-

out, something that most Americans support. But the prime culprit here is Social Security -

-

I mean, is medical costs, not Social Security. The prime culprit is medical costs. They've been going up way faster than inflation.

Now, I want to make two points. Why do we reduce the deficit only \$500 billion over five years, even though that's a huge amount? Because it was the considered judgment of the economic team

-

-

Secretary Bentsen, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Rubin -

-

that in a recession there was a limit to how fast you could contract the deficit, and that this would be a very rapid reduction of the deficit in a time where there's very slow economic growth around the globe. We think it will actually lead to some expansion of the economic activity. Why? Because there's so much debt built into our system at high interest rates that if people just go refinance all their homes and their business loans, it will give them a lot of cash in their pocket and that will stimulate the economy to grow.

Secondly, it is our considered judgment that we cannot get the deficit down to zero, which is where it ought to be, until we do something about health care costs, which is why the next big piece

of this administration's work is to provide a comprehensive health care plan that will bring health costs in line with inflation.

If you do that, then this yellow line here, instead of going up, will keep going down. And since there is no historic precedent in America, let me ask you to go back and look what happened in Japan in the mid-

'70s to mid-

'80s. They had about the same size deficit we do in the mid-

'70s. They decided they were going to wipe it out. They took 10 years to wipe it out, not five. But they did it. And today, in spite of all their economic problems, they are the only major nation in a surplus position.

We can do it, too, if we do this, then tackle the deficit. And let me remind you of one other thing, in September, the Vice President's task force will make it's report on reinventing government and reorganizing the whole way the government operates. That will give us another whole shot to deal with this issue.

Q Mr. President, John F. Kennedy once said that the coverage he'd been getting as President, that he'd been reading it more and enjoying it less. And many other Presidents have expressed similar sentiments. Lately, sir, there have been some indications, at least, that you may be experiencing those feelings as well. Can you give us your analysis of that?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think I could say it any better than President Kennedy did. (Laughter.) But let me say this: You have to do your job as you see it. And I'm going to do mine the best I can. Everybody in America knows, as I said, that I did not live and work in this city until I became President. I knew when I came here that there would be things that I would need to learn about the processes and the way things worked. I believe then and I believe now that if I do the big things right and deal with the big issues, that eventually the other things will also work themselves out.

In the meantime, I think the most important thing that we attempt, you and I, to create an atmosphere of trust and respect, and that you at least know that I'm going to do my best to be honest with you. And I think you're going to be honest with me, and I expect you to criticize me when you think I'm wrong. The only thing I ever ask is, if I have a response and I have a side, let that get out and we'll watch this conflict unfold. I mean, this is nothing new. President Jefferson got a rough press, too.

Q Sir, on Haiti, the Security Council of the U.N. has stated that they're giving Haiti until the 23rd of this month before they put real tough petroleum and economic sanctions. Do you think that will solve the problem, or will we see a multinational force in

Haiti as we do in Somalia?

THE PRESIDENT: As you know, since you asked the question about Haiti, the United States is pushing for the U.N. resolution to strengthen the sanctions to include not simply a freeze on assets and lifting visas, but also to include oil. I think it will make a difference. And the members of Congress who are expert in Haitian affairs and who talk to people in Haiti believe that it will make a difference.

Secondly, I have always assumed that to really facilitate the restoration of democracy in Haiti, there would have to be some sort of multinational force there. But I would remind you that, recently, when that was proposed with the support of the United States, both sides rejected it. President Aristide rejected it and the de facto government rejected it, which was a disappointment to us. So we decided to go back to the drawing board, look for tougher sanctions.

In the end, since both sides distrust each other to treat each other civilly, even to keep from shooting each other, there, in my judgment, will never be a resolution of that, as long as the main players are who they are, unless we have a multinational peacekeeping force.

Q Mr. President, what have you been told about the plot to assassinate George Bush in Kuwait? How definitive is the chain of evidence against Iraq and what do you plan to do about it?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not received the final report from the FBI, and until I do I don't think I should say what I will or won't do.

Q Mr. President, in Bosnia the Europeans did not want to take action because the United States did not have troops on the ground. In Somalia, although we turned over operations to U.N. peacekeepers about a month ago and it was Pakistani soldiers who were attacked, the forces that went into action were largely American; most of the firepower was American. You were just talking about a multinational peacekeeping force in Haiti. Is the United States now being put in the role of enforcer for the United Nations? And what principles or thoughts do you bring to the table when you consider committing U.S. troops to enforce not something that may be strictly a U.S. interest, but something that is the will of the international community?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we have to ask ourselves, first of all: What are the interests of the American people? Secondly: What are the values and humanitarian concerns at stake? And, thirdly: What is the price of doing what we might be asked to do?

I think -

-

let me just say on Bosnia, it's not so simple
as that. We didn't have an agreement -

-

ever -

-

about what troops
would do. I pledge to the American people in the campaign last year

-

-

and I reaffirmed repeatedly -

-

that I did not think we had any
business sending troops into combat in Bosnia. I also said if there
were a cease-

fire and a genuine peace agreement and the United
Nations had to guarantee the peace agreement that the United States
would participate. I don't think we should minimize the importance
of leading the way, but also setting an example.

Let me tell you, a lot of other countries -

-

the
President of Namibia was here, a fairly small country. They sent
people to Somalia. There are people from all over the world who sent
people to Cambodia in very dangerous circumstances. The Pakistanis
are the people who were murdered in Somalia. So I think this is a
very good thing.

Yes, America can lead the way. But it is very moving to
me to see all these other countries -

-

Ireland sending people,
putting themselves on the line. Not just government employees, but
people working through other organizations to try to help solve these
problems. There is a remarkable confluence of people trying to
promote democracy and human rights and freedom and market economics.
And I think that if we can leave that an acceptable price, that is in
our narrow interest and it is certainly in our broader human
interest.

Q Mr. President, now that you've made your decision about the Space Station, are you going to appoint a new NASA administrator? And if you are, when?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't have any plans at this time to do that. Let me just make a point about the Space Station, if I might. As you know, I have always supported the Space Station; I realize that some people don't. The United States indisputably leads the world in space. It is an important area of science and technology. I think it would be a mistake, after all the work we've done, to scrap the Space Station.

There is a \$4-billion budget cut in my budget for the Space Station because we're going to redesign it and redesign the management system of NASA. We've brought in all of these scientists to look at it, to tell us exactly what ought to be done and exactly how this thing ought to be run and we're going to have to make some changes. But I want to tell the American people: We need to stay first in science and technology, we need to stay first in space. We're going to be able to get more people to come in and invest with us, and we're going to have to make some very tough management decisions at NASA to get that done.

Q Mr. President, many African American leaders have expressed their anger or extreme disappointment with the way you handled the Lani Guinier nomination and with the way you handled the Haiti situation. In addition, the Congressional Black Caucus has said it is very angry with the fact that they voted for your budget package and cast some very politically difficult votes, only to have you negotiate a watered-

down package in the Senate. How would you assess your relationship right now with blacks? And what are you doing to mend fences with the Congressional Black Caucus so that they will not vote against the conference report on the budget package?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, I did not negotiate that bill that the Senate passed. That is just inaccurate. I did not do that. And I think you know what I liked about the House bill and you know where I have been on the issues and you know what the principles are I've enunciated.

I think Senator Moynihan did a remarkable job to get a bill out that does have \$500 billion in deficit reduction, more spending cuts and tax increases and taxes falling primarily on upper-

income people. I think to that extent we ought to give him credit. But there has been no negotiations.

Secondly, and quite to the contrary, when members of the Black Caucus came to see me and asked me to pursue sanctions in the

United Nations against Haiti that included oil, I examined it and I agreed to do it. They were the first people who asked me to do it. And very shortly after the meeting I agreed to go forward. But they know, the ones who follow the Haitian developments, that even before that I offered to have the United States participate in a multinational peacekeeping force to restore democracy and to restore President Aristide and that he rejected that. They know that's a fact.

Thirdly, I don't think my commitment to civil rights is very much open to question. And I think my actions as President and the appointments I've made, and the things I've stood for document that. And I believe that over the long run the Black Caucus and the Clinton administration will continue to be very close. And I've talked to any number of them personally, recently.

Q On campaign finance reform, now that most of the public financing provisions have been removed from the Senate bill, how do you convince people that this is truly meaningful campaign finance reform? And also, will you seek at some point in the future, perhaps, to put that public financing back into another measure?

THE PRESIDENT: First, let's see what the House does. Again, this is a bill you're going to have to watch come out of conference. The House will probably adopt a somewhat different bill.

But let's talk about what the Senate bill does do. The Senate bill reduces the influence of PACs and special interests; it limits the cost of campaigns; it spends public funds, if necessary, if one party violates the spending limits then the other party can get public funds in the form of communications vouchers so that the airwaves will be open to both parties and people can hear both sides.

So this is a vast advance over the present law in breaking the back of special interest domination of politics and elections. So I like it in that regard. Let's see what the House does. I think we can get a good bill out and I hope both sides will vote for it.

Q Mr. President, will you support the Senate's ten percent increase in the capital gains tax?

THE PRESIDENT: They imposed a ten percent surcharge because there's now a difference between the capital gains rate and the income rate. And, as you know, the theory of the Tax Reform Act of '86 was to level them. Let's see what comes out of the conference report. What I want is a tax system where 75 percent of the burden falls on the top six percent of the American people -

-

at least that progressive. And if it is that progressive, then I'm open on the details. But I want to see what the final bill is. That's the key thing: Will the wealthy pay their fair share? Will it all be in a

trust fund to reduce the deficit? And will the ratio be at least as good as the one I showed -

-

\$5 of every \$10 in spending cuts; \$3.75
in tax increases on upper income people; \$1.25 on the middle class.

Thank you very much.

THE PRESS: Thank you.
END8:41 P.M. EDT

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Keith Boykin (BOYKIN_K) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME: 18-JUN-1993 08:29:00.00

SUBJECT: friday news report

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (97970144,david wilhelm) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:97970144\C:DAVID wilhelm\) (DEFAULT)

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER

White House News Report

Friday, June 18, 1993

Prepared by the News Analysis Staff, Rm. 160, x7151

ECONOMIC PLAN -

-

The Wall Street Journal says the President's economic program "as reworked by the Senate Finance Committee, appears headed for speedy passage by the Senate," but, "the trouble begins in the House-

Senate conference committee."

A "dozen or more liberal and moderate Democrats warned the White House and Senate leaders that changes would be necessary to gain their votes on the floor next week." (WP) Democratic Sens. Metzenbaum (Ohio), Harkin (Iowa), and Wellstone (Minn.) don't like the deeper cuts in Medicare and the earned income tax credit. (WP) Some are also unhappy with the Senate's plan to create ten "so-called" empowerment zones. (WP) Rep. Mfume (D-Md.), said the cuts were unacceptable to the Congressional Black Caucus, and that "There is a clear and growing dissatisfaction" among the caucus. (WP) The Washington Times says that after weeks of "self-imposed exile," Senate Republicans joined Democrats in "line-by-line scrutiny of the Senate version of the Clinton deficit-reduction program." (WT) Republicans said the "bill was laden with job-destroying taxes and miragelike spending cuts that would leave voters disappointed." (WT) Sen. Dole criticized the plan for relying too heavily on tax increases which precede spending cuts. (Newsday)

"The President's biggest challenge will be brokering a compromise on the energy tax..." (WP) The President plans to "reassert his influence" on the tax package when the plan goes to conference next month. (USA Today) On the energy tax, the President may still try to reinstate his broad-based energy tax which would raise \$72 billion over five years. (USA Today) But,

USA Today reports that the Senate's \$24 billion motor fuels tax will probably win. Both House Speaker Foley and Rep. Rostenkowski (D-Ill.) favor higher gasoline taxes. (USA Today)

An article in the Des Moines Register with the headline, "Tax package 'a lot better' Harkin says," elaborates, "Sen. Tom Harkin said Thursday that a tax package put together by the Senate Finance Committee puts to rest earlier objections he had raised that the end result might be unfair to middle-class taxpayers." Another Des Moines Register article says the tax package taking shape in the Senate is a "win-some, lose-some proposition for Midwestern interests, with deep cuts in the proposed barge-fuel tax but a slight rise in taxes on ethanol."

The Senate Finance Committee plans to complete its work by its deadline today. (WP) Sen. Moynihan (D-NY), defended the Senate's plan as "The most progressive change in taxes since World War II," adding that 80% of the tax increases would be borne by people making more than \$100,000 a year. (WP)

Republicans said not all of the \$248 billion in proposed tax increases would go to reduce the deficit, "contrary to assertions by Clinton and Senate Majority Leader George J. Mitchell." (WP) Sen. Dole said, "We're not doing this to reduce the deficit to protect [Social Security recipients'] children and grandchildren. We're doing it so we can spend more money somewhere else." (WP) The President's plan to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion over five years remains.

Congressional Democrats are preparing to cut more than \$1 billion from a White House intelligence budget request. (NYT A1) The House Intelligence Committee voted to eliminate a \$150 million CIA scholarship named for Sen. Boren. (NYT) BUDGET EDITORIALS -

-

The New York Times editorial with the headline "Budget Bill: Make it Better" says "the committee bill, like the President's plan, would be a step toward fiscal prudence...For the sake of the environment, the poor and health reform, the country can afford more than \$25 billion in new energy taxes."

The Wall Street Journal editorial on the budget criticizes the income tax increase on married couples with high incomes, saying, "of course, most of these couples don't have a combined income of \$140,000 and never will. But whoever they are, the decision to marry, combine incomes and make a family propels them rapidly in the direction of the next higher bracket."

A Washington Post editorial says what the Senate Finance Committee "mainly did was yield to the manufacturing and other business groups that... didn't want to pay the broad-based energy tax," but "on balance this remains a progressive and fiscally responsible bill. Mr. Clinton has asked the congressional Democrats to cast some hard votes, and so far on the question of the deficit they continue to cast them. He's winning."

Calling taxes a "crushing burden," the Washington Times

says, "The bad news for Mr. Clinton is that the not-so-rich have a stake in this tax. Out of the capital that the rich invest in the market economy come plant expansions, start-up companies, business spinoffs, whole new industries."

A Detroit Free Press editorial says the agreement made in the Senate Finance Committee is a "giant step" forward for the Clinton administration and toward breaching the threatened deadlock in Congress. The editorial advises, "It is most important that the majority in Congress make some decisions to eliminate some of the uncertainties, and permit the country to move on to other things." (Detroit Free Press)

The Atlanta Constitution calls the President's package the "best proposal the current political system is capable of producing."

CAMPAIGN FINANCE -

-

The Senate passed the Campaign Finance Bill 60 to 38 with the support of seven Republicans. (WP) USA Today calls it "a much needed victory" for the President, but says it must now be redesigned in the House. The Washington Times says when the bill goes to the House "lawmakers there are expected to pass a significantly different version."

With voluntary limits on campaign spending, a ban on PAC contributions, a 50% discount on broadcast advertising rates for candidates, a ban on out-of-state money in the first four years, and full disclosure of "soft money" by political parties, the Senate bill is already "under fire" from House members. (USA Today) The bill also said that if the ban on PAC contributions is ruled unconstitutional, the limit would be set at \$1,000. (NYT)

Rep. Gephardt said that if public funding is not restored, PAC contribution limits would have to be increased to assure adequate funding of campaigns, rather than being banned or drastically reduced. (WP) Speaker Foley said the House will consider the legislation this year but said he was "not sure" if it would be brought up before the August recess. (WP) Rep. Foley also said, "We will retain part of the campaign finance role of" PACs. (NYT)

PRESS CONFERENCE -

-

Two of the three networks declined to carry the press conference live; NBC broke after 25 minutes. (WP) The Washington Times reports, the President "was thwarted in his attempt to reach ordinary voters at home last night about successes in Congress in his first scheduled prime-time press conference." A USA Today front-page headline says, "Pre-empted Clinton says economy is 'on the move.'" The New York Times headline says the President was "Spurned by 2 Networks."

"Clinton offered little new in the way of policy or pronouncements, choosing instead to repeatedly make the case that he has begun the process of enacting the 'change' he promised during the campaign...." (WP) The New York Times says the President spent a "large chunk" of his time discussing foreign affairs. (A1)

"The media mania at the White House over the past four days has the name David R. Gergen written all over it." (WP) USA Today questions whether it was the "coaching and prodding of new communications guru" David Gergen that caused the President to charm the "lately contentious White House press corps." USA Today says, the President "has long shown that he is teachable, and his performance reflected that as he tried to bury the hatchet with the media." The "cool reception was due at least in part to the "suspicion among some news executives that they were being manipulated by Mr. Gergen." (NYT) Mr. Gergen said that Reagan held six prime-time addresses his first term in office and six prime time news conferences in his second term, and all were televised. (NYT) "Noting Gergen's quickness to claim credit for Clinton's successful appearances, some Democrats snipe that he is even better at promoting himself than promoting the president." (WSJ)

A Washington Times article with the headline, "Clinton uses light touch to break ice with press," says the President's lighter moments in the press conference were "'Reagan humanizing touches'...referring to Mr. Gergen's media-handling tactics." The Washington Times reports that White House officials admitted that the "news conference was an effort by the president and his aides to use recent bits of upbeat news to help reverse the downward spiral of public opinion about Mr. Clinton."

A news analysis piece in the Boston Globe tentatively calling the President a "New Clinton" says, "Last night marked the opening of an offensive of necessity, conducted with warmth and humor...the president's strategy is to get momentum by claiming to have it."

SOMALIA -

-

The fighting in Mogadishu led all three network newscasts last night. ABC called it the bloodiest fighting since Korea. U.N. troops backed by American air power captured Aideed's headquarters today, but the battle took six hours. (WP A1) The fighting left 6 U.N. soldiers dead and 43 wounded. (USA Today) "At least 60 Somalis were killed, and scores of buildings, including a hospital and an international relief agency, were damaged by shells, grenades and missiles. (WP) "The attack was intended to destroy [Aideed's] power base, not to capture the general or his fighters, giving Washington and its allies a goal they were almost certain to attain." (NYT A1)

The President said the U.N. troops had "crippled the forces of warlord Aideed...The military back of Aideed has been broken." (WP) Admiral Howe said he hoped Aideed, who has not been

captured, would "give himself up peacefully." (WP) USA Today says the President declared U.N. military action in Somalia a "success" that restored security in Mogadishu.

HEALTH CARE -

-

The Washington Times reports that "changes have brightened for action on President Clinton's health care plan this year, now that his budget proposal has cleared its first major hurdle in the Senate." Yesterday, Bob Boorstin said the Administration is meeting with the Senate and House leadership to figure out the best time to introduce the package. (WT) Sen. Moynihan said, "When we get by the necessary near-emergency work with the budget, I'm prepared to spend the rest of the year on that [health reform]." (WT)

The Senate and House are preparing for a fight over how deeply to cut the growth of Medicare. (NYT) The Senate bill would make selective cuts in Medicare over five years, whereas the House bill would freeze most payment rates, eliminating inflation allowances for the next two years. (NYT) The Senate bill has drawn "a chorus of criticism from spokesmen for elderly people, doctors, and hospitals." (NYT)

Rep. Rostenkowski anticipates the passage of the health care plan may "take all of President Clinton's first term, if not longer." (Boston Globe) Rostenkowski's remarks "dampen" the administration's expectations that the plan will be introduced in late July and passed this year. (Boston Globe)

SUPREME COURT NOMINATION -

-

A Washington Post headline says, "Ginsburgs Make Habit of Snubbing Exclusive Clubs," and says that Martin Ginsburg have dropped out of two exclusive golf clubs since the 1960s. (WP)

A Des Moines Register editorial in support of Ginsburg's nomination says, "Clinton's search for court justice was untidy, but that's democracy...Open and messy is preferable to tidy and secret."

