

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Folder Title:

POTUS Trip to Brussels, Belgium; Prague Czech Republic; Moscow, Russia; Kiev, Ukraine; Minsk, Belarus; and Geneva, Switzerland (January 8-16, 1994) [5]

Staff Office-Individual:

Press-Crowley, Philip J. (PJ)

Original OA/ID Number:

3460

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
42	5	7	3	V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. draft	Correction to Pool Report from Jazz Club [partial] (1 page)	01/13/1994	b(7)(E)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Office of Press and Communication (Crowley, Philip J. (PJ))
OA/Box Number: 3460

FOLDER TITLE:

POTUS Trip to Brussels, Belgium; Prague, Czech Republic; Moscow, Russia; Kiev, Ukraine; Minsk, Belarus; and Geneva, Switzerland (January 8-16, 1994) [5]

2017-0413-F

sb2293

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Brussels, Belgium)

For Immediate Release

January 11, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN MEETING WITH AMERICAN BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Conrad Hotel
Brussels, Belgium

8:06 A.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Thank you, Jim, and good morning ladies and gentlemen. I got here in time to hear the last several moments of the Secretary of State's remarks and all that stuff where he was bragging on me, and it reminded me of Clinton's fourth law of politics, which is whenever possible, be preceded on the platform by someone you've appointed to an important position. (Laughter.)

Nonetheless, we did have a good day yesterday -- the United States did -- and I think the Atlantic Alliance did. I came here to Europe hoping