FORESTS POLICY -

-

The Washington Post reports that the Administration officials have recommended that the President adopt a "potentially explosive" plan that would maximize timber cutting within legal limits, permit some logging within own reserves and be at least partially immune to court challenge. (WP A1) A 47-page draft memo to the President prepared by the Administration's forest committee headed by Katie McGinty acknowledges that some scientists involved in the plan would oppose the policy. (WP) The memo says that no option can both

comply with environmental laws and produce more than 2 billion board feet every year, and all the options would entail an estimated 6,000 to 9,000 job losses. (WP) The option selected "was developed on a crash basis at the very end of the staff review, and only after the scientific team had finished the first eight." (WP) The President is expected to review the policy over the weekend so that Congress can act on it quickly. (WP) Brock Evans, a vice president of the National Audubon Society, said, "This is war. It's political science, no biological science." (WP)

BOSNIA -

-

The President signaled that the U.S. might accept a partition of Bosnia but said he still preferred a multi-ethnic state. (NYT A1) Lord Owen urged the Bosnian Muslim government to accept the Bosnian Serb and Croat plan to divide Bosnia into three separate countries, and the President indicated he would accept such a solution. (WP A1) State Department officials said they were unsure whether the new plan means formal dismemberment of Bosnia or some form of federation. (WP) "A recent CIA briefing in Washington in which the division of Bosnia into three states was aired as the most viable solution has apparently been taken by the Bosnian Serb and Croat leaders as a green light from Washington to push ahead with their own plan." (WP)

U.N. military observers reported that tens of thousands of Muslims in Gorazde are critically short of food, housing, and medical facilities. (WP)

HAITI -

-

The Washington Post says, "Faced with a cutoff of petroleum, Haiti's military rulers are betting they can weather the international pressure..." Sources close to the Haitian army said they have a supply of about 10 to 12 weeks. (WP) Another source said the regime is unlikely to name a new prime minister soon. (WP) A New York Times editorial criticizes Brazil's diplomacy in the U.N. that went against authorizing the enforcement of the embargo of Haiti and "prolongs the agony of Haitians who have already suffered far too long."

In a bipartisan bill proposed by Rep. Mica, 42 lawmakers demanded the President pay the \$1.8 million for the care and treatment of the Haitian refugees. (WT)

DEFENSE -

-

Senior U.S. military and diplomatic officials say the Administration is drafting a new set of criteria for involvement in U.N. peacekeeping operations that would provide for a much wider role for the U.S. military. (WP A1) The proposed criteria

are detailed in classified drafts of a White House policy review document known as PRD-13, the U.S. could take part in action if the involvement would catalyze involvement by other nations or more generally advance U.S. interests. (WP) The degree of involvement would be determined by the intensity of public support and the risk of a commitment being open-ended. (WP) PRD-13 has not been presented to the President yet, but State, DoD, and Joint Chiefs officials generally agree on the outline. (WP)

Secretary Aspin told the base closure commission that shutting down any more bases than he recommended could hurt military readiness and overwhelm Pentagon efforts to help communities find new uses for closed sites. (NYT)

WOMEN IN THE MILITARY -

-

The Administration's initiative to expand combat assignments for women is "meeting stiff resistance from the Army and Marine Corps. (WP A1) On Tuesday, an internal working group of military officers completed a draft policy that would bar women to units that "co-locate" with ground combat units, according to a copy obtained by the Washington Post. (WP) A senior military officer who read the report called it a potentially "catastrophic" setback for women seeking widening career opportunities in the military, and, "If you adopted this, you wouldn't have women in Somalia, Bosnia, the Persian Gulf, anywhere." (WP) "Sources familiar with the internal debate" said the military's resistance to the Administration's policy change reflects the current lack of civilian oversight at the Pentagon because of a shortage of confirmed appointees. (WP)

GAYS IN THE MILITARY -

-

Congress and the President are "moving closer to a showdown over homosexuals in the military as Republicans are devising a strategy to force an initial House vote next week and Defense Secretary Les Aspin is preparing to brief top generals on his proposed new policy." (WT) Secretary Aspin is to start the task of selling his compromise to the Joint Chiefs of staff today. (WT) Pentagon officials say Mr. Aspin's plan is different from the President's original plan to lift the exclusion and follows, instead, Sen. Nunn's "Don't ask, don't tell" proposal. (WT) According to the same sources in the Washington Times, the Aspin policy would set strict guidelines for the investigation of military personnel and would change current Pentagon language that says being gay is incompatible with military service. (WT) Members of Congress and retired military officials of the "National Campaign to Keep the Ban on Homosexuals in the Military," held a press conference yesterday and publicized a voting survey of Congress saying that, in the House, there are 216 "firm" votes in favor of keeping the ban and

81 undecided votes and, in the Senate, there are 41 senators

opposed to lifting the ban. (WT) A survey of all 540 members of Congress conducted by the American Security Council finds 174 members support the ban, 257 oppose the ban, and 109 are undecided. (WT)

SPACE STATION -

-

Yesterday, the President announced his support for a scaled-down version of space station Freedom and endorsed the Superconducting Super Collider. (WP) According to USA Today, the President's plans will keep the US a "leader in space." The President said he will ask Congress for \$2.1 billion in space station funding for the next fiscal year. (WT) On congressional support, Rep Bacchus (D-FL) said the President "has embraced a station that will fly in space and in Congress." (USA Today) Workers at a Grumman Corp building in Reston said they were worried that jobs would be lost as the project shrinks. (WT)

The Dallas Morning News gives a "thumbs up" to the President saying, "Credit President Clinton for his continued backing of the nation's biggest scientific projects, the Superconducting Super Collider and the space station. Pledging that support this week was a difficult move."

CONALLY'S BULLET -

-

The Justice Department said Thursday that it was pursuing a request to remove bullet fragments from the body of John Connally but made no attempt to halt his burial. (Dallas Morning News) JFK researchers contend that state or federal officials have the authority to compel an examination of the body because the bullet fragments are critical evidence in an unresolved murder investigation. (Dallas Morning News)

POLLS -

-

The Washington Times cites a Times Mirror poll that found that more than four Americans in ten say the press is being unfair to the President. Fifty-

one percent said the President was getting fair treatment, but 43% disagreed.

A Washington Post-ABC poll taken June 11-15 found that 45% approved of how the President is handling his job. (WP)

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Kathy McKiernan (MCKIERNAN_K) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:03-JUL-1993 17:20:00.00

SUBJECT: Supplemental Appropriations Release

TO: David Seldin (SELDIN_D) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey L. Eller (ELLER_J) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Manager Infomgt (INFOMGT) (SYS)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mary H. Anton (ANTON_M) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah J. Behr (BEHR_D) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven Akey (AKEY_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (TOIV_B) (OMB)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen B. Silverman (SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (STERN_T) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: FAX (2685,Julia Payne) (TLXA1MAIL_ \F:2685\C:Julia Payne\\) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Evelyn S. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Unice B. Lieberman (LIEBERMAN_U) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Anne M. Edwards (EDWARDS_A) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Rabinowitz (RABINOWITZ_S) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael R. Lufrano (LUFRANO_M) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marsha Scott READ: UNKNOWN	(SCOTT_M) (WHO)
TO: Julie A. Nash READ: UNKNOWN	(NASH_J) (WHO)
TO: Ethan J. Zindler READ: UNKNOWN	(ZINDLER_E) (WHO)
TO: R. Paul Richard READ: UNKNOWN	(RICHARD_R) (WHO)
TO: Carter Wilkie READ: UNKNOWN	(WILKIE_C) (WHO)
TO: Kimberly Tilley READ: UNKNOWN	(TILLEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Eric Berman READ: UNKNOWN	(BERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: Anne Walker READ: UNKNOWN	(WALKER_A) (WHO)
TO: David Kusnet READ: UNKNOWN	(KUSNET_D) (WHO)
TO: Meeghan E. Prunty READ: UNKNOWN	(PRUNTY_M) (WHO)
TO: Jeffrey L. Eller READ: UNKNOWN	(ELLER_J) (WHO)
TO: Lavora R. Barnes READ: UNKNOWN	(BARNES_L) (WHO)
TO: Lisa Mortman READ: UNKNOWN	(MORTMAN_L) (WHO)
TO: Joshua N. Silverman READ: UNKNOWN	(SILVERMAN_J) (WHO)
TO: Ernest D. Gibble READ: UNKNOWN	(GIBBLE_E) (WHO)
TO: C. Patricia Cogdell READ: UNKNOWN	(COGDELL_C) (WHO)
TO: Richard Strauss READ: UNKNOWN	(STRAUSS_R) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan P. Gill READ: UNKNOWN	(GILL_J) (WHO)

TO: Patricia A. Enright READ: UNKNOWN	(ENRIGHT_P) (WHO)
TO: Maria M. Tio READ: UNKNOWN	(TIO_M) (WHO)
TO: Jess Sarmiento READ: UNKNOWN	(SARMIENTO_J) (WHO)
TO: Kimberly S. Hopper READ: UNKNOWN	(HOPPER_K) (WHO)
TO: David B. Anderson READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDERSON_D) (WHO)
TO: Karen L. Hancox READ: UNKNOWN	(HANCOX_K) (WHO)
TO: Susan Brophy READ: UNKNOWN	(BROPHY_S) (WHO)
TO: Howard Paster READ: UNKNOWN	(PASTER_H) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine C. Miller READ: UNKNOWN	(MILLER_L) (WHO)
TO: Stuart E. Trevelyan READ: UNKNOWN	(TREVELYAN_S) (WHO)
TO: Steve Ricchetti READ: UNKNOWN	(RICCHETTI_S) (WHO)
TO: Nestor M. Davidson READ: UNKNOWN	(DAVIDSON_N) (WHO)
TO: LeeAnn Inadomi READ: UNKNOWN	(INADOMI_L) (WHO)
TO: Melissa G. Banks READ: UNKNOWN	(BANKS_M) (WHO)
TO: Kathleen L. O'Neill READ: UNKNOWN	(ONEILL_K) (WHO)
TO: Margaret C. Sherry READ: UNKNOWN	(SHERRY_M) (WHO)
TO: Timothy J. Keating READ: UNKNOWN	(KEATING_T) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)

TO: Margaret A. Williams READ: UNKNOWN	(WILLIAMS_MA) (WHO)
TO: Evelyn Lieberman READ: UNKNOWN	(LIEBERMAN_E) (WHO)
TO: Karen Finney READ: UNKNOWN	(FINNEY_K) (WHO)
TO: Melanne Verveer READ: UNKNOWN	(VERVEER_M) (WHO)
TO: Ann Stock READ: UNKNOWN	(STOCK_A) (WHO)
TO: G. N. Lattimore READ: UNKNOWN	(LATTIMORE_G) (WHO)
TO: Isabelle R. Tapia READ: UNKNOWN	(TAPIA_I) (WHO)
TO: Anne Walley READ: UNKNOWN	(WALLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Stephanie Streett READ: UNKNOWN	(STREETT_S) (WHO)
TO: Marcia Hale READ: UNKNOWN	(HALE_M) (WHO)
TO: Nancy Hernreich READ: UNKNOWN	(HERNREICH_N) (WHO)
TO: Joshua A King READ: UNKNOWN	(KING_J) (WHO)
TO: David Leavy READ: UNKNOWN	(LEAVY_D) (WHO)
TO: Steven A. Cohen READ: UNKNOWN	(COHEN_SA) (WHO)
TO: Dee Dee Myers READ: UNKNOWN	(MYERS_D) (WHO)
TO: Lisa M. Caputo READ: UNKNOWN	(CAPUTO_L) (WHO)
TO: Marla Romash READ: UNKNOWN	(ROMASH_M) (VPO)
TO: Nancy L. Ward READ: UNKNOWN	(WARD_N) (WHO)

TO: Jeremy Gaines READ: UNKNOWN	(GAINES_J) (WHO)
TO: Chad H. Griffin READ: UNKNOWN	(GRIFFIN_C) (WHO)
TO: Debra D. Bird READ: UNKNOWN	(BIRD_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: Heather Beckel READ: UNKNOWN	(BECKEL_H) (WHO)
TO: Amanda Crumley READ: UNKNOWN	(CRUMLEY_A) (WHO)
TO: Lorraine A. Voles READ: UNKNOWN	(VOLES_L) (WHO)
TO: Dawn A. Alexander READ: UNKNOWN	(ALEXANDER_DA) (WHO)
TO: A. Victoria Rivas-Vazquez READ: UNKNOWN	(RIVASVAZQU_A) (WHO)
TO: Regina Montoya READ: UNKNOWN	(MONTOYA_R) (WHO)
TO: Jeff Watson READ: UNKNOWN	(WATSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Rahm Emanuel READ: UNKNOWN	(EMANUEL_R) (WHO)
TO: Joan Baggett READ: UNKNOWN	(BAGGETT_J) (WHO)
TO: Elaine Weiss READ: UNKNOWN	(WEISS_E) (WHO)
TO: Carola McGiffert READ: UNKNOWN	(MCGIFFERT_C) (WHO)
TO: David Dreyer READ: UNKNOWN	(DREYER_D) (WHO)
TO: Ricki Seidman READ: UNKNOWN	(SEIDMAN_R) (WHO)
TO: George Stephanopoulos READ: UNKNOWN	(STEPHANOPO_G) (WHO)

TO: Robert Boorstin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOORSTIN_R) (WHO)
TO: Michael Waldman READ: UNKNOWN	(WALDMAN_M) (WHO)
TO: Jason Solomon READ: UNKNOWN	(SOLOMON_J) (WHO)
TO: Ken Chitester READ: UNKNOWN	(CHITESTER_K) (WHO)
TO: Keith Boykin READ: UNKNOWN	(BOYKIN_K) (WHO)
TO: S. Collier Andress READ: UNKNOWN	(ANDRESS_S) (WHO)
TO: Jeffrey L. Eller READ: UNKNOWN	(ELLER_J) (WHO)
TO: Elizabeth A. Bernstein READ: UNKNOWN	(BERNSTEIN_E) (WHO)
TO: Jonathan M. Prince READ: UNKNOWN	(PRINCE_J) (WHO)
TO: Carolyn Curiel READ: UNKNOWN	(CURIEL_C) (WHO)
TO: Thomas F. McLarty READ: UNKNOWN	(MCLARTY_T) (WHO)
TO: Mark Gearan READ: UNKNOWN	(GEARAN_M) (WHO)
TO: David Watkins READ: UNKNOWN	(WATKINS_D) (WHO)
TO: Christine Varney READ: UNKNOWN	(VARNEY_C) (WHO)
TO: Dwight Holton READ: UNKNOWN	(HOLTON_D) (WHO)
TO: Andre C. Oliver READ: UNKNOWN	(OLIVER_A) (WHO)
TO: Karen A. Sudbay READ: UNKNOWN	(SUDBAY_K) (WHO)
TO: Stephen B. Silverman READ: UNKNOWN	(SILVERMAN_S) (WHO)

TO: Bruce Lindsey READ: UNKNOWN	(LINDSEY_B) (WHO)
TO: John B. Emerson READ: UNKNOWN	(EMERSON_J) (WHO)
TO: Jan O. Piercy READ: UNKNOWN	(PIERCY_J) (WHO)
TO: John Podesta READ: UNKNOWN	(PODESTA_J) (WHO)
TO: Todd Stern READ: UNKNOWN	(STERN_T) (WHO)
TO: Bernie Nussbaum READ: UNKNOWN	(NUSSBAUM_B) (WHO)
TO: Vince Foster READ: UNKNOWN	(FOSTER_V) (WHO)
TO: Ron Klain READ: UNKNOWN	(KLAIN_R) (WHO)
TO: Cheryl Mills READ: UNKNOWN	(MILLS_C) (WHO)
TO: Carol Rasco READ: UNKNOWN	(RASCO_C) (OPD)
TO: Bruce Reed READ: UNKNOWN	(REED_B) (OPD)
TO: William Galston READ: UNKNOWN	(GALSTON_W) (OPD)
TO: Shirley Sagawa READ: UNKNOWN	(SAGAWA_S) (OPD)
TO: Robert E. Rubin READ: UNKNOWN	(RUBIN_R) (OPD)
TO: Gene Sperling READ: UNKNOWN	(SPERLING_G) (DEFAULT)
TO: W. Bowman Cutter READ: UNKNOWN	(CUTTER_W) (OPD)
TO: Ira Magaziner READ: UNKNOWN	(MAGAZINER_I) (OPD)
TO: Sylvia M. Mathews READ: UNKNOWN	(MATHEWS_S) (OPD)

TO: Roy Neel (NEEL_R) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall, Jr (MARSHALL_T) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Greg Simon (SIMON_G) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Marla Romash (ROMASH_M) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Leon Fuerth (FUERTH_L) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Quinn (QUINN_J) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Katie McGinty (MCGINTY_K) (VPO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Kukis, Heidi (HEIDI KUKIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (JULIA M. PAYNE@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Gill (GILL_M) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SKILA S. HARRIS@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Remote Addressee (SALLY J. AMAN@EOP_OVP@CCGATE@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: (202) 456-6444 (WNS_1) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Eli J. Segal (SEGAL_E) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Karen D. Ewing (EWING_K) (WHO)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Richard L. Allen (ALLEN_RL) (OA)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

On February 17, I unveiled my national economic strategy to increase growth and job creation, to reduce the deficit and lower interest rates. The plan reflects my belief that the United States had to address long

-standing economic problems
so we could expand growth and opportunity for all Americans.
The long

-term portion of the plan is nearing completion
by the Congress. The House and Senate have adopted versions of the plan that reduce the deficit by \$500 billion while providing needed investments in our country's future strength and job creating ability. However, the short

-term component, a jobs
bill designed to keep the recovery on track, was not adopted
by the Congress.

While there are some optimistic signs -- lower long

-term
interest rates, the lowest mortgage rates in twenty years,
and the creation of nearly one million jobs since January --
I am not satisfied with the performance of the economy, many
Americans are still hurting, and others are uncertain about the
future.

Because too many Americans are still without meaningful
work, I was pleased to sign into law last night a modest job
creating bill, H.R. 2118, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of
1993. This Act funds a variety of critical programs, including
key targeted investments that I requested in February. Adoption
of this law means that summer jobs will be created, local law
enforcement will be able to hire back police laid off during the
last recession, and small businesses will be able to expand
their payrolls, products, and profits. It also provides funding
that will benefit farmers adversely affected by weather
conditions in the Midwest.

This bill does not nearly provide what I believe is
necessary to help our economy. But every job it creates, every
policeman or policewoman it rehires, every farm devastated by
weather it assists, and every small business it enables to grow
will make a difference to the people and communities served by
this legislation.

These are among the provisions of the Supplemental
Appropriations Act of 1993:

The Act provides \$220 million for summer jobs for youth,
including \$50 million for the Youth Fair Chance Program. This
new program will provide a comprehensive range of services to
low

-income youth in communities with high concentrations of poverty.

The Act provides \$150 million for grants to State and local government to enhance public safety by hiring additional law enforcement personnel. These funds will help fight crime and offset layoffs resulting from fiscal restraints on local governments.

The Act provides \$341 million to the Pell Student financial assistance program to help address a shortage of funding from previous years.
more

(OVER)

2

H.R. 2118 provides \$175 million to support nearly \$3.2 billion in SBA loan guarantees. Regular appropriations for SBA's primary lending programs were exhausted in late April, and the program has been shut down since then. The supplemental funds provided for SBA will allow thousands of businesses to receive loans for start

-up, expansion, and working capital.

The Act provides \$475 million for veterans compensation and pensions, and is necessary to ensure that payments continue to be made to veterans through the end of the fiscal year.

Honoring my commitment to provide additional assistance to victims of Hurricane Andrew, the bill makes available \$271 million for disaster assistance through the Departments of Agriculture and Housing and Urban Development.

These funds are to be used to address the destruction caused by Hurricane Andrew, Hurricane Iniki, and Typhoon Omar and, in some cases, other Presidentially declared disasters as well. These funds are necessary to promote rebuilding and to respond effectively to the continuing need for disaster relief. In accordance with the applicable provisions of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, I join the Congress in designating the \$63 million provided by the Act for agriculture disaster assistance as an emergency requirement.

The Act extends Federal crop disaster relief to farmers with disaster

-related losses occurring prior to August 1, 1993, without appropriating additional disaster funds. Existing emergency funds are sufficient to pay roughly 15 cents for every dollar claimed. This provision will permit some assistance to farmers impacted by the recent floods in the Midwest. I have directed Agriculture Secretary Espy to submit to me a crop disaster assistance plan to provide additional assistance to these farmers.

The Act support \$73 billion in loan guarantee authority

to allow the FHA single- and multi

-family mortgage insurance
programs and the GNMA mortgage

-backed securities program to
continue operating through the rest of the year. Absent this
supplemental, both programs would soon deplete their funding.

Finally, the Act provides \$1.3 billion for the Department
of Defense and partially offsets the additional funding with
nearly \$1 billion in rescissions. The additional funds are for
the costs of Operation Restore Hope, Operation Southern Watch,
and other requirements.

I commend the Congress for developing a supplemental
appropriations bill that supports my investment program and
meets urgent National needs.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
July 3, 1993.

#

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Bureau of Policy and Programs (1=US@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.NET@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)

CREATION DATE/TIME:09-SEP-1993 06:22:00.00

SUBJECT: Daily Digest, September 8

TO: Media Reaction -- Bulletin Board (1=US@*RFC-822\bulletin(A)Hr.HOUSe.gov@3=iNTerNET@2=teLEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bonnie Nicholson (1=US@*RFC-822\BNichols(a)de2d800a.pa.osd.Mil@3=InternET@2=TELeMail@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Brian Cullin (1=US@*RFC-822\BCullin(a)se2e800a.pa.osd.mIL@3=INterneT@2=TELeMail@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Cliff Bernath (1=US@*RFC-822\cbernath(a)se2e811b.pa.osd.Mil@3=InternET@2=TELeMail@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Kurtz (1=US@*RFC-822\DKurtz(a)hr.house.gov@3=intERneT@2=teleMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Belcher (1=US@*RFC-822\jbelcher(a)hr.house.gov@3=iNTerNET@2=teLEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: jonathan gill (1=US@*RFC-822\jpg+(a)campaign92.org@3=intERneT@2=teleMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Icenogle (1=US@*RFC-822\micenogl(a)se2e800a.pa.osd.Mil@3=InternET@2=TELeMail@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mike Stepp (1=US@*RFC-822\MStepp(a)se2e800b.pa.osd.miL@3=INTerneT@2=TELeMail@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy Burt (1=US@*RFC-822\wburt(a)se1e794a.pa.osd.mil@3=iNTerneT@2=TELeMail@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
--608187348-1865416330-747568780:#21638
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

--608187348-1865416330-747568780:#21638
Content-Type: APPLICATION/octet-stream; name="mdd300.txt"
Content-ID: <Pine.3.07.9309090540.A21638@access.digex.net>
Content-Description:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
FOREIGN MEDIA REACTION--DAILY DIGEST

For further information: Anne Chermak, Chief
Media Reaction Staff (P/M), Tele. No. (202) 619-6511

Wednesday, September 8, 1993

INCHING TOWARD AN ISRAELI-PLO ACCORD

As negotiations and meetings multiplied in pursuit of the signing of the Israeli-PLO agreement, foreign writers touched on several themes: the U.S. role; President Clinton's proposal for a White House signing ceremony; the dangers inherent for the accord's protagonists; and the need for funding.

Comment in Israel and Arab countries reflected different mindsets. In Israel, concern focused on dealing carefully with the right-wing opposition to the deal. A Palestinian daily softened its opposition to the accord. In Lebanon, a writer for mainstream Christian An-Nahar wondered, "Will Israel be flexible enough to schedule its withdrawal from the Golan Heights and Lebanon?" A columnist for Jordan's center-left Al-Dustur remarked, "From now on our war with Israel will be a war of economic interests" and suggested that Arab relations with Israel will now begin to resemble U.S. relations with Japan and Europe. Syrian media resolutely denied that any progress is being made on the Syrian-Israeli track.

European commentators suppressed a growing ebullience that this may finally be the "turning point" in the search for "permanent peace" between Israel and its Arab neighbors. Britain's independent Financial Times welcomed "a Middle East devoted to economic cooperation rather than condemned to war." A former New York correspondent wrote in Serbia-Montenegro's centrist Borba that the Israeli-Palestinian detente had provided "the birth of a model" for peace which factions in the former Yugoslavia would do well to emulate. But a commentator in Algeria's independent L'Opinion offered this negative vision of the region's future: "If this peace opens the doors to a 'common market' where Arab land, water, oil, money, and labor will again...serve the Jews and Americans...we can be sure that...no expert from the CIA or the Mossad will be able to guarantee peace and security in this region."

This survey is based on 62 reports from 26 countries, September 2-8.

EDITORS: Mildred Sola Neely and Gail H. Burke

Special Report attached

MIDDLE EAST

ISRAEL: "Concern Over Arafat's Interpretation"

Diplomatic correspondent Hemi Shalev and Washington correspondent Akiva Eldar reported (9/8) in liberal Haaretz, "Sources in Prime Minister Rabin's office have expressed concern over what they describe as a long series of public and private statements by Arafat in which he plainly contradicted various understandings that he had reached with Israel and which are clearly stated in the document of principles."

"Do Not Dismiss Demonstrators"

An editorial in independent Maariv (9/8) commented, (Rabin's) offhand and dismissive reaction doesn't alter the fact that the thousands of demonstrators who marched in Jerusalem yesterday represent a third of the Israeli public.... Rabin must not dismiss the right-wingers or provoke them. He shouldn't even be angry with them. Their concern for the country's future is just as legitimate as his own.... We may be heading for peace, but we may also be heading for a trap and war."

"Worried Over Lack Of Information"

The right-wing Jerusalem Post's (9/8) editorial said, "What worries the public most is the lack of information. It simply does not know what the (Israeli-PLO) agreement means. The mere promise that it will bring 'peace' is far too nebulous and uncertain to satisfy anyone with experience of living in this region."

WEST BANK: "Palestinian Concessions Not Excessive"

In a softening of its previous anti-accord stance, pro-Jordan An-Nahar concluded (9/8), "The Palestinian people have felt bitter about the settlement emerging through the Gaza-Jericho agreement. We have been raised on principles and convictions that promised us the achievements of all of our rights and the return of the home land. Today, it seems that the solution will come in installments....

"Although we sympathize with those of our people who oppose the agreement between the PLO and Israel, we do not believe that the concessions given by the Palestinians were excessive."

JORDAN: "And Next...The Economic War"

Center-left Al-Dustur said (9/8): "Realizing that the next war, which has already started between the United States, Japan and Europe, is going to be a war of economic interests, Israel and the Zionist movement put aside their teachings and are seeking a method other than war planes and missiles to achieve hegemony over the world. From now on, our war with Israel will be a war of economic interests, where the Zionist state will try, using every capability, to control the Arab markets, including the Palestinian market in Gaza and the West Bank.... If the Arabs fight this vicious war in the same way they did their military wars, then disaster is definitely on its way."

"Hope Pact Will Create A New Driving Force"

Al-Dustur also commented (9/8): "We hope that the momentum set by the Palestinian-Israeli accord will create a new driving force behind all tracks of the peace process, and that some of what was achieved in the Palestinian track will be achieved in the other tracks as well."

LEBANON: "What's The Next Step?"

Emile Khuri wondered in mainstream Christian, pro-Hariri An-Nahar (9/8): "What comes after Gaza-Jericho? An ex-official believed attention would turn to the other tracks, mainly the Lebanese and Syrian ones, since the Jordanian track poses problems. Will Israel be flexible enough to schedule its withdrawal from the Golan Heights and...Lebanon? Or will it propose separate solutions? This source feared Israeli full withdrawal from Lebanon will be conditioned upon an end to resistance activities in the South and the disarming of Hezbollah."

"No Stopping Now"

Talal Salman opined in pro-Syrian, pro-Arab nationalist As-Safir (9/7): "It makes no sense to denounce the Palestinian-Israeli agreement now. No one holds the key for history, and no one has the right to deprive the nation (of Palestine) of its existence and future just because he is eager for a solution (over one meter of Jericho.) The right of veto will continue to be neglected, waiting for someone who can afford to refuse defeat--the agreement of the defeated."

SYRIA: "Rumors And Fabrications"

Government-supported Tishreen (9/6) included this piece by Muhamad Khair Al-Wadi, "News about progress on Syrian-Israeli track during the first week of the 11th (sic) are fabrications of a media campaign that aims at creating unrealistic optimism.... The organizers of this campaign wanted to prepare a proper atmosphere...to ratify the Israeli-PLO agreement quietly by talking about alleged progress on the Syrian-Israeli track and giving the impression that Israel is really serious about peace...."

"For the same reason rumors about secret Israeli-Syrian negotiations spread, but they know very well that such a thing will never happen and that the only negotiations will be during the Washington peace talks."

EGYPT: "Peace Only Available Way"

Columnist Mahmoud Abdel Moneim Murad opined (9/8) in influential, pro-government Al-Akhbar, "There is now real hope for a just, comprehensive peace, for security, for stability and cooperation and a good neighborhood. Why are the Arabs afraid of dealing with Israel? Is Israel more cunning and stronger than America, Russia, China...some of whom had attacked Egypt before and occupied Arab land? Isn't it fair to try peace with those who sat at the negotiating table...evacuated from Sinai...and are willing to evacuate from Golan and Lebanon? Peace is the only available way."

"Out Of Desperation With U.S. Role?"

Al-Akhbar (9/8) columnist Maha Abdel Fattah maintained, "The PLO resorted to secret talks because of 'total desperation with the American role.'... The PLO realized, without a doubt, that the American team had become even more 'Likudish' than the Israelis themselves."

ALGERIA: "Arabs' Political Suicide"

Kheireddine Layeb stated in independent, Arabic-language El-Hayat El-Arabia (9/6): "All Arab states have tried to hide their political failure by saying that the Israeli project is a first step toward the accomplishment of other steps.... They might be right because one failure hides another.... In fact, the Arabs are in a weaker position than at any time since the seventies.... The big winner in the new project is Egypt (which) achieved its 1979 hope of

regaining its strong reputation in the region.... Palestinian acceptance of this project was political suicide."

"The Stakes"

Mohamed Tahar Bensaada maintained in independent, French-language L'Opinion (9/5): "Peace will be lasting only if it allows (us) to surpass the multiple dimensions--territorial, political, technical, scientific, economic, financial and regarding security--of the current strategic disequilibrium. The West knows this well and applied this political technique in dealing with...Franco-German relations after the second world war. Their determination to apply discriminatory treatment to the Arab world may satisfy their desire for power and their superiority complex, but it will not prevent a vital region for the world's economy from sinking into crises...threatening peace and world security.... Arab and Palestinian leaders can accept any peace today, provided that it preserves their power and privileges, but if this peace opens the doors to a 'common market' where Arab land, water, oil, money, and labor will again...serve the Jews and Americans, without feeding the 300 million inhabitants the Arab world will have in the year 2000, we can be sure that, regardless of the military-police forces set up to guard this new regional 'order,' no expert from the CIA or the Mossad will be able to guarantee peace and security in this region."

"Jerusalem On The Auction Block"

Nocine Baka commented in El Hayat El Arabia (9/2): "What is little known is that the United States, through its policy of millimeter by millimeter rather than the step by step policy of the seventies, is looking to change the Israeli function from a military to an economic one, and to establish a weapons-free zone starting with Syria, which frightens the club of nuclear states."

MOROCCO: "An Outright Israeli Victory?"

Opposition, nationalist, French-language L'Opinion (9/7) warned in a comment on its English page: "Once the Gaza-Jericho plan is approved, the Palestine question will be settled for all time to come.... Apparently the Gaza-Jericho plan is an outright Israeli victory.... The plan prepared with the help of the Egyptians...has five interesting points.... Anyone could see that none of these conditions meets the demands of the Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, nor the terms of reference of the Madrid conference of 1991. The Palestinian's leaders seem ready to accept whatever little they can get so as to satisfy themselves that their long struggle was not fruitless."

"New Atmosphere Offers Chance For Change"

Opposition socialist, Arabic-language Bayane Al Youm (9/4) editorialized: "It would be a mistake to judge that the current dialogue holds nothing positive for the Palestinian people and its national cause. We are against the 'all or nothing' point of view, and we believe that dynamism in the current dialogue has created a new atmosphere which could bring new gains for the Palestinian cause."

SAUDI ARABIA: "GCC Support"

Top-circulation, pro-government Ukaz observed (9/8): "Dialogue and negotiations made it possible for the Palestinians, 'in principle,' to obtain self-rule somewhere inside the occupied territories, no matter how small the territory. Then some Palestinian voices began to reject this Israeli withdrawal, saying that struggle and resistance from outside the territories is

more effective than struggle from inside. It is a strange logic for many reasons.

"We believe that supporting such an agreement will constitute the beginning of a serious march toward liberating the rest of the occupied territories through many means.

"Out of this understanding comes the GCC ministerial council's acceptance of the agreement. Their position comes as a result of a full understanding of the dimensions of the issue, the prevailing international situation and the logic of the new world order which calls for quiet diplomacy and dialogue."

SUDAN: "A Welcomed Decision"

The government-controlled New Horizon opined (9/7): "It is known that the United States has been optimistic that the Israelis and the Palestinians would develop a declaration of principles relating to the self-autonomy authority.... However, in response to the will of Palestinians, any peace-loving nation which has been in support of the struggle since 1948, would as well hail this decision which will bring an end to the conflict that has claimed the lives of old people and young men."

"Arab Unity Is Essential"

Government-controlled Al-Inqaz Al-Watani commented (9/4): "The Jericho-Gaza accord concerns not only Palestinians. It will also affect all Arab-Islamic countries. Thus, unity among Arabs is essential...in order to avoid differences between Arabs.... The real danger, however, which might follow the signing of this accord, is the escalation of the dispute between Palestinian factions. Then, we will understand that Israel will be the one to benefit."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: "Unstoppable March Of Peace"

Government-owned Al-Bayan of Dubai editorialized (9/8): "Opponents of the accord between the Palestinians and the Israelis will not be able to stop the peace march and the effort to reach a historic agreement between Israel and the PLO."

"GCC And Other Arabs Have No Choice But To Back Palestinians On Accord"

Commenting on the GCC support of the Gaza-Jericho deal, Al-Bayan remarked (9/7): "The GCC stand stems from the Council's interest and support of the Palestinians in their struggle to restore their rights. So if the Palestinian leadership believes that the settlement of the Palestinian question starts with the Gaza-Jericho deal, then the GCC and other Arabs will have no choice but to back the Palestinians in their position."

EUROPE

BRITAIN: "A Vision: Economic Cooperation Vs. War"

The independent Financial Times (9/8) judged, "Israel's Labor-led coalition government is out to crack the issue of the Palestinians, which is at the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict. If it succeeds, the Israeli government and the PLO will have broken the logjam obstructing progress toward a wider peace between Israel and the Arab states to its north and east. And the vision that some Israeli leaders have dreamed of for years--a Middle East devoted to economic cooperation rather than condemned to war--could start to become reality....

"There is also a danger that the politics could turn sour--especially if Mr. Yasser Arafat...claims his state before the Israelis are ready to discuss it.... (But if the accord

works), it is more than likely that Palestinian statehood...will be up for discussion before too long.

"And at that point Israel would be well on the way to attaining the status so long denied it--that of a normal state at the heart of the Middle East."

FRANCE: "Enormous Step Forward"

Independent weekly Le Point's (9/8) Pierre Beylau remarked, "Until the end, American diplomats had underestimated the chances of the operation. Thus, the United States...looked more like spectators than actors.... But nothing may happen without Washington. It is the United States which is in a position to convince the Arab countries of the Gulf to provide financial support to the process. It is the United States which may persuade Syria not to hinder the march toward peace....

"The convulsive history of the Middle East has moved these past few days at a brutally accelerated pace. There will undoubtedly be some turnovers, bloodshed, tears, disappointments. But an enormous step forward had been made which is probably irreversible."

"U.S. Will Have To Make Decision On Arafat"

Washington correspondent Stephane Marchand wrote in conservative Le Figaro (9/8), "If Israel and the PLO sign in Washington, within the next few days, an autonomy agreement complete with mutual recognition, the United States will have to make a decision: to deliver a visa to the PLO leaders, maybe even to Yasser Arafat."

GERMANY: "Will Arafat Make It?"

Right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (9/8) front-paged this editorial by Wolfgang Guenter Lerch: "Arafat did the right thing. For the first time in its 30 year-history, the PLO has really freed itself from the 'leash' of its Arab 'brothers.'... Because it is so weak, the PLO can be manipulated again....

"A real peaceful settlement for the Middle East will be a long time in coming. Without economic assistance to the region it will be unthinkable. According to Washington's views, the PLO--or another Palestinian representation--is to be supported again by rich Arab oil states after the mutual recognition with Israel. If this is the case, Arafat should try to continue his course of independent action despite new dependencies."

"Arab Oil Money And Western Sponsorship"

Wolfgang Koydl wrote in centrist Sueddeutsche Zeitung (9/8) of Munich, "The 40 years of warlike status in the Middle East have been an expensive undertaking for all sides involved...but, peace, which is now visible, will not be cheap either. If it is to be a permanent peace, it must be strengthened with financial infusions. Obviously, Americans and Arabs, Europeans and Israelis have realized this quickly.... While the Gulf states, surprisingly, reacted generously after the announcement of the Israeli-PLO accord...it is not yet certain whether the West will get engaged with considerable amounts of money.... The greatest impetus must come from the region itself."

ITALY: "Tangible Image Of Sensational U.S. Diplomatic Success"

Paolo Passarini filed from Washington in centrist La Stampa (9/8), "Clinton's offer to use the

White House for the signature of the PLO-Israeli agreement represents an incentive for the parties involved but is also meant to exert pressure on them in order to speed up the negotiations.... At the same time, it would offer the world the tangible image of a sensational U.S. diplomatic success."

"White House Site For Festival Of Peace?"

Jerusalem correspondent Lorenzo Cremonesi observed in centrist *Corriere della Sera* (9/8), "Clinton is offering the White House for the festival of peace. Resembling the rich friend who wants to gain the favors of his companions after being ignored for some time, the U.S. president is trying to relaunch his foreign policy by proposing Washington as the site of the signature of the Gaza-Jericho accord.... After being left aside during the secret negotiations, the White House now aims at again becoming the locomotive of the peace process."

BELGIUM: "New Theory In Arab-Israeli Relations"

Foreign editor Leo Custers commented (9/8) in conservative Catholic *Gazet van Antwerpen*, "A new theory regarding future Israel-PLO relations--and, more widely, Israel-Arab world relations--is emerging in Israeli circles. It says that there is no longer a conflict between Zionist and Palestinian nationalists on the possession of the same territory but rather a struggle between the secularized lay society with everything that it entails--democracy, civil liberties, human rights--and fanatic integralists. From this perspective, Rabin can extend his hands not only to Arafat, but also to the governments of his Arab neighbors: Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon and Syria. On these grounds one might say that a new element is being added to the Western world coalition against advancing Islamic integrism which touches upon a crucial problem in the post-communist era, namely relations between the West and Islam."

"Islam And The Israeli-Palestinian Turnaround"

Robert Verdussen comments in conservative Catholic *La Libre Belgique* (9/8), "By tackling the peace from its thorniest angle, Israelis and Palestinians took adversaries and partners by surprise. They did not leave them any choice. How could Hafez el Assad reject what Arafat has accepted? How could King Hussein disagree with the solution of a problem which has corroded his regime for so long? How could Saudi Arabia refuse to finance again a PLO with which Israel signs an agreement with the blessing of the United States?"

"Did the Islamic peril play a decisive role in this Israeli-Palestinian turnaround? Undoubtedly. The radicalism of Hamas has persuaded Peres and Rabin to come to terms with a more moderate party. But it also allowed Arafat to demonstrate that moderation pays. This will be true provided peace gets rooted in the daily life of Palestinians who, in the absence of a prompt improvement, will always be tempted to believe in the superiority of Islamism to ensure a better future."

SERBIA-MONTENEGRO: "The Birth Of A Model"

Prominent Slovenian free-lance writer and former New York correspondent for *Politika*, Jurij Gustinic, wrote in centrist *Borba* (9/4-5): "It's hard to believe that the three egocentric factions from the Geneva talks (on Bosnia-Herzegovina) found time to inquire about developments in the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. The Middle East is such a provincial topic! However, it should be vital for them to cast a glance toward Jerusalem.... When we get confronted with a pathological conclusion that those in (Bosnia) will 'never again' be able to live together (or even be neighbors), we will not have to refer to the out-of-date 'deadly enmity' between France

and Germany, but to the Israelis and Palestinians instead.... It will prove that deadly enemies might be satisfied with small concessions, even though for years they kept saying, 'All or nothing'.... Peace is worth a piece of land! In peace, society is progressing, new technology can be developed, and boundaries between the small and big erased."

TURKEY: "Cautious Optimism"

Hasan Cemal asked in mass-appeal Sabah (9/8), "Will the Jews and the Arabs be able to overcome their own past? They have such deep-rooted, bitter and tragic memories about each other; will they be able to overcome these and build peace together? Achieving a lasting and just peace is easy for neither side.... Yossi Beilin, with whom I met in his office at the Foreign Affairs Ministry, does not favor over-optimism. He prefers a cautious or skeptical optimism. Prime Minister Rabin holds the same view."

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

INDONESIA: "Agreement May Be First Step Toward Overall Solution"

Business-oriented Analisa of Medan commented (9/7): "If this agreement is signed, it will be an exceptional historical event...although the plan to sign the agreement on September 13 is still tentative. Hopefully, the agreement will be the first step toward an overall solution to the Palestinians' problems, namely the creation of an independent and sovereign state which is, in fact, a basic requirement for peace in the Middle East."

NEW ZEALAND: "Palestinians Are On Their Own"

The top-circulation, moderate New Zealand Herald of Auckland commented (9/8): "Even the Syrian message is unequivocal: The Palestinians are on their own. Those among them who seek a peaceful foundation from which to negotiate what even the Israeli ambassador to the United States had acknowledged is a possibility--a Palestinian state--now have to stand firm against those in their own ranks who would wreck that dream. So do the Israelis."

SOUTH ASIA

BANGLADESH: "Arafat's Difficult Undertaking"

In the opinion of the independent Morning Sun (9/8), "It is for Arafat to strike a deal for his people before time walks out on him. At the other end, which is the historical, the point cannot be lost on anyone that what Mr. Rabin and Mr. Peres are offering the PLO now is the best under the circumstances. It is now for the PLO to accept the offer or be plainly dismissive about it. The Palestinians know that a rejection of the offer could create conditions that will certainly turn the clock back. If and when that happens, the world could brace itself for a Middle East ready to play havoc with history."

PAKISTAN: "Sept. 13 Signing?"

The government-owned Pakistan Times opined (9/8), "As things stand, both the PLO and Israel are on the verge of recognizing each other as PLO leader Yasser Arafat has removed the stumbling block by saying that he is ready to renounce terrorism and formally recognize Israel's right to exist. It is hoped that a beginning toward a lasting peace in the Middle East will be made with the signing of the accord between PLO and Israel in Washington on Sept. 13 which allows self-rule for the nearly 2,000,000 Palestinians of the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip."

NEPAL: "World Waiting For Historic Announcement"

Semi-official Gorkhapatra advised (9/5): "Taking account of the increasing protests of extremist Palestinian groups and right-wing groups of Israel, and even the threat to kill Yasser Arafat, the autonomy plan should be implemented sincerely.... The world community is waiting for the historic announcement about Israel and the PLO recognizing each other."

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

COLOMBIA: "Global Agreement Needed"

Liberal-party affiliated El Espectador (9/7) opined: "The rest of the Arab world--Syria, Jordan and Lebanon--are very distrustful, and they have talked about the need for a global agreement in which everyone participates.... Something similar happened with the 1980 agreement between Begin and Sadat, which resulted in the murder of the latter during a military parade. It would be very disappointing if the Arab countries don't understand the need for peace in the Middle East only because they oppose an agreement that puts an end to the continuity of the conflict."

AFRICA

NIGERIA: "Arafat Must Be Vigilant In Gathering Popular Support For Plan"

The influential, government-owned Daily Times maintained (9/6): "It is necessary at this time to appeal to all opponents of this historic agreement to allow it and watch how it works as it is a fitting accomplishment for the several years of struggle of the Palestinian people."

"Opposition is expected and it promises to be ferocious. There is no doubt that the Israeli government will be able to contain opposition from Israeli political circles. The case of the PLO presents difficulties. Chairman Arafat must be vigilant and get the popular support of the Palestinian population for this unique experiment in Palestinian statehood."

ZIMBABWE: "Commendable Spirit Of Give-And-Take"

The government-influenced Chronicle observed (9/3): "Notwithstanding extreme pressures and disruptive forces, the [leaders of Israel and the PLO] have affirmed their resolution not to deviate from their quest for peace, and in this pursuit committed themselves to continue in the spirit of give-and-take that they have shown, for which they must be commended and supported by the progressive-thinking world."

Wednesday, September 8, 1993

SOMALIA: HAZARDS OF PEACEKEEPING

The press was uniformly critical of the UN mission as the guarantor of peace in Somalia. Its harsh treatment of the current unprecedented phase of peacekeeping contrasted dramatically with its great appreciation of the UN's performance as provider of humanitarian relief. Papers continued to call for the UN to review its mission, to unify its central command so that it speaks with one voice, and to develop a plan that links the capture of warlord Aideed with larger issues of stability and self-government in Somalia.

The loss of the lives of 46 Blue Helmets--thus far--in this campaign caused several dailies to question whether the UN should or could pacify hostile forces and establish democracy in Somalia. One paper pointed out that as long as the UN does not control Mogadishu, it cannot have any viable policy in Somalia.

Reports were mixed in their assessment of U.S. policy: on the one hand, there were those who perceived the U.S. as a "Rambo" who is "out to get" Aideed; on the other were those who contended that the U.S. was tired of the problems posed by Somalia and wants very much to be relieved of them. The former made much of the U.S. rangers' unsuccessful raid to capture Aideed.

This survey is based on 56 reports from 26 countries, August 27-September 8.

EDITOR: Herman W. Henning, Jr.

AFRICA

KENYA: "Time To Review UN Policy In Somalia"

The independent Weekly Review (8/27) carried this commentary by editor-in-chief Hilary Ng'weno criticizing the U.S./UN role in Somalia, "Operation Restore Hope, which started off as a humanitarian effort to save hundreds of thousands of Somalis from the ravages of war and drought, is in danger of turning into a military quagmire with Washington, through the United Nations, seeking primarily to punish Somali warlord Mohammed Farah Aideed for targetting American troops in Mogadishu for terrorist activities. President Clinton says the original American humanitarian objective in Somalia still stands. But increasingly the evidence belies this claim. More and more, American-led UN activities are focusing on 'getting' General Aideed, a focus which is as misguided as it is legally questionable....

"The United States needs to rethink its global mission in today's unipolar international community. In Somalia, it must avoid advancing narrow national interests--as yet unspecified--behind the increasingly shaky moral shield of the United Nations."

NIGERIA: "Somalia: "Peace-Keeping Generates Hostility"

The Lagos-based independent tabloid Daily Champion (8/30) ran an op-ed article by Okechukwu Emeh, "The humanitarian mission code-named 'Operation Restore Hope' undoubtedly brought a semblance of optimism and calm to a nation left in a terrible desolation by years of fratricidal strife and famine.... But as the marines were bidding farewell to Somalia after accomplishing

their arduous task, the relative order that attended their swift operation began to wane as the once disappeared gunmen returned to hold the disconsolated nation into another siege. Mired by this sort of hostilities, there might be growing chaos if the UNOSOM does not retrace from the prevailing combatant entanglement with the Somali dissidents.

"The offensive could even draw the UN peace-keeping forces into an open warfare with the warlords that would be disastrous. Regardless of the apparent intransigence of General Aideed to UN troops, one would have expected the Blue Helmets to tread the honoring path of dialogue instead of pandering to military muscle that could deface its corporate image as guarantor of civil peace."

EUROPE

BRITAIN: "Whoops: Delta Force Does It Again"

The liberal Guardian's Washington correspondent Martin Walker commented (8/31), "Whoops. Delta Force does it again. The people who brought the world Operation Desert Disaster in the wilds of Iran, colliding their helicopters in the botched rescue attempt of the American hostage diplomats in Tehran, have chalked up another humiliation. It was never like this for Rambo, for Hollywood's seductive myth that all you need are heroes with stout hearts and smart weapons. But the delusion that military power can be used with the precision of a scalpel to achieve complex policy goals endures....

"The Clinton administration, with very little military experience, and the new Pentagon chief, General John Shalikashvili, who seems less devoted to Powell's law than his elders who learnt in Vietnam about the vanity of military wishes, are now embarked on their learning curve. If they are lucky, the lesson of Delta Force's botched mission in Mogadishu will teach them something of the limits and liabilities of military power."

"U.S. Armed Farces"

Under the satirical headline above, the left-leaning tabloid Today (8/31) front-paged this report, "Crack American troops looked a laughing stock last night after a daring mission turned into a military farce of Hollywood proportions.... The astonishing bungle in Mogadishu could have been a script from the zany movie 'Hot Shots.' But charity workers in Somalia were not laughing last night."

"Pressures Mount On Washington To Cut Somalia Commitment"

The centrist Independent (8/31) reported on its front page, "A bungled assault by United States troops on a UN building in Mogadishu...is increasing pressure on President Bill Clinton to reduce the U.S. commitment in Somalia.... With Congress not in session and most politicians on holiday, Mr. Clinton may escape without much political damage from the latest Somalia blunder. But criticism is mounting on both right and left."

FRANCE: "Raid Was A Not A Good Lesson In Democracy"

Economic Les Echos (9/1) contributed this unattributed back-page editorial, "The circumstances (of the recent U.S. helicopter operation in Somalia) deserve greater reflection than Bill Clinton granted them. The U.S. president is apparently convinced that things went on normally.... When they arrived in Somalia, the Americans did court warlord Mohammed Aideed enough to not now make others suffer the results of the manhunt they have launched against him. One thing is certain: it is not with such methods that the Somalis will be taught the sense of

democracy."

"A Disaster Americans Would Like To Leave?"

Pierre-Marie Christin said on radio RTL (8/31), "The Americans are awkward, very awkward--probably because they are in a hurry.... Aideed is a murderer. We (international community) were right to go to Somalia. It is a disaster that the Americans want to leave.... We must stay to complete our mission."

GERMANY: "Murders And Misunderstandings In Mogadishu"

Centrist Sueddeutsche Zeitung of Munich (9/7) carried an editorial that said, "More dead UN soldiers in Mogadishu.... This means that 46 members of the UN force have lost their lives in trying to bring peace to the country. The snipers were quickly classified as Aideed sympathizers.... The incident shows that the UN by no means controls Mogadishu.... UNOSOM speaks with too many tongues. How else can one explain that \$25,000 have been offered as a reward for the capture of Aideed but his guerillas have received \$100,000 for protective services which they have not been carrying out for a long time?"

UN Is Planless In Somalia"

Right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (9/7) featured an editorial that read, "The row about the right way to proceed militarily so that something approximating a political order can be brought back to Somalia is increasingly poisoning the atmosphere between the various national Blue Helmet contingents. First the Italians accused the Americans of launching military operations against their favorite villain Aideed without consulting the other countries involved. This time Italian soldiers are being accused of having left their Nigerian comrades in the lurch.... Events such as this are casting a bad light on the entire operation. It is high time the participating nations sat down at the UN table and worked out a military and political strategy for Somalia."

"Reasons For Remaining In Somalia Have Become Fuzzy?"

Centrist Stuttgarter Zeitung (9/7) commented in this editorial, "Why are UN troops still in Somalia?... Food supplies are good and the population is no longer starving. Object achieved, operation over? Nine months after the arrival of the UN forces in Somalia, the means and end of the operation have been worryingly reversed. What previously seemed necessary to banish hunger from Somalia--keeping rival militia gangs in check--now seems to have become the main priority. The purpose of a large number of the Blue Helmets deployed in Somalia is obviously to capture Aideed. This has, of course, created an embarrassing impression: An international force has spent months hunting a single man.... Now that no one in Somalia is starving, the political and military aims of the Blue Helmets in the country seem fuzzy."

"Wild West?"

Right-of-center of Die Welt Berlin (9/1) carried an editorial that characterized the Ranger's "In his desire to present by all means a success, U.S. Admiral Howe is resorting to Wild West methods that are even putting members of the United Nations into the line of fire of the peace troops. The failure on Monday must thus be blamed on the rashness of the UNOSOM leadership rather than the experienced rangers. Considering that experts are calling this special area of Mogadishu a maze, to look for alleged Aideed supporter in a UN building would only be acceptable if such actions did not jeopardize the peace mission. However, the opposite is the case. The Blue Helmets are not supposed to commit any spectacular heroic acts in Somalia but to help the

suffering people lead a new live again."

"Embarrassing Blunder In Mogadishu"

Under the headline above, centrist Sueddeutsche Zeitung (8/31) carried this editorial, "When the spokesman for the American forces in Mogadishu calls the nightly operation of the Rangers a success, this is nothing but an attempt to camouflage a major embarrassment with words.... The failure of this raid is spectacular evidence that the U.S. command headquarters is groping in the dark when it comes to apprehending Aided. Under pressure from the U.S. public, which is increasingly questioning the soldier's continued presence in Somalia, the U.S. soldiers got carried away and ordered a rapid operation without adequate preparation."

ITALY: "Second Thoughts In Mogadishu"

An unsigned commentary in economic Il Sole-24 Ore (9/7) held, "Boutros Ghali's request to the Italians to postpone their departure from Mogadishu....means that the UNOSOM commander trusts the Italians and prefers to have them handy in the most difficult area. Asking the Italians to prolong their presence in Mogadishu must have been a bitter pill to swallow for Boutros Ghali as well as for his deputy and former Admiral Howe. Evidently the UN Secretary General asked Italy to remain only because he deemed it absolutely necessary."

"However, an Italian initiative to shed full light on the alleged failure of Italian soldiers to help Nigerian peacekeepers during Sunday's attack would be appropriate and would help defend the prestige and honor of the Italian contingent, which has already paid its contribution in blood to the mission in Somalia. Given the situation in Mogadishu and misunderstandings among the various contingents and the UN command, the best thing would be for Italian peacekeepers to be redeployed in an area where they are more free to move independently."

"The Good Reasons Of Dialogue"

This unsigned commentary in leading conservative Il Giornale (9/6) said, "The Americans, with their puritanical Manicheism, have transformed Aided into a national hero, put the assistance operation in a bad light in the eyes of the Somalis themselves, and cast gratuitous shadows on the behavior of General Loi and therefore on the credibility of the Italians."

"Time To Choose: In Or Out"

A commentary by Franco Venturini on the front page of centrist Corriere della Sera (9/6), "Most of all, the Italian contingent cannot continue to keep one foot in Mogadishu and one foot outside, consequently exposing itself completely to the rebukes of the allies and the fire of the enemy. In or out, whatever Boutros Ghali has to say."

"A Lively Debate Is Sure To Ensue"

Paolo Passarini from Washington predicted in centrist La Stampa (8/31), "Disputes over the U.S. mission in Somalia were already growing in the United States after Secretary of Defense Les Aspin hinted last week of the need for U.S. troops to remain in Somalia for a long period of time. The raid Sunday night is certainly destined to make this dispute very lively."

BELGIUM: "CNN Is preparing To Broadcast Aided's Capture"

Conservative Het Laatste Nieuws (9/7) reported, "CNN has already sent an extra two tons of equipment to Mogadishu in order to be able to transmit live the arrest of Mohammed Farah

Aideed, Somalia's most powerful warlord. One of these days, the American Army Rangers--specialized in missions behind enemy lines--hope to pick Aideed out of one of his shelters."

"Strange UN 'Culture'"

Under the headline above, diplomatic correspondent Mia Doornaert in independent Catholic de Standaard (9/7) commented, "UN troops in Somalia--including Belgian troops--adapt beautifully to local 'culture.' For male Somalis who get killed in traffic incidents with Blue Helmets, damages are twice the amount of those paid for female victims. Imagine that the UN, at the time of apartheid, had sent Blue Helmets to South Africa who would have been told that they could drive their vehicles over two blacks for the price of one white person: The 'world community' would have cried shame over those racist procedures.

"Discrimination on grounds of the color of the skin is racist, discrimination on grounds of gender is 'cultural.'... The fact that, in the name of the UN, procedures are applied which declare inferior half of the world's population--women--is unacceptable and in total contradiction with the universal declaration of human rights. The fact that no questions are asked about this [behavior] in democratic countries whose Blue Helmets participate in the operation but who, on the other hand, are preoccupied with all other minorities, once more demonstrates how difficult it is for the notion that women are human beings, too, to penetrate a world dominated by men."

CANADA: "Mission Has Become A Caricature"

Foreign-affairs writer Dave Todd commented on the UN role in Somalia in an op-ed piece headlined as above in the liberal Montreal Gazette (9/8) that argued, "The mission has strayed far from its original humanitarian purpose as defined by the UN and former U.S. President George Bush. Undoubtedly, this is one of the most difficult UN military operations in the world body's 48-year history. But last week's events have also underscored its growing reputation as possibly the most badly bungled one ever mounted. The tragicomic raid August 30 by U.S. commandos on the UN Development Program's offices in the capital...is the most dramatic example yet, in its demonstration of just how uncoordinated and directionless the Somalia intervention has become. The UN special envoy in Somalia...Jonathon Howe, says he is determined to press ahead with disarmament of insurgent forces in Mogadishu, many of whom answer to warlord Mohammed Farah Aideed. This can only deepen the country's descent into violence, say many Somalis and foreign analysts."

"Red, White And Bruised"

The left-of-center Vancouver Sun (8/31) carried an editorial headlined as above, "It has been an article of faith...that American forces would never submit to the authority of the United Nations...this demand has created inequity and awkwardness. In insisting on being first among equals, the United States has sabotaged any hope of creating a non-partisan force that is loyal, primarily, to the United Nations....

"The UN needs U.S. support. It needs the money, the manpower and the political legitimacy that would come from an unconditional endorsement by the world's only remaining superpower. But there cannot be two police officers on the global stage. If that role is to be filled by the UN, as it should be, the United States must submit.

"If the Americans refuse, then they may just as well admit that they are not really an

international police force, but merely a rogue power enforcing their national self-interest."

IRELAND: "Toughest Challenge Yet"

The left-of-center Cork Examiner (8/31) said, "Elite American troops accidentally stormed a UN building in Mogadishu yesterday as Irish troops were preparing to leave for Somalia on the most sensitive mission ever undertaken by our defense forces.... Yesterday's swoop by the black-bereted Army Rangers on the empty UN building, led to accusations by senior foreign aid officials in the Somali capital of 'bungling' a claim denied by the UN."

MALTA: "Pressure Mounting On Washington To Clarify Somalia Policy"

The independent English-language Times (9/2) wrote, "Monday's raid in Mogadishu by elite U.S. troops who captured only innocent international aid workers has increased pressure on the Clinton administration to clarify American policy in Somalia.... Despite President Bill Clinton's personal defense of the joint UN and U.S. policy in Somalia after Monday's raid, analysts warned that Washington may be stumbling toward a long military presence by expanding policy from humanitarian aid to capturing Aideed and rebuilding the country.... It was a highly visible mistake and will only add to questions about U.S. policy in Somalia--questions likely to be taken up in earnest when Congress returns from its summer recess."

SPAIN: "The Heavy Burden Of Africa"

Liberal-left El Pais (9/7) concluded, "It is amazing to see that an operation which was reasonably put together and started by Bush's administration, carried out by the UN and which was enthusiastically received by the Somalis has deteriorated to the point of anarchy and hatred. Eight months ago it would have been easy to relieve the hunger and unarm the war lords and to find a politically viable solution. Today all the initial efforts have resulted in differences among the various international commands.... Just the opposite of what was desired."

SWITZERLAND: "UN Confronts The New Nationalisms"

Centrist Tribune de Geneve (8/31) ran an article by Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali that read, "Multilateralism and voluntary cooperation among nations in the work of peace and development has long been an ideal, though seldom practiced. Member-nations have given the United Nations new and increasing responsibilities. The risks and costs involved, and their scale, are unprecedented in UN experience, and represent a new stage in international affairs."

MIDDLE EAST

ALGERIA: "Soldiers of Peace Or 'Rambos'?"

This inside-page commentary by Khedaoudj Larroum was printed in government-controlled French-language El Moudjahid (9/8), "Recourse to force has not seemed the best means of re-establishing peace in Somalia so far....

"The UN's methods have not only stirred up the Somalis' hostility toward the soldiers; some UNOSOM members have criticized them as well.... The American contingent has been reinforced specially to arrest General Aideed.... Given UNOSOM's determination to neutralize Aideed at any price, several questions must be asked. Is General Aideed the only 'cause' of the Somali problem? Doesn't the Aideed 'affair' hide other intentions?"

JORDAN: "Slaughter In Somalia"

Under the headline above, pro-establishment Al Ray (8/27) commented, "We do not know what the American forces with their barbarity and black hearts will accomplish in Somalia. Reports, however, say the mission of these forces is to apprehend the leader of the national resistance, as if his arrest will end the Somali people's resistance to occupation.... We expect that we will discover once again that unarmed nations are capable of defeating military empires. The African continent has a long history with the United States, and we hope this will mark the start of paying back for this history on the land and jungles of Somalia."

MOROCCO: "Clinton Should Understand That Power Is Not Everything"

Opposition Socialist, Arabic-language Al-Ittihad Al-Ishtiraki (9/1) carried this front-page commentary, "U.S. troops have not managed to arrest...Farah Aideed. Neither the...reward award nor the use of special military forces succeeded in capturing Farah Aideed. President Clinton badly needs someone to make him understand that power is not everything."

"The Crimes Of Operation Restore Hope"

Opposition, socialist, Arabic-language Bayane Al Youm (8/29) front paged an editorial entitled saying: "U.S. troops have gone beyond their mission and have become snipers intervening violently and causing several casualties (among Somalis).... The tragedy of Somalia has unveiled the West's hypocrisy and double standard."

SYRIA: "The Somalia Experience"

Ilias Khouri wrote in Al-Baath (9/2), "The UN operation in Somalia is a prime example of international failure in dealing with world crisis. There is fear that this failure will become a tradition in every crisis the UN attempts to solve, especially since there are a series of regional and civil conflicts. When the UN entered Somalia almost a year ago its objectives were to end the civil war and help the Somali people. But after several weeks in Somalia its mission changed from impartial mediator into a part of the conflict and entered a long struggle against General Aideed and his supporters. The reason for the UN failure is probably due to the nature of its force which is comprised of U.S. Marines. The UN so far did not deal with the Somali crisis as a regional problem."

TUNISIA: "A Pause For Meditation"

Independent mass circulation Ash-Shourouq (9/7) ran an editorial by co-chief editor Abdelhamid Riahi, "Initial (UN) efforts to conciliate Somalis had led to several agreements in Addis Ababa, which could have been a firm basis for a nation-wide reconciliation.

"However, hands, which are no longer secret, interfered to abort this hopeful beginning, by siding with one side against the other and by working to eliminate General Aideed and his supporters, or half of the Somali people, from any settlement.... This vicious circle of stubbornness, retribution and violence calls on the international community to reassess the whole operation and to clean humanitarian action from any defects."

"The Sooner A Settlement Is Arranged, The Better"

Government-owned, French-language La Presse (9/6) front-paged this editorial, "A new incident yesterday occurred in Mogadishu between UN forces and Aideed followers which resulted in seven deaths among Nigerian troops. This is not the first incident of the kind.... One even witnesses a real test of strength between the Blue Helmets and General Aideed's men. The arrest of General Aideed is not in dispute. But, everything should not be suspended while waiting for

a settlement of the Aideed case. With the UN subjected to financial hardship, the sooner a settlement is reached, the better it is. Every passing day may prove to be a real loss of time."

"Aideed's Dialogue"

Independent mass circulation Ash-Shourouq (8/27), ran this editorial by chief editor Hassen Hamada, headlined as above, "Though the confrontation (between Aideed and U.S. forces) is not equal, it creates much trouble for U.S. forces.... The real hope lies in Aideed's offer presented to accept mediation by former President Carter. This means opening the door to a, so far, missing dialogue in Somalia. It also shows that Aideed has combined...both political and military pressures, confirming that he is a political leader with an effective role to play in any settlement in Somalia. He could put the United States in an embarrassing position. If it really wants to help Somalis establish security in their country, it has to accept dialogue with Aideed. In any case, the U.S. position in Somalia remains fragile."

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

AUSTRALIA: "Disarmament Must Be UN's First Order Of The Day"

The liberal Sydney Morning Herald (9/8) opined, "(The Italian) complaint that the United Nations operation has lost its way...has struck a chord with aid agencies and...some other national contingents in the UN force. There is no sign, however, that the dominant UN policy will change. The U.N. Secretary-General...has said the 'wanton, unprovoked and premeditated attack' on the Nigerian troops on Sunday simply demonstrates the 'urgent need' to disarm all of Somalia's factions. That is still a reasonable position. But the longer such disarmament remains unaccomplished, the greater the pressure to consider alternative policies."

HONG KONG: "Time For The U.S. To Get Serious?"

The center-left Tin Tin Daily News (9/1) said, "Washington recently said that U.S. troops will be stationed in Somalia, and declared that they would not stop until they arrest General Mohammed Farah Aideed. Now, the deployment of the hand-picked shock brigade has become a standing joke."

"U.S. Army In Somalia Seeks Help"

The center-left Tin Tin Daily News (8/31) wrote, "However, the U.S. Army is in an unfavorable position. First, it has been seen as a replacement for the United Nations and the UN headquarters in Somalia is headed by the US Admiral. This is why even U.S. journalists treat the United Nations (headquarters) and the United States as the same thing. The second thing is, the United States deployed soldiers to another country to enforce armed suppression. Even the Somalis who oppose their leaders do not like the U.S. Army. Therefore, the U.S. Army may have to deploy more soldiers there and stay there for a longer time."

INDONESIA: "U.S. Triggers A Revolution In Somalia"

Independent Merdeka (9/8) carried this editorial, under the headline above, "To the common people, UN policy in Somalia does not make sense. How can you give money to the detainee and the jailor at the same time? Indeed, there has been a great deal of criticism of the UN under Boutros-Ghali. The latest indication of dissatisfaction in Somalia is the increased frequency of attacks on UN soldiers. If Washington cannot see these actions as indications of an imminent revolution that will unify all Somalis in order to remove 'foreign' troops from

thier land, then we don't know a better way to get President Clinton's attention."

SOUTH KOREA: "Mixed Up Somalian Policy Of The U.S."

A conservative Segye Ilbo (8/27) feature story headed as above, said, "Amid rumors of an imminent U.S. offensive on Mogadishu and criticism on U.S. Somalian policy in general, the conflict between the Department of State and the Department of Defense is deepening. The DOS puts priority on the removal of Aideed while the DOD is focusing on resolution of more practical concerns such as termination of civil violence, social rehabilitation, and political reconciliation."

SOUTH ASIA

BANGLADESH: "Behind The Peace Mission In Somalia"

Left-of-center Ajker Kagoj (8/30) carried this editorial by columnist by Ahmed Rafiq, "It is reported that U.S. commando troops will land in Mogadishu to arrest the anti-U.S. leader Aideed. This surely raises the question of whether the United States has the moral authority to arrest a rebel leader of a foreign country with commando troops. Nobody has given the United States the authority to become the global policeman.

"We are aware that Somalia will not become another Vietnam for the United States. Yet its tail may catch fire there. According to a Senator, U.S. involvement in Somalia has already begun to create some disturbing questions. We think that any rash action in Somalia by the United States will not only be unjust, but also a serious mistake. Nobody has the moral authority to do good to anybody using muscle power. The attempt to assume the role of global cop will not please the U.S. people, although the war industrialists of the United States desire it."

"Humanitarian Relief Or Oil Politics In Somalia?"

Independent Janakantha (8/31) carried this editorial-page article by Badruddin Umar, columnist and leader of a left-wing political party, that said, "Western media is describing General Aideed as a warlord and declaring him an enemy of the people to the Somalis. This is extremely necessary for the imperialists because aggression against the sovereignty of the Somali people by the United States and world imperialist powers under the cover of the UN cannot be justified. Aideed is not only being painted as a warlord, he is being termed a looter of relief goods. Despite this imperialist propaganda, relief organizations supported by the imperialists themselves like CARE and Save the Children have expressed their concern that due to the military operations of the UN, they are alienated from the Somali people.

"Why do the United States, Germany and Japan keep their military presence in a poor country like Somalia and find it necessary to continuing a long war? Firstly, control of Somalia is needed to maintain control of sea lanes to the important Middle East. But this is not the only reason for the military presence of the United States in Somalia.... A major reason for aggressive presence of the United States in Somalia is to gain control of unexploited oil fields in Somalia."

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

BRAZIL: "The Somalian Quagmire"

Under the headline above, conservative O Estado de Sao Paulo (9/7) commented in this editorial,

"There is something definitively wrong with the UN intervention in Somalia. No week goes by without the multinational forces getting involved in bloody episodes with the local warlords.... This operation confirms the UN's lack of orientation authorizing the use of force against Somalis as well as the U.S. lack of consistent political objectives in Somalia....

"It is not by chance that several countries that had joined the UN operation in Somalia have been reluctant to abide entirely by their commitment. Others are directly opposed to the UN mission's military orientation under a Turkish general strongly influenced by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and with a U.S. admiral representing the UN at the scene....

"Only excessive interpretation can lead us to accept as a UN objective the destruction of the group led by General Aideed, no matter what one thinks of him or his actions. He is an important piece in the Somali scenario and any lasting accord is unlikely to be made without his agreement. On the other hand, the pursuit of this man leaves the clear impression that the UN peacekeeping mission, which should be politically neutral, has taken sides as directed by the impetus of American military logic. After this recent ranger incursion the only thing left for the UN Security Council to do is to revise the objectives of the mission it sponsors in Somalia. Likewise, the U.S. Department of State should re-evaluate American interests in the Horn of Africa...after the end of the Cold War."

COLOMBIA: "Somalia And The U.S. Intervention"

Leading Cali conservative El Pais (8/30) said that the situation in Somalia is so complex that the United States is having a very hard time keeping it under control, in this editorial: "When the United States arrived in Vietnam in 1963, it never imagined that it would enter a war that would last 11 years. Its objective was to put a stop to the communists.... Now the Americans are intervening in another war, in Somalia. Are they entering quicksand over there?... The truth is that the establishment of order in a territory such as Somalia is a titanic task....

"The United States, in its task of maintaining worldwide equilibrium as the only surviving power, runs increasingly greater risks so long as it extends its presence in Somalia.... The situation in Somalia is another example that shows that the wars in the world are out of control, and that the United States cannot be the planetary policeman."

--608187348-1865416330-747568780:#21638--

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J) (WHO)

CREATION DATE/TIME:05-OCT-1993 18:09:00.00

SUBJECT: Just a test

TO: Remote Addressee (1=US@2=TELEMAIL@3=INTERNET@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.COM@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATOR: Keith O. Boykin (BOYKIN_K)

ATT CREATION DATE/TIME:05-OCT-1993 18:04:00.00

ATT BODY PART TYPE: B

ATT SUBJECT: Just a test

ATT TO: Jonathan P. Gill (GILL_J)
READ: UNKNOWN

ATT TEXT:
PRINTER FONT 12_POINT_COURIER
WHITE HOUSE NEWS REPORT
(Abbreviated version)
Tuesday, October 5, 1993
Prepared by the News Analysis Staff, Rm 160, x7151

SOMALIA -

-

All major newspapers included headlines from the latest round of U.S. casualties in Somalia, including reaction from President Clinton's Administration.

Twelve American soldiers were killed, 78 wounded and an undetermined number missing and believed captured in a 15 hour battle in Mogadishu, the Somali capital, late Sunday and early this morning with guerillas of fugitive militia leader Mohamed Farah Aideed.(WP)

USA Today ran a large photograph of an apparently captured American who was shown on television on Monday. (USA Today) The article on the incident was headlined, "Bodies desecrated; six held hostage," Another American soldier was said to be bound, lifeless, and naked after he had reportedly been dragged in the street. (USA Today)

President Clinton issued a warning on the captives: "If anything happens to them...the United States -

not the United Nations, the United States -

will view this matter very gravely and take appropriate action." (USA Today, CNN) Secretary of Defense Les Aspin said the Clinton administration would "respond forcefully if any harm comes to those who are being detained." (WP) Aspin also said an Army mechanized infantry company of 220 soldiers would be dispatched to Mogadishu to bolster 4,700 U.S. forces there. (WP) When asked about the additional deployment of troops, President Clinton said the "modest increase" in troops "does not signify some new commitment of offensive commitment" in Somalia. "I am just not satisfied that the American soldiers who are there have the protection they need under present circumstances." (WP)

RUSSIA -

-

All major newspapers led with headlines reporting the defeat and capture of anti-

Yeltsin parliament members.

Headlines from major papers:

"Yeltsin's Chief Foes Surrender," LA Times

"Army Ousts Yeltsin Foes From Parliament: President Takes Steps to Solidify Power," New York Times

"Army Shellfire Crushes Moscow Revolt; Dozens Killed in Assault on Parliament," Washington Post

"SURRENDER: Moscow Hard-Liners Give UP After Military Assault; Dozens Die, and Parliament Building Is Left in Ruins," International Herald Tribune

President Boris Yeltsin routed his rebellious opposition in the Russian parliament after a 10-hour barrage by tanks and armored personnel carriers that left dozens dead and the parliament building burning. (WP)

The New York Times led with a two-

stack banner headline:

"Army Ousts Yeltsin Foes From Parliament; President Takes Steps

to Solidify Power." (NYT) President Clinton was described as being "foursquare" behind Yeltsin, although he urged Yeltsin "to use free elections to mend the bitter divisions in Russia." The U.S. also announced that Secretary Christopher would go to Moscow in the second half of October as a show of support. (NYT)

The leaders of the rebellion, Vice President Alexander Rutskoi and Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov, surrendered after Yeltsin promised they would not be harmed. A Yeltsin aide said they will likely face prosecution. (WP)

To help assure peace, Yeltsin imposed a citywide curfew from 11 p.m. until 5 a.m. In addition, Yeltsin also shut down at least seven hard-line newspapers.(WP)

President Clinton reiterated to reporters the backing he has expressed for Yeltsin throughout the crisis, while in California. Senior U.S. officials added that the outcome had vindicated the Clinton administration's belief that Yeltsin has the support of Russia's people and its major institutions. (WP)

Yeltsin received widespread backing for his actions. The European Community issued a statement declaring their support for Yeltsin and absolving him of blame for today's bloody shootout. (WP) Another Washington Post article ran under the headline, "Ex-Soviet Nations Give Support." (WP)

CNN aired President Clinton's comments live as he responded to the Moscow events at the AFL-CIO meeting in San Francisco. The network split its screen to show the Russian White House burning at the same moment that President Clinton said that Yeltsin had apparently succeeded in restoring order to the chaotic confrontation with his opposition forces. (CNN)

PENTAGON -

-

Defense Secretary Les Aspin has decided to keep Admiral Frank Kelso and to ignore the advice of the chief navy civilian officer that Kelso be dismissed. (WP, NYT, LAT, CBS) A Washington Post editorial agreed with the decision not to oust Kelso, saying "Removing him from office only months before his planned retirement would have been overkill. The [Tailhook] scandal made reform essential, and Adm. Kelso has demonstrated that he got that message." (WP)

Eric Schmitt reported in the New York Times, "Mr. Aspin rejected the recommendation [to dismiss Kelso] after several of his top aides reviewed Mr. Dalton's findings late Sunday and found that they had treated Admiral Kelso unfairly compared with 34 other admirals and Marine generals who attended the Tailhook Association convention in Las Vegas, Nev." (NYT)

APPOINTMENTS -

-

The United States Information Agency (USIA) faces steep budget cuts and reorganization in the near future, and has plans to cut 210 jobs and \$17.5 million from its 1995 budget.

MICHEL RETIRES -

-

House Majority Leader Bob Michel (R-IL) announced yesterday that he would not seek re-election. Michel's

announcement sparked immediate interest in who would succeed him, with Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) considered by some to be "his heir apparent." (NPR, WP)

FOIA -

-

The Justice Department, rescinding rules imposed by the Reagan administration, announced yesterday it will no longer defend in court government agencies that routinely deny FOIA requests from the public. (WP) The ruling was outlined by Attorney General Reno as part of an "open government" policy favored by the Clinton Administration. (WP)

VIOLENCE -

-

Three Washington Post editorial columnists (Mary McGrory, Richard Cohen, and E.J. Dionne) wrote about violence, focusing especially on violence in the District of Columbia. (WP) McGrory said the President had made no effort to visit the troubled areas. "But he might have made the frightened inhabitants of Launice Smith's neighborhood feel that someone of consequence cared about them. It might have lessened their feeling that Washington is two cities..." (WP)

===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

RECORD TYPE: FEDERAL (RECONSTRUCTED EMAIL)

CREATOR: Bureau of Policy and Programs (1=US@*RFC-822\USIA01(A)ACCESS.DIGEX.NET@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-OCT-1993 09:28:00.00

SUBJECT: Daily Digest for October 14, 1993

TO: Media Reaction -- Bulletin Board (1=US@*RFC-822\bulletin(A)Hr.HOUSE.gov@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bonnie Nicholson (1=US@*RFC-822\BNichols(a)de2d800a.pa.osd.Mil@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Brian Cullin (1=US@*RFC-822\BCullin(a)se2e800a.pa.osd.mil@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Cliff Bernath (1=US@*RFC-822\cbernath(a)se2e811b.pa.osd.Mil@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Diane Kurtz (1=US@*RFC-822\DKurtz(a)hr.house.gov@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Jack Belcher (1=US@*RFC-822\jbelcher(a)hr.house.gov@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: jonathan gill (1=US@*RFC-822\jpg+(a)campaign92.org@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Icenogle (1=US@*RFC-822\micenogl(a)se2e800a.pa.osd.Mil@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mike Stepp (1=US@*RFC-822\MStepp(a)se2e800b.pa.osd.mil@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy Burt (1=US@*RFC-822\wburt(a)se1e794a.pa.osd.mil@3=INTERNET@2=TELEMAIL@MRX@EOPMRX) (DEFAULT)
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
--608187348-302420407-750628213:#14949
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

--608187348-302420407-750628213:#14949

Content-Type: APPLICATION/octet-stream; name="mdd400.txt"

Content-ID: <Pine.3.05.9310141512.B14949@access.digex.net>

Content-Description:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
FOREIGN MEDIA REACTION--DAILY DIGEST

For further information: Anne Chermak, Chief
Media Reaction Staff (P/M), Tele. No. (202) 619-6511

Thursday, October 14, 1993

HAITI AND SOMALIA: CNN DIPLOMACY?

There was concern among foreign commentators that the Clinton administration, influenced by media-driven public opinion about the setbacks in Haiti and Somalia, is backing away from future involvement in foreign crises where there is not a direct threat to American national interests. In much of the commentary the U.S. was portrayed as having the moral desire to lead the world toward more democracy but being paralyzed by "the Vietnam syndrome" and the lack of "a new national interest that is understood, shared and supported by the American people." In Italy, where correspondents were the most alarmist about the implications of the administration's foreign policy approach, centrist Corriere della Sera claimed, "The overall impression is not only of confusion within the administration, but also of an alarming disarray of the U.S. superpower, which claims a leading role for itself but is showing neither the strategic vision nor the tactical ability for that role."

Several analysts argued that Washington--and all foreign policymakers around the globe--should not be overly influenced by the brutal images broadcast by CNN. As one German writer put, "The postwar world is crying out for new concepts and well considered policies. But television is crying out for action." Some reports today echoed views from Latin American countries yesterday that in the case of Haiti, policymakers should exercise more caution in the use of force. In the words of Rio's independent Jornal do Brasil, "to require the return to office of Aristide, the winner of the only free elections in the history of Haiti, is a high democratic

aspiration. But to ignite a new civil war is something that shouldn't be done in today's world, on the eve of the 21st century."

In the case of Somalia, some writers thought that the U.S. should talk with warlord Mohamed Farah Aideed, but warned that the U.S. and the UN should not let a violent minority be victorious. Other editorialists emphasized a theme articulated over the past several weeks--that the capture of Mr. Aideed has become an obsession with the U.S. and the UN--and cautioned that personalizing the abridgment of individual and national rights by zeroing in on the Aideeds and Saddam Husseins of the world will keep solutions for dealing with rogue and anti-democratic states as elusive as ever.

This survey is based on 48 reports from 23 countries, October 12-14.

EDITORS: Pat McArdle and Gail Burke

Special Reports attached

EUROPE

BRITAIN: "President Clinton's First U-Turn"

The conservative Times (10/14) editorialized: "President Clinton's first U-turn after being elected was his campaign pledge to reverse the Bush administration's policy of turning back Haitian boat people. The humiliating seaward retreat of the USS Harlan County...is his first unequivocal foreign policy disaster..... More consequentially for Mr. Clinton, Haiti's lords of misrule have sent the world a televised message: that the easiest way to flout the UN is to threaten Americans....

"The UN mission is Haiti's only chance. Mr. Clinton should now attempt to increase the involvement of other countries' troops and police. But he should not bend before jittery opinion polls and withdraw his offer of American manpower. Haiti's strongmen are, as he says, 'at their last gasp of power.' Here, as in Somalia, he must demonstrate that his professed steadiness of purpose can be reflected in consistency of action."

"Difficult To Fulfill Commitment"

The liberal Guardian (10/14) maintained, "It will be extraordinarily difficult for the United States to fulfill its earlier commitment to send 25,000 troops to help enforce any peace agreement in Bosnia. Congress and the public...have made it clear that the Vietnam syndrome is not nearly as dead as Bush used to brag after the Gulf War. In fact it has crawled from its grave to grip Clinton by the throat. Without the clear and present danger of the superpower enemy of the Cold War, Americans are chary of military involvement and losses for dubious purposes overseas."

"The Multilateralist School Of Thought"

The independent Financial Times (10/14) editorialized: "Once elected, Mr. Clinton recruited many foreign policy specialists to advise him, most of whom inclined toward the multilateralist school of thought. Yet, partly because they are not confident about carrying either the public or the president with them, there remained an underlying ambivalence. The United States wanted to work through the UN and other multilateral institutions, but always on their assumption that it would be in the lead--not only politically, but also in the sense of having command of any combat operations in which its troops were involved....

"From now on, the United States is unlikely to risk its forces in any conflict where there is not a direct and more or less self-evident threat to its national interests. Those who believed the Cold War would be followed by a period of Pax Americana, worldwide or even in Europe, need to think again, and urgently."

"The Yankees Are Going Home"

The conservative Daily Telegraph (10/14) carried the following commentary by Jonathan Clarke, former British diplomat in Washington, "As Somalia, Bosnia and now Haiti have shown, the hard reality is that the American people are no longer willing to accept the casualties and diversion of resources that underlie the President's rhetoric (in his speech at the University of North Carolina).

"This should be sending a clear signal to the Europeans. A pivotal point in post-war European history has arrived. The Yankees are going home. Henceforward the Europeans will have to look after their own security.

GERMANY: "CNN Diplomacy"

Uwe Knuepfer, Washington correspondent of centrist General-Anzeiger (10/14) of Bonn, filed, "While nuclear missiles were the symbol of the Cold War, the postwar period carries the CNN sticker.... The postwar world...is crying out for new concepts, for well considered policies. But television is crying out for action.... The dilemma is that very few problems in the world can be solved by blindly taking action....

"The United States initially tried to make operation 'Restore Hope' telegenic. It lured itself into the media trap.... Now it is not only the successes of the UN operation in Somalia which hang in the balance but Clinton's UN policy as well. Those in power in Haiti have also seen the pictures from Somalia. They have learned quickly: In the CNN era, it only takes a revolver held close enough to a camera lens to force a superpower to back down.... Television adores the Davids of this world. If it is not diplomats, reason and the interests of nations which determine the agenda of world politics but rather CNN and co., it will not be the Goliaths which have control over the 'new world order'--not Washington, not the UN,

not NATO--but the Davids. They are called Aideed and Karadzic."

"Solution Only Possible With Aideed"

Matthias Nass observed on the front page of left-of-center weekly Die Zeit (10/14) of Hamburg, "The high-handed Boutros-Ghali is behaving like a global field marshal. Clinton had to remind him that he is primarily the secretary of the Security Council. We should not, however, forget that it was the Americans who issued orders to capture Aideed. A political solution is only possible if the UN talks to all the parties to the civil war--i.e. with Aideed as well."

"Violence Is Winning"

Right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine (10/14) front-paged this comment by Guenther Nonnenmacher: "It is no coincidence that the Haitian military is threatening to repeat the example of Somalia....

"In Bosnia, Mogadishu and now Port-au-Prince, the remains of the hope which was born with the idea of a new world order following the Cold War are disappearing. Violence is winning because those who represent the law are not prepared to enforce it with violence of their own. The United Nations...is in a wretched state."

ITALY: "Clinton, The Hamlet Of Foreign Policy"

Under the headline above, New York correspondent Mario Platero wrote for economic Il Sole-24 Ore (10/14), "The most difficult problem faced by Clinton's America is once more an internal one: The definition of a new national interest that is understood, shared and supported by the American people.... Rather than trying to resolve the problem at its roots, Bill Clinton has been feeling his way so far, assuming positions which he failed to back up with deeds." "Clinton, The Scapegoat"

Ennio Caretto concluded from Washington in leftist, top-circulation La Repubblica (10/14), "Clinton runs the risk of becoming one of the unintentional causes of the escalation of international disorder. To a large extent, the president is the scapegoat of growing neo-isolationist feelings in the United States, a trend that appears clear not only in foreign policy but also on trade issues.... U.S. commentators no longer hide their uneasiness over the fact that, so far, Clinton has achieved only one success on the international scene--the Middle East accord--and not by his own merits."

"Confusion, Disarray"

Rodolfo Brancoli remarked from Washington in centrist Corriere della Sera (10/14), "The overall impression is not only of confusion within the administration, but also of an alarming disarray of the U.S. superpower, which claims a leading role for itself but is showing neither the strategic vision nor the tactical ability for

that role. Furthermore, the U.S. does not appear ready to run the minimum risks to promote the noble goals which it rhetorically proclaims, and U.S. decisions are quickly leading to the collapse of the coalitions that take place in peacekeeping operations."

"Clintonism"

According to Alberto Pasolini Zanelli in conservative Il Giornale (10/14), "Very rarely or never has the U.S. superpower suffered two simultaneous defeats of such dimension by enemies that are almost invisible on the international radar.... 'Clintonism' can be described as an 'interventionism of the left,' distinguished from other kinds by both a renunciation of realpolitik and the absence of an ideological counterforce.... Clinton launched a series of 'police actions' aimed not at pursuing national interests but at affirming principles."

BELGIUM: "Bill Clinton Backs Down In Haiti"

Conservative, Catholic Gazet Van Antwerpen (10/14) observed, "Images of a murdered, naked soldier...dragged through the streets of Mogadishu by a mad crowd, had a clear effect on the public, the politicians and the president of the United States...."

"If Clinton continues to back down and cancels the entire operation so that the Haitian military get a free hand, he will be facing another problem of equal concern to the Americans, namely the unceasing flow of Haitian boat people."

"Peace Missions At A Standstill"

Independent Le Soir (10/14) asserted, "Confronted with states and clans' egoism, morality must remain an essential engine of that action. The suffering of starving Somalis, of Haitians robbed by a greedy elite, or of expelled and massacred Bosnians is unacceptable. But willy nilly, this morality must be as modest, patient and pragmatic as the adversary is cynical, crafty, unpredictable and omnipresent...."

"A new distribution of responsibilities in policing the world would perhaps give America a more comfortable position on the international chessboard. But who among the Europeans, the Russians or the Japanese...are ready to render their service.?"

CANADA: "Triage For Wounded Nations"

The leading Toronto Globe and Mail (10/14) declared, "U.S. President Bill Clinton argued in a speech to the UN General Assembly last month (that) the UN must ask some serious questions before it acts. Is the nation's distress serious enough to merit international intervention? Would the populace support such an intervention? Is there a reasonable chance of success? What would the cost be? Is there a clear end point for those taking part? Many distressed nations will not meet these standards...."

"The UN's nation doctors face the same hard decisions as a battlefield surgeon. They must set up a system of triage, giving priority to those with serious wounds and a reasonable chance of survival. Like it or not, the rest must wait."

"Squeezing Haiti's Elite"

Liberal, nationalist Montreal Gazette (10/14) opined, "The United Nations took some welcome steps yesterday to ensure that the USS Harlan County's embarrassing withdrawal from Haitian shores Tuesday was only a tactical retreat, and not a surrender.... Haiti's people remain among the world's poorest and most oppressed.... They deserve the support of Canada and all decent countries. The military and their backers think they have won a round. All the more reason, then, that the UN is right to turn up the heat."

"The Royal Canadian Mounted Police In Haiti"

According to the liberal, nationalist Toronto Star (10/14), "President Bill Clinton was right to recall the shipload of non-combatants, who are not equipped with the arms, nor the political mandate, to fight their way into Haiti and impose order. Unlike Somalia, where anarchy triggered widespread starvation, Haiti is not suffering from a vacuum of power. It remains a sovereign country with a functioning government. Now that the military regime has gone back on its word, it is not the UN's job to forcibly oust it.... The Canadian government should withdraw the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as soon as safety permits, and re-impose sanctions."

CZECH REPUBLIC: "To Avoid The Exodus Of Poor, HIV-Positive Haitians"

Centrist, intellectual Lidove Noviny held (10/14), "What many have forecast and what must have happened, is a reality: The agreement on the settlement of the situation in Haiti is a scrap of paper. Operations which are designed to restore democracy in Haiti, have been run under the banner of the UN and OAS but, as in Somalia, the main 'supplier' of troops and diplomats is the United States.... Bill Clinton cannot afford to risk the lives of further subordinates in Haiti because the United States might be referred to as an unsuccessful world gendarme.... But Clinton has to contribute to the solution of the crisis in Haiti as much as he can. New isolation of the island would mean another mass exodus of poor (mostly HIV positive) Haitians to the United States."

THE NETHERLANDS: "Sanctions"

Labor-oriented De Volkskrant (10/14) editorialized: "(The recall of the American ship was) a bitter experience for the United States. The Haitian thugs have not only managed to force an American ship to retreat, but they have also torpedoed the accord--regarding the reimplementation of democracy on the island and the return of the elected president Jean Bertrand Aristide--which was finished in New

York in July.

"President Clinton made a good move in recalling the ship, because it was never the intention to rebuild Haitian democracy with force.... But it would be incorrect to now give up the New York accord. Clinton does not want that either....

"The Security Council must especially support measures which hit the military hard. In July, sanctions moved Cedras toward the accord for the return of President Aristide. Strong sanctions must now force him to implement the accord."

NORWAY: "Black On Haiti"

Independent tabloid Dagbladet (10/14) commented, "A few hundred gangsters in the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere have dealt the U.S. superpower and the UN a humiliating blow. The threat from armed gangs ruling the streets of Port-au-Prince was enough to force the peacekeeping forces to return to international waters.

"After the loss of American lives in Somalia, a few street gangs were enough to stop the United States in a UN action aimed at returning democracy to Haiti. Clinton cannot risk the loss of American lives in a new military action.

"President Clinton has shown neither resolve nor energy in his foreign policy. Surrender to an unstable dictatorship in America's own 'backyard' weakens the role the United States has assumed as UN police. And the gangsters in Haiti have once and for all killed off the Monroe Doctrine."

SWEDEN: "Symbolic Gesture From Haiti"

Stockholm's conservative Svenska Dagbladet opined (10/14), "The message from the White House is that it's back to economic sanctions again.... One reason for this compliancy is the fact that Haiti does not constitute a security risk for the United States. Not even Cuba is considered a security problem anymore....

"Furthermore the American people and their elected representatives are becoming increasingly less enthusiastic about sending U.S. troops abroad....

"Bill Clinton is now trying to pull out of Somalia in an honorable way. He is not eager to intervene anywhere, so the return of the troop-transport ship from Port-au-Prince is a symbolic gesture that reaches much further than just to the Caribbean Islands."

SWITZERLAND: "Haiti Isn't Somalia, Clinton Says"

Centrist Tribune de Geneve ran the following commentary (10/14): "Haiti isn't Somalia--as President Clinton likes to remind his hearers. He was responding to American congressmen who, following the abortive landing attempt by American military advisers at

Port-au-Prince Monday, fear another mediatized Somalia-type operation. So does the ruling army junta in Haiti. The 600 experts sent to the island to smarten up the Haitian army have nothing in common with the 4,700 Rangers deployed in Somalia, Clinton maintains. The former have to restore democracy; the latter, keep the peace. To avoid any confusion, the White House has ordered the immediate recall of the warship, suspended the operation, and shifted the thorny problem to the politico-diplomatic terrain.... However, this prudent withdrawal, though justified by Monday's violent anti-American demonstrations, has only delayed the disembarkation, which nobody appeared to oppose until this week."

SERBIA-MONTENEGRO: "Peacekeeping At Risk"

Centrist Borba (10/13) opined: "Concerned by what is now happening to the Americans in Somalia, Washington is not very sure if it's ready to send U.S. soldiers to a so-called peacekeeping mission (in Bosnia), particularly because of the fact that the primary task of the peacekeepers, keeping of the peace, has been obviously turning into peace enforcement. This, however, proved to be impossible, so those who decide on the engagement of NATO troops in the new role of peacekeepers under the UN command, have also become aware of this fact and are slowly withdrawing. The whole negotiation process is at a standstill, while the killings and the war are continuing."

MIDDLE EAST

BAHRAIN: "Change in U.S. Policy"

Influential, London-based Al-Hayat (10/12) maintained, "The ugly pictures broadcast by U.S. television networks of an almost naked body of a U.S. soldier dragged by Somali boys on the streets of southern Mogadishu...was the main factor in the sudden change in the U.S. policy toward Somalia...even though this change still remains dubious in some respects."

REPUBLIC OF YEMEN: "Falling Into Aideed's Trap"

Fundamentalist Al-Umah (10/13) remarked, "U.S. forces took the bait that Aideed had long been waiting for them to swallow. A new phase of violence has begun, this time against the UN and U.S. forces. A feeling of hatred against America and the West has exploded in Somalia."

EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

AUSTRALIA: "Future U.S. Role In UN Peacekeeping Questionable"

The liberal Sydney Morning Herald (10/14) editorialized: "Daily, Mr. Clinton is facing dwindling domestic support for the commitment of U.S. troops to UN peacekeeping missions abroad.... The Haiti debacle is another case of good intentions being poorly informed. "Almost without exception, the outsiders who have tried to negotiate a return to democracy in Haiti view the crisis as the usurpation of

power by a group of rebellious military officers.... If U.N. peacekeeping efforts are to continue they will need to draw on better intelligence and local knowledge than have been shown in Somalia, Bosnia and now Haiti."

"U.S. Isolationism Opens Way For Lesser Powers"

A byliner in the liberal Canberra Times (10/14) observed: "Some analysts see the tussle in the U.S. as a reflection of the Congress' horror at being drawn into a series of swampy foreign excursions with no viable way out, combined with a new thrust by the politicians to grab control of foreign policy, traditionally the preserve of the President. That may be so. But the end result of a successful campaign to limit any U.S. involvement in such peacekeeping operations could only be a more isolationist U.S. and a world where middle-ranking powers in various regions are effectively encouraged to widen their horizons."

INDONESIA: "Clinton's Obsession?"

Medan's nationalistic Waspada (10/14) concluded in a column by its foreign affairs writer Enna E. Burhan, "It seems that capturing Aideed dead or alive has become an obsession for the Clinton administration, just as Saddam was for Bush administration."

SINGAPORE: "Heed Lessons Of Somalia"

The pro-Government, top circulation, Straits Times (10/14) editorialized: "No two humanitarian crises are the same, but a point or two could be made about the larger lessons of the international intervention in Somalia. Those lessons were reinforced by the disastrous attempt to land a U.S. military assistance mission in Haiti this week....

"The overwhelming presence of troops from one country in a UN mission gives it the appearance of being a mission mounted by that country. Ideally, the answer is the presence of a UN standing army, made up of volunteers from a variety of nations and under UN command, to carry out humanitarian and peacekeeping work swiftly. Such intervention would be easier on nationalist sentiments.

"However, in the absence of a permanent UN army, the world cannot but fall back on the need to keep the powers, especially the United States, engaged in peacekeeping missions. If Somalia and Haiti are precursors to the kind of response the United States can expect, Washington cannot be blamed for rethinking its policies of engagement in such conflicts. The results...are worrying in an international order...far less stable than...in the Cold War era."

SOUTH ASIA

BANGLADESH: "Dialogue With Aideed Called For"

Opposition, pro-Awami League, Banglar Bani (10/14) commented: "A group of multinational UN troops has arrived in Somalia at a time when the attempts of the negotiators to restore political and social discipline seem promising.

"Aideed and other tribal leaders have been involved in armed conflicts with UN troops in the name of Somali national pride. In the words of Western media, Aideed is not only a warlord, but also the symbol of national pride and glory of Somalia. So it seems that attempts are underway to resolve the crisis through dialogue."

INDIA: "Clinton Can't Afford Comparisons To Vietnam"

An editorial (10/14) in the independent National Herald lamented, "It is unfortunate that the UN mission to Somalia, largely led by the United States, has run into difficulties.... For various reasons, not the least of which is the American self-consciousness about its leadership role, the United States had had to bear the brunt of the problems and disappointments involved in the mission.

"Clinton...cannot afford to let his Somalia policy to be compared to the Vietnamese imbroglio and written off as a failure....

"It remains to be seen whether the objective of getting the mission back to the humanitarian track will be achieved without further involvement in the internal politics of Somalia.... The UN has to be careful not to be seen carrying on a vendetta against...General Aideed."

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

BRAZIL: "Sorcery And Sorcerers"

Rio's independent Jornal do Brasil opined (10/14), "It's a case of sorcery turning on the sorcerer. The United Nations, is by its own definition, an international forum for the solution of conflicts and not a mere pretext for the maintenance of an interventionist police force, which in the name of human rights ignores the principle of people's sovereignty and self-determination. To require the return to office of Aristide, the winner of the only free elections in the history of Haiti, is a high democratic aspiration. But to ignite a new civil war is something that shouldn't be done in today's world, on the eve of the 21st century.

"The precedents of Bosnia and Somalia give a clear message: It is time to redefine the role of the UN. This abuse of the use of force cannot continue. The new world order requires more efficient means to show repudiation of those that violate the fundamental rights of man."

"Regime Of Terror"

Conservative O Estado de Sao Paulo (10/14) editorialized: "The present rulers of Haiti act as the country's leaders have always acted: They keep themselves in power through terror....

"If General Cedras and his gunmen refuse to fully accept the words and spirit of the agreement they signed, the international community must not wait for a peace force to sacrifice soldiers in Haiti. It will be better to isolate the island with a naval blockade and to close the border with the Dominican Republic, leaving up to the Haitians what to do with the regime of terror."

CHILE: "Washington's Indecisiveness"

Financial El Diario (10/14) held, "The lack of experience and doubtful leadership of President Clinton seem to be reflected in the crisis in Bosnia, where, in spite of efforts, negotiations have gone from failure to failure; in Somalia, a country where in spite of (U.N.) military superiority, the rebels continue causing casualties among U.N. troops; and Haiti, where U.S. troops were unable to land because of popular opposition.

"The obvious conclusion is that the U.S. has not yet defined the role it wishes to play in current history...In addition, to this objective fact must be added a subjective factor: Clinton has an idealistic perception of Washington's role in the world... A policy based on such premises can in the end globalize conflicts, generating massive conflicts with considerable loss of life and costs much higher than those of a pragmatic foreign policy, lacking such clear ideals."

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: "Defeating Haiti And Its Hopes"

Establishment Listin Diario (10/13) stated, "The United States didn't send armed forces to Haiti on this occasion. It sent a team to train the police on a mission that corresponds to a police force.... Now the Haitian mobs proclaim that they have preserved their national sovereignty, that they have defeated imperialism. (In fact) they are defeating Haiti and its hopes. The victim is the Haitian nation. Certainly 'patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels.'"

"Opposition Doesn't Come Just From Cedras And Francois"

An editorial in conservative El Caribe, which has opposed the sending of U.S. and UN forces into Haiti, commented (10/14), "This is a moment in which one cannot speak of victory or defeat. Everything is inconclusive. Nonetheless, it is clear that the resistance to a foreign military intervention doesn't come just from Cedras and Francois."

JAMAICA: "Tragic Risk Of Vietnam-Type Debacle"

The independent Gleaner (10/12) commented: "We sympathize with the view of those in Congress who feel that the United States has allowed itself to be drawn into a conflict determined by the warlord Aideed and the United Nations forces....

"Great care is now necessary to bring the whole conflict back to the original humanitarian focus. Aideed should be invited to meet with the UN chief in Somalia without conditions, and every effort made to talk and establish peace. We hope that Aideed's unilateral declaration of peace will lead to constructive talks with the UN and the U.S. delegates. For to continue and to intensify the fighting would be to transform what was originally a humanitarian objective into a losing Vietnam-type debacle."

Thursday, October 14, 1993

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ISSUES: NAFTA; GATT

NAFTA: While Canadian and Mexican dailies agreed that NAFTA would be beneficial for the economies of all three signatory countries, Mexican writers continued to warn against "foreign interference" in Mexico's affairs. Observers cautioned U.S. legislators and others to focus on the merits of the free trade pact instead of setting conditions for U.S. passage of NAFTA that, in their view, intervene in Mexican domestic affairs.

Sentiments on NAFTA in the Latin American and Caribbean press ranged from hopeful to concerned. On the one hand, Chilean and Colombian analysts were very positive about NAFTA, viewing it as a possible unifying force for all of Latin America that would also create new jobs and foster better U.S.-Latin American relations in the future. Meanwhile, observers in Brazil, the Dominican Republic and Guatemala worried that, with the implementation of NAFTA, foreign investment would be lured away from their countries to Mexico, posing a threat to further economic development for the rest of the region. Commentators from both perspectives, however, hoped to "hop on the NAFTA bus" when the opportunity presented itself. Other opinionmakers continued to speculate on the chances for NAFTA's passage through the U.S. Congress, with most concluding that it remains in danger of being rejected.

GATT: The press in Europe agreed that French Prime Minister Edouard Balladur's "interim" accord--i.e. agreeing on a range of trade sectors by the GATT December 15 deadline, while leaving controversial issues such as agriculture and culture for negotiation next year--was merely Paris's way of "passing the buck" (to the U.S.) in the event of a GATT talks failure. French papers called

Mr. Balladur's recent efforts regarding the Blair House dispute a "zig-zag" policy, saying that Paris felt "trapped" by its trade stance and needed to find an "honorable way out." The U.S. was still portrayed as being "intransigent" on the Blair House accord. Right-of-center Le Quotidien reiterated, "France cannot sign an accord which would condemn its agriculture.... (The Americans) would be wrong to think that the government might give in." Preliminary French reports on the meeting in Brussels between USTR Mickey Kantor and Sir Leon Brittan were negative. TV France 2 maintained, "Mickey Kantor chose the role of the bad guy. And he has been perfect."

There was a general sense that the chance for a successful conclusion to the GATT talks was in great doubt, and that a compromise must be made by the U.S. and the EC to avoid a world free trade system breakdown.

This survey was based on 27 reports from 17 countries, Sept. 29-Oct. 14.

EDITOR: Diana McCaffrey

NAFTA

NAFTA SIGNATORIES

CANADA: "NAFTA Is A Good Deal For Canada"

Barry Nelson judged in left-of-center Calgary Herald (10/9): "I've concluded that NAFTA is a good deal and is likely to be endorsed by the U.S. Congress. I've concluded it's no great threat to Canadian jobs. I've concluded that Mexico offers even more business opportunities than those now being explored. When we trade, we exchange a lot more than goods and services. We trade ideas and values as well. We won't change undemocratic aspects of Mexican culture by building a wall around the country. Another NAFTA benefit is a pledge by the United States and Mexico to spend \$5 billion cleaning up pollution along their common border.... There are great opportunities in Mexico. If we don't grab them, the Americans will."

MEXICO: "The Right Attitude"

Leftist La Jornada observed (10/12): "[Mexican] President Salinas's statement to the Washington Post represents the Mexican government's clear position on the opportunities which NAFTA's timely implementation will bring about for better relations and understanding.

"This is the right position to take, particularly after Democratic Congressman Collin Peterson, a leader in the fight against the NAFTA, said that the purpose of his trip to Mexico would be to discuss with President Salinas 'what to do after the NAFTA is defeated.'... If the agreement were to be rejected, it would be a

lost opportunity for the United States.... But despite the intervention in Mexican affairs that Peterson's statement implies, he is not taking into consideration the enormous economic problems the United States faces and NAFTA's positive aspects which will help to support the United States in a world of trading blocs.... Even though it is still too early to predict NAFTA's approval or rejection, Mexico can determine its own course in either case."

"Rejection Of Foreign Pressures"

Nationalist El Universal commented (10/12): "When we jointly defend Mexico's sovereignty from foreign interference, our domestic differences disappear. This occurred when Mexican congressmen and political leaders of different ideologies responded to former President George Bush's statement that, in order to reduce the uncertainty that prevails among some U.S. legislators--Mexico should accelerate its process of presidential succession in order to obtain NAFTA's approval.... But NAFTA should only be judged by its merits and trade goals, and it should not become a political issue.... If the United States is willing to participate in the world's largest trade zone, it should do so because of the benefits for its economy.... Some within the new U.S. administration wish to know the name of the next Mexican president, (in order to approach him) to modify the NAFTA.

"With this attitude, they are postponing the accord's enactment, and they may be endangering its ultimate approval. They have the right to do so, but they should solve their differences internally, and not get involved in Mexico's domestic affairs.

"The mistaken intention of Bush's unfortunate statements seems to be to interfere (in Mexico's domestic affairs) which cannot be accepted by any sector of our society."

EUROPE

BRITAIN: "The Battle Over NAFTA"

Writing in the centrist Independent, Washington correspondent Rupert Cornwell said (10/6): "Make no mistake, NAFTA will be the battle of this Congress.... The White House has nailed its colors to the mast; Mr. Perot has made NAFTA's destruction his political *raison d'etre*. And if the Texas billionaire prevails, America's crisis of self-belief will have been carved in stone....

"For Mr. Clinton, this is a vital moment in his presidency.... His approval ratings have recovered.... Yet for all his articulacy and command of detail, he remains an elusive figure. He may grasp an issue, but fails to shape it. His administration preaches American activism and involvement in the world, but its deeds point the other way. He is liked, but not truly respected. He has yet to teach fractious Congressional Democrats they cannot spurn him with impunity. NAFTA offers the chance to wipe the slate clean.... Mr. Clinton still has six weeks left, to twist arms and make his case to the country. The prize would be huge, proof at last that beneath

the smoothness there is steel. And just maybe, it is starting to happen."

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA: "NAFTA In Danger In U.S. Congress"

Economic Ambito Financiero commented (10/6): "It is calculated that at least until the end of the decade, more than two million jobs will be lost annually in the United States due to factors other than NAFTA.... Although all of that has nothing to do with NAFTA, this commercial accord which the Congress will ratify or reject before the end of the year has become the symbol of the problem of the loss of jobs in the United States. If Clinton cannot persuade the legislators before they vote that he has a viable plan to contain the exodus of jobs, NAFTA will be rejected by Congress."

BRAZIL: "NAFTA Could Pose A Problem For Brazil"

Independent Jornal Do Brasil commented (10/4): "NAFTA...presents another problem for the countries in this hemisphere under the influence of the United States. The probable flight of capital to Mexico, in search of such advantages, would hurt countries such as Brazil which are dependent on foreign investments. The Brazilian economy has everything to fear from the flight of American capital, as opposed to the Mexican economy, which would directly benefit from this capital.

"Beyond the simple question of employment, NAFTA, debated within the United States itself, amplified a political situation which could bring harmful effects to the area under American influence, including, certainly, Brazil."

CHILE: "Importance Of NAFTA"

Government-owned La Nacion said (10/4): "The importance of the NAFTA resides not only in the new jobs that it is hoped will be created in the United States, but also in the fact that its approval is essential to the future of U.S.-Latin American relations, which are now based on free trade, and which is the hope for the future development of the region. Thus, the rejection of the treaty, or its indefinite postponement, would demolish much of what has been gained toward the integration of industrialized America with the America still in the process of development, which could create a feeling of profound frustration.

"A large measure of Chile's expectations depend on the approval of the NAFTA, which means we would be left out of the picture if the U.S. Congress fails to ratify it."

COLOMBIA: "Others In Latin America Want To Hop On The NAFTA Bus"

Liberal Party El Espectador commented (10/13): "The NAFTA and other

processes in Latin America tend to make the countries of the new continent much more cohesive.... Mexico's problem with...NAFTA must be treated as something that can be overcome in time. The reason is that at this time, Chile, Argentina, Venezuela and Colombia want to hop on the NAFTA bus, and even more so when the member countries of the NAFTA have left a door wide open so that this can happen. That is why the NAFTA is important."

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: "Shared Concerns"

Establishment Listin Diario opined (10/9): "Dominicans are concerned about NAFTA for the same reason that many sectors of the United States are concerned. Dominicans believe that many industries in the free-trade zones will leave the Dominican Republic for Mexico because the opportunities are wider than those of the Caribbean Basin Initiative."

GUATEMALA: "NAFTA: Threat To Central America And The Caribbean?"

Leading Prensa Libre commented (9/29): "With NAFTA, countries in the Caribbean basin would lose practically all the benefits they have secured through the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP).... One of the main problems for Guatemala and the rest of the countries in this region is that their exports products are very similar to Mexico's. If GSP were to give Guatemala advantages over Mexico for exports to the United States, when NAFTA enters into effect...there would be the same advantages in exporting agricultural goods, but there would be disadvantages in textile trading.

"However, to leave Central America and the Caribbean out of NAFTA would also have adverse consequences for the United States. "According to the U.S. Commerce Department, for each billion that the United States exports, 20 thousands jobs are created, which would mean that the Caribbean generates 220 thousand jobs with its \$11 billion in imports.... In spite of this...the three countries that will be part of NAFTA would rather establish trade agreements with Chile and South American countries before...Central America or the Caribbean region because their markets are larger and their economies are more developed. In light of this situation, the possibilities for this region to become part of NAFTA are remote."

GATT

EUROPE

FRANCE: "U.S. Intransigent, Kantor Inflexible"

TV France 2 and AFP speak of "a black Wednesday for France on GATT." All commentators reported on Mickey Kantor's "inflexibility." Private Radio Europe 1 held (10/14), "America is still as intransigent on GATT." Public TV France 2's economic specialist Philippe Sassier reported from Brussels last night:

"Mickey Kantor chose the role of the bad guy. And he has been perfect."

"Will This Lead To Political Crisis In France?"

Philippe Sassier told viewers of TV France 2 last night (10/14), "In Brussels, one has political questions. Can these GATT negotiations lead to a political crisis in France?"

"It's Europe France Is Hurting"

Pascal Riche and Armelle Thoraval co-authored this piece in today's influential Liberation (10/14), "The government says it not only defends the future of French agriculture but, beyond, that of Europe before the U.S. power.... But, with its attitude, it is the already fragile cohesion of Europe which the government is hurting.... Many European partners would have dropped Paris a long time ago if the European Community's fate had not been at stake.... It is true that the French are right to denounce U.S. intransigence. In order to convince, Washington uses more often a hammer than dialogue.... Everything is taking place as if as if France, over the past two days, has been only betting on one single scenario--the best way to manage a (GATT) failure."

"Paris Sets A Strategy Of Crisis"

Under the headline above, Pascal Riche observed in influential Liberation (10/13), "France is now convinced that the GATT affair will end with an international clash on December 15. It is that crisis for which the Balladur government wants to prepare.... (The government) hopes to be able to say, when the failure of the negotiations is obvious, that the United States was inflexible to the end.... The French government is now convinced that the United States will make no concessions on Blair House, or on cultural exception, nor on the French proposal to create a world trade organization.... The new French tactics are embarrassing the other EC members."

"French Can't Afford To Be Black Sheep"

Philippe Reinhard authored the front-page editorial in right-of-center Le Quotidien (10/13), "In our confrontation with the Americans, we (the French) cannot afford to appear to be the 'black sheep' that prevents the conclusion of the Uruguay Round. However, France cannot sign an accord which would condemn its agriculture.... (The Americans) would be wrong to think that the government might give in. Even if he wished it, Edouard Balladur would not be able to do it. Signing a GATT accord that endorses Blair House would be political suicide."

"France Looking For An Honorable Way Out..."

Catherine Chatignoux wrote in Les Echos (10/13): "France continues to look for an honorable way out on GATT. This is probably the

explanation for the Balladur government's new strategy. Paris wants to avoid having to take the blame for a failure of the GATT talks on December 15."

"...Or An Honorable Way To Compromise Without Saying So"

Dominique Gerbaud opined in regional La Nouvelle Republique du Centre Ouest (10/13): "France is toning it down a bit but does not want to give the impression that it is giving in. It is thus trying every which way, including with a dictionary of synonyms, how to conclude a compromise without saying so."

"France Caught In A Trap"

Jean-Marcel Bouguereau observed in regional La Republique des Pyrenees (10/13): "Caught up in the trap which it made, the government does not know how to get out.... The GATT accord is not that scarecrow which some continuously wave before us. A big exporter, France has an interest in its conclusion. Free trade cannot but be beneficial for a country which is the fourth biggest exporter in the world."

"Lack Of Coherence In French Position"

Jean-Pierre Tuquoi wrote in Le Monde (10/12): "With the December 15 deadline coming closer, the French government gives an impression of panic on GATT, which makes it adopt confused, often contradictory attitudes.... The most striking thing is that the lack of coherence in the French position, the awkward moves toward the United States don't hurt the U.S. determination. Rather, they tend to strengthen it."

"America The Powerful"

Charles Lambroschini said in Le Figaro (10/11): "Paris has changed its tactics on GATT. By saying, on Saturday, that a partial accord could allow to bypass the agricultural deadlock, Alain Juppe tried to transfer the (blame) from France to the United States. Thus, one could no longer say that it is the French who block the talks, but the Americans. But the Foreign Minister is still showing the same firmness--there must be limits to free trade....

"If...the Americans don't manage to agree with their neighbors (Mexico and Canada) on the terms of a simple regional market, why do they want to conclude the GATT package in eight weeks? But France is very lonely. Soothing words from some U.S. negotiators who explain behind the scenes that adjustments to Blair House are possible after the signing must not fool us. In the United States, the farm lobby is too vigilant to forgive Bill Clinton for some--even discrete--(adjustments). Also...no (EC country) dares to confront the United States. The shock waves after the fall of the Berlin Wall have also...effects on GATT. Now that the USSR is no longer here to compete with the United States, France has to acknowledge this: Even for its friends, America is so powerful that it is becoming stifling."

"Trapped France"

Gilles Dauxerre said in regional L'Yonne Republicaine (10/11): "Trapped by its 'all-or-nothing' strategy, misunderstood by its European partners, harassed by farmers, pushed by protectionist temptations from some in its majority, the French government is looking for an honorable way out so as not to be the only one stalling the international trade negotiations."

"France Blowing Hot And Cold On GATT"

French newswire service AFP and conservative Le Fig-Eco commented (10/7): "Paris is blowing hot and cold [on GATT.]... This rhetorical zig-zag mirrors the contradictory interests which the government is now facing.... On the one hand, in order to preserve its popularity, it must reassure farmers and those in the public who are hostile to any concession on GATT. On the other hand, Paris must take into account its European partners' impatience...and the worries of some in the French industrial circles who are aware of the negative fallout of a GATT failure."

GERMANY: "Paris: Straining Our Patience"

Right-of-center Frankfurter Allgemeine's editorial (10/14) judged, "The Paris government is excessively straining the patience of its trade partners in the EC, in GATT, and in the United States."

"Passing The Buck?"

Referring to the French proposal of a partial accord for December 15, Paris correspondent Hans-Hagen Bremer wrote for left-of-center Frankfurter Rundschau (10/14), "The Paris government obviously wants to signal that it does not see a possibility of compromise in the decisive questions, but that the GATT talks on other problems should not fail. But if the partners accepted this demand, it would be an invitation to all others to demand the exclusion of other unpopular topics. The result would be a GATT agreement that will certainly not give growth a new impetus.... Or is it so that France does not want an agreement at all and is now trying with this unacceptable move to pass the buck for the failure to somebody else?"

ITALY: "Gap Between French Position And EC Strategy Widening"

Leading centrist commented Corriere della Sera (10/14): "The trade negotiations between the United States and Europe are by now taking place within a triangular scheme. Formally, the negotiations take place between USTR Kantor and EC Vice President Brittan. But the gap between the French position, much more protectionist, and Brittan's negotiating strategy is getting wider and wider. Paris is thus assuming the role of the invisible guest at the U.S.-EC negotiating table, forcing the Europeans into a tiring mediation on two fronts--with the United States on one side and France on the

other."

IRELAND: "Increasing Optimism In EC For Resolution On Farm Deal"

The left-of-center Irish Times commented (10/5): "There is increasing optimism in EC circles that the community may be able to resolve its bitter internal dispute over GATT farm subsidy cuts amid hints that France may be prepared to soften its opposition to the proposed agreement. EC officials believe that France could now move away from its hardline approach to the issue and they point to the recent remarks by the French Prime Minister Balladur, that France may not be '100 percent correct' on the GATT farm issue."

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

CHINA: "Some Kind Of Compromise Will Probably Be Reached"

The official Communist Party People's Daily opined (10/4): "If [Europe and the United States] do not make concessions, a trade war of unprecedented scale over agricultural products will surely occur and the result can only be that neither side gains. Observers figure that if the two sides coolly weigh the advantages and disadvantages, some kind of compromise will probably be reached after bargaining."

SOUTH KOREA: "France Under Fire"

Independent Dong-A Ilbo commented (10/4): "France has now come under fire for impeding the resolution of the Uruguay Round talks. The French repulsion against the round's agricultural field is mainly targeted at the United States since France can hardly ignore its farmers' demands for the protection of their interests. The United States seems determined not to raise the U.S.-EC agreement on farm issues again. However, France does not unconditionally oppose the agreement if its demands are fulfilled. That is why the present state of the Uruguay Round talks could be compared to 'thick darkness' right before the dawn."

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA: "Nations Wait While For GATT Accord"

Daily-of-record La Nacion opined (10/7): "The principal responsibility regarding the GATT falls on the major countries which have failed to harmonize their interests during three years of talks. Meanwhile, more than 90 nations wait patiently for the protagonists to end their conflicts and put a common document on the negotiating table in Geneva. If it does appear, it will have to be analyzed with a magnifying glass."

AFRICA

MAURITIUS: "We Agree With France On Culture"

Leading independent Le Mauricien commented (10/6) on the French minister of culture's announcement in Paris that France would ask members countries at the 5th Francophone summit from to sustain the French request to keep cultural goods and services out of the GATT world trade negotiations: "After agriculture, it is culture's turn to pit Paris against Washington at the level of the international conference on GATT. And this time, the quarrel will pass through Mauritius on the occasion of the Francophone summit which will open on October 16.

"What does it consist of? Of a French attempt to put 'Francophonie' in the center of the struggle for a multilingual and multicultural world to fight, what Paris considers, a dangerous invasion of the planet by a cheap Anglo-Saxon culture, often extolling violence and values harmful to indigenous and national cultures. A tendency which accelerates with the advent of satellites soon to cover the whole world by this anglophone and Anglo-Saxon network tending toward monolingualism, even a monoculture excluding all other forms of culture.

"Mauritius should, in principle, sustain the French position for two reasons.... Namely that we in principle support all initiatives in favor of multilingualism and a multicultural world in the sense that Mauritius is itself a multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural example.... But the second reason is rather political: Paris and Port Louis have common economic interests, which relate to the very survival of the Mauritian sugar industry as much as the survival of the French agricultural sector.... Mauritius has...more reasons to support the proposal of [the French culture minister] than to oppose it or remain neutral. Let us hope that it takes a position of consequence at the summit which opens in 15 days."

Thursday, October 14, 1993

ILLEGAL DRUGS: THE VIEW FROM ABROAD

A strong interest in the Clinton administration's plans for curbing illegal drug traffic and suggestions for successful strategies in the anti-drug struggle were the main themes in a survey of media comment from overseas. Writers welcomed Washington's renewed interest in reducing domestic demand, and some suggested that a mix

of approaches--interdiction at the source, programs to discourage drug use and funding for alternative development--might be the best strategy for combating trafficking and addiction. These were other salient topics addressed by the press in Latin America and Asia:

BRAZIL--While expressing support for armed intervention against drug traffickers, liberal Folha de Sao Paulo suggested that legalization should at least be discussed as a way to eliminate huge profits earned by traffickers.

BOLIVIA--A regional daily pointed out that "ignorance and coca" have been the traditional tools for subjugating the Indian population, and called on the government to free them from "coca slavery."

COLOMBIA--Conservative tabloid La Prensa praised the Clinton administration for moving to a strategy espoused by the Andean countries, reducing consumption so as to diminish production.

PANAMA--Observers charged that articles in leading U.S. papers depicting Panama as a center for laundering drug earnings were an attempt to "destroy" its economy.

PERU--Writers split on the implications of the DEA's withdrawal from the Upper Huallaga Valley, but a majority deplored the move as a sign that the U.S. is "giving up" the fight against drugs at one of its most important sources of production. Influential, left-of-center La Republica lamented that the U.S. decision will "leave us, along with Colombia and Bolivia, facing a monster that, to date, we have not been able to control."

HONG KONG--An editorial said the Goldfish case, the first drug prosecution case by the U.S. and China, started out as an example of international cooperation but became "nothing short of a disaster" for relations between the two countries.

PAKISTAN--The radical Muslim denounced the extradition of Pakistani drug traffickers to the U.S.--allegedly without an extradition treaty--saying this compromises Pakistan's sovereignty.

This survey is based on 32 commentaries from 9 countries, Sept. 14-Oct. 10.

EDITOR: Mildred Sola Neely

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

BRAZIL: "Why Not Discuss Legalization?"

In an editorial (9/30), liberal Folha de Sao Paulo concluded, "Good sense recommends the participation of the armed forces in the fight

against drugs (in Brazil). However, less orthodox solutions cannot be discarded beforehand. As this paper has suggested off and on, why not encourage the debate about the controversial thesis of drug legalization?

"Without the profits (deriving) from illegality, the traffickers would lose their enormous financial power, thus reducing the intolerable level of violence with which society has to live."

"Too Much Hypocrisy, Too Little Coherence"

A byliner in Folha de Sao Paulo (9/30) wrote, "Social sensibility tolerates the drug addict as a deviant while it satanizes the trafficker. I suspect there is something wrong in that obviously hypocritical way of putting things. Drugs are undoubtedly an ulcer, just like alcohol, smoking and rock-and-roll, which have different degrees of malignity but are drugs nonetheless...."

"I am not suggesting the liberation of drugs: (But) I suspect that there is too much hypocrisy and too little coherence about the subject. Socially, alcohol abuse is as devastating as that of drugs...."

"I may be oversimplifying a complex problem, but honestly, I know that coca is grown in Bolivia and Peru. Hypocrisy grows everywhere."

BOLIVIA: "We Lost Opportunity To Control Illegal Drugs"

Centrist El Deber (9/30) of Santa Cruz lamented in an editorial, "When drug trafficking began to show up in Bolivia, we had all the resources to cut it out at its roots. The people linked to it were few and isolated, and without great consequences, they could have been segregated easily in strict application of the law."

"But we fell into demagoguery; the usual politicians began to stir their sickening antiyankee sentiments, making us believe that everything that was done to protect us from drug trafficking was but an abject surrender to the fierce and abominable monster of capitalism...."

"While furious voices screamed 'gringos go home' and built an impenetrable protection cordon for the coca producers, the drug industry flourished splendidly.... We lost the opportunity to prevent the sickness and now we do not know what to do with it."

"It's Not Flattering"

Santa Cruz's regionalist El Dia (9/28) commented in an editorial, "The U.S. government has pointed out that it will take the Bolivian government's antidrug battle as an example to continue with the task of interdiction in the Latin American region according to its own strategy."

"What seems to be flattery for this country has other connotations"

for public opinion, because the criticisms are addressed fundamentally at the lack of alternatives that the antidrug war leaves the coca producers, causing a deep social problem, of which we only know the tip. In addition, interdiction has not diminished drug consumption among the Bolivian population. On the contrary, it has increased and youth are the main victims of this scourge."

"Ignorance And Coca Enslaved Our Indians"

In a reference to a New York Times interview with Bolivian Vice President Victor Hugo Cardenas where the vice president referred to the historical enslavement of the Indians, Samuel Mendoza wrote (9/24) in Cochabamba's centrist Los Tiempos, "It is fair to say that the Indian's slavery was possible due to two powerful instruments used by his slaveholders: ignorance and coca. Neither the Incas nor the Spaniards, nor the landowners--even less the politicians--were interested in educating the Indian. It was easier to dominate him through his ignorance; and the way to keep him ignorant was by making him chew coca to numb him, because even if many demagogues want to deny it, coca-chewing is cocaine.... If we really want to free Indians from their slave-like condition, we must begin by freeing them from coca slavery, beginning with the older ones, and forbidding its consumption among the youth and children. Only in that way it will be possible to incorporate them into democratic society as the vice president suggests."

"Coca And Ecological Devastation"

Regionalist Correo del Sur (9/18) commented editorially, "Charles R. Bowers, U.S. ambassador to Bolivia, presented some days ago an extraordinarily objective and concrete view of what is happening in the Chapare, especially in the Isiboro Reserve National Park.... He also gave an assessment of the reality of the zone: 'The fact that drug traffickers and coca growers have invaded the park reflects the great success which alternative development has had in the region of the Chapare.' One need not be very smart to point out that this is a terrible paradox....

"We believe that unless investments are of a huge dimension and interdiction reaches total efficacy, this race, although it may present some encouraging results, is lost beforehand.... We agree with Ambassador Bowers that the greatest danger of uncontrolled coca production lies in the ecological devastation that it causes; but we do not think that the best response is to promote development of lands that can be used for coca production. In consequence, perhaps the time has come to think about the substitution of areas of planting and not fall into the dangerous trap of a model of substitution that suddenly is only benefitting drug trafficking."

"Their Ill-Gotten Gains Should Be Seized"

El Deber (9/14) opined about efforts to return confiscated goods to the families of drug traffickers: "Public opinion and institutions become....indignant about these [drug traffickers who] get rich

within view of everyone.... Public opinion and the institutions expect and demand exemplifying punishments such as...the seizure of all their goods so that they may be allocated to social service to benefit those most in need in the community, especially the very victims of drug addiction."

CHILE: "Attack Both Ends"

Christian-affiliated La Epoca's editorial (9/19) pointed out, "Complacency in a matter as serious as drug trafficking and drug consumption is not an effective method for solving the problem. Congratulating oneself for 'progress' which is not so is the least advisable course of action in any serious attempt to fight drug trafficking networks.

"The leaked U.S. National Security Council report, which analyzes military operations against the drug trade, is clear in its recommendation: The strategy must be changed because it has not been working.

"Nevertheless, the suggestions that the report makes... are at least as questionable. It proposes a strategy that seeks only to eliminate the supply, without concerning itself with reducing demand.... The best way to confront the problem is to attack simultaneously the two extremes which interact to create the drug flow, and not to concentrate exclusively on one."

COLOMBIA: "U.S. Strategy Moving Closer To What We Asked For"

According to conservative tabloid La Prensa (10/3), "The war on drugs is a bad metaphor that leads us to a failed policy. The defeat in this 'war' has been thoroughly proven.... The good neighbor from the north (United States), which has been the biggest drug consumer in the world, is moving toward a strategy that will answer to that being requested by the producing Andean countries for a long time, meaning that what is needed is to concentrate on eradicating consumption, because so long as the latter increases, production will not diminish....

"More than \$100 billion have been spent in the 'war' on drugs since 1981. Of said figure, close to \$75 billion have been spent in repression inside and outside the United States. Only a third has been used in prevention-oriented measures whose purpose is to educate against the risks of consumption."

"Supply And Demand?"

Liberal Party-oriented El Espectador (9/22) noted, "An increase of 300 percent in solid marijuana and 600 percent in liquid marijuana (oil) has led (Colombia's anti-drug director) to issue a warning about the new boom of this type of drug trafficking to other countries.... The huge increase is due to the decrease of marijuana plantations in the United States because of the cold weather, the Colombian government's action against poppies, Mexico's efforts

against this drug, the increase of hashish consumption in the United States, and the high prices charged by the Middle East producers."

PANAMA: "Intention To Destroy Panama's Economic System"

Oppositionist La Estrella de Panama (9/26) remarked in an editorial, "The article published recently by one of the most influential dailies in the United States, the Washington Post, in which it assured us that Panama maintained itself as the most active center in laundering drug trafficking money, has jarred people in this country.... We have, in the midst of these attacks against the moral integrity of the nation, total confidence in the Panamanian banking system.

"We are sure that behind these articles there exists the clear intention to continue destroying the Panamanian economic system....

"At the same time it is inexplicable that after several years since our country signed the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT), with the clear intent of fighting all these crimes, the U.S. Senate keeps it unratified."

"Damaging Panama"

Readers of tabloid Critica Libre (9/22) saw this editorial: "A constant barrage of journalistic opinion stemming from well-known North American newspapers insists on depicting a panorama of crime in Panama, an empire of drug dealers, making Panama the most active money laundering center of the Western Hemisphere and sending...the message that nothing has changed since the fall of the dictator, Noriega.

"This informational formula...has as its hidden and duplicitous goal to damage (Panama).... To assert that Panama is the sanctuary of the drug business is perfidious; this publicity negates the gains in the antidrug fight being made by the national authorities.... It scares away healthy investment; frightens travelers and tourists and...is a journalistic thrust against the country."

PERU: "Alone, Facing A Monster We Have Not Been Able To Control"

Influential, left-of-center, often anti-Fujimori La Republica (9/30) observed, "As regards our country (the DEA withdrawal) represents the death certificate of the anti-drug agreement signed by the governments of Alberto Fujimori and George Bush.... It is clear that the U.S. economic assistance requested (in the Upper Huallaga Valley) to replace the coca crops with alternative crops will not take place.

"At the very most, and probably not for long, the superpower is willing to cooperate with the Peruvian government in interdiction activities that do not represent a major military commitment, but the DEA withdrawal from the Huallaga makes this a purely theoretical point.... We need to interpret the change in the (U.S.) strategy as

giving up the fight against drug trafficking at the source of cultivation and production.... (This will) leave us, along with Colombia and Bolivia, facing a monster that, to date, we have not been able to control....

"At a time when U.S. economic assistance comes to an end, our country must seek other sources of funding, mainly European, and do it now. To end the image of passivity that we have exhibited in this field will help us attract substitute aid. But, on this issue as on so many others, there is a complete divorce between what the Fujimori regime says and what it does."

"DEA Withdrawal Crowns Drug Dealers' Success"

Leftist, sensationalist El Popular (9/22) pointed out, "Drug traffickers may be celebrating the DEA's announcement of its withdrawal from Peru for lack of funds.... Will President Clinton listen to the critics--who are growing in number--of the priorities given to repressive actions until now? The limited results obtained, in spite of the high economic costs, would justify it."

"In the meantime, the criminal drug organizations have been crowned with success."

"U.S. Withdrawal Could Affect Drug Effort In Andean Countries"

Remarking on the announcement of the withdrawal of DEA agents from the Santa Lucia base in the Upper Huallaga Valley, conservative, influential El Comercio (9/20) suggested that Peruvian President Fujimori would try to meet with President Clinton and talk about the drug fight. The paper continued, "Despite statements by the counselor (for drugs) of the U.S. Embassy in Peru, Sherman Hinson, that supplies and equipment will not be withdrawn (from the base) and that the DEA administrative office will continue operating in Lima, we are concerned by the posture that the United States adopts in the short term will affect the eradication of the illegal crop in the Andean countries."

"Death-Knell For 'Fujimori Doctrine'"

Rightist, often anti-U.S. weekly Oiga (9/20) judged, "Beyond the budgetary reasons that are being offered in Washington, and the certain fact of a shift in its anti-drug strategy orientation, the real kick in the pants comes for the bombastic 'Fujimori doctrine,' the alternative development program that Hernando de Soto designed and turned into an agreement, under the hypothesis that President Bush's view on the drug war would endure."

"Just Give Us The \$"

Sensationalist, mass-appeal, generally anti-Fujimori La Manana (9/20) declared, "That \$1 billion in fighting drug trafficking in Peru have been spent, and that they (the United States) are discouraged because they achieved nothing? Please! Just give us

(the money) directly and we will show them how we solve our problems."

"Major Difference In Treatment For Coca Farmers, Dealers"

Mass-appeal, conservative Ojo (9/16) asserted, "The drug strategy can't be restricted to military action alone. This has been the error of past American administrations and should not be repeated by President Clinton. He must come to understand that the coca farmers are driven to this activity because there is a great demand for cocaine in the United States. As a result it would be much more efficient to convince farmers to eradicate their coca and then go after the drug traffickers.

"There should be a major difference in the treatment given to coca farmers and drug traffickers. The former should be guaranteed that their substitute crops will have attractive prices in the U.S. market. To meet this objective the Clinton administration should finance the alternative development program and increase economic and military assistance to the Andean countries. As far as the drug traffickers are concerned, they should be captured and put in prison for life as the Peruvian government has proposed."

"Fujimori's Plan Can Succeed, If..."

An editorial (9/16) in pro-business Gestion concluded, "President Fujimori's alternative development program has a chance of succeeding if it operates in harmony with the anti-drug policies of the consumer nations. One effective way to make sure this happens is to reactivate the anti-drug convention with the new Clinton administration, and obtain expanded opportunities under the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA) which benefits the countries that produce coca.

"The reinitiation of the anti-drug convention with the United States, which the Peruvian government is trying to achieve, would parcel drug control activities among interdiction, the substitution of crops with cooperation of the coca farmers, and, hopefully, an expansion in the list of items that are covered under the ATPA."

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: "New Accord With U.S."

The following article by Suzanne Sheppard appeared in the independent Newsday (9/29). It discussed the recent signing of an anti-drug agreement between the United States and Trinidad, whereby the United States will provide \$50,000 for the reorganization and equipping of the organized crime and drugs unit of the police service. It said, "The project is designed to enhance this country's capability to suppress and eventually eliminate all aspects of the illegal drug trade.... 'Emphasis will also be on the development of actionable intelligence and coordinated intelligence sharing for use in all phases of the illicit narcotics situation within and/or otherwise affecting the country of Trinidad and

Tobago,' the agreement states."

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

HONG KONG: "Dead Goldfish Are Bad News For Everyone"

The independent, English-language South China Morning Post's editorial (10/10) remarked, "Mention the Goldfish case to any Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) agent in the United States and he will groan. What started out as an example of international cooperation has turned out into nothing short of a disaster for relations between China and the United States.

"A U.S. judge has added to the DEA's misery by refusing to send suspected heroin trafficker Wang Zongxiao back to China. Not only that, Judge William Orrick said the U.S. government committed 'clear, flagrant and shameful violations' of the rights of Mr. Wang, who 'faces certain torture and probable death' if returned to China.

"Beijing will be furious and will interpret this as another dirty trick by the Americans at a time when relations with Washington are distinctly cool.

"The Goldfish case, as it is known, was the first joint drug prosecution case by the two countries, and Mr. Wang was the first witness sent from China to testify in a U.S. criminal case. Mr. Wang, who was arrested in Shanghai in March 1988, was taken to San Francisco to testify against three men charged with smuggling heroin found inside dead goldfish shipped from China.

"The trial came to an abrupt halt in February 1990 when Mr. Wang testified he had lied on the stand after being tortured in China and threatened with death by Chinese officers who accompanied him to the United States. Beijing has said it will not cooperate with the Americans on any narcotics investigations until Mr. Wang is returned to China.

"And, at a time when traffickers are using China as a conduit to smuggle heroin out of the Golden Triangle before shipping it on to the United States, that is bad news for everyone."

SOUTH ASIA

PAKISTAN: "Compromising Pakistan's Sovereignty"

The radical Muslim (9/30) commented on the extradition of Pakistani drug traffickers to the United States: "Caretaker Prime Minister Moin Qureshi's crusade to cleanse the society of all evils is laudable indeed but he must pause and ponder that not only there are limits to his powers but that some of his decisions could be double-edged weapons which may wound rather than heal the society. No one will fault him to curb the narco trade with an iron hand but the methods he chooses to employ are certainly questionable. The latest decision to award the death penalty to drug pushers and to

raise minimum punishment for the crime from two-years imprisonment to life term and forfeiture of property is certainly as questionable as was the earlier decision to extradite drug barons to the United States for trial there.

"When we agree to extradite our own citizens to another country to stand trial for alleged crimes, even without a formal extradition treaty, what we are actually doing is to compromise the sovereignty of the state. Where is the extradition treaty between Pakistan and the United States and why is it not being made public?"

--608187348-302420407-750628213:#14949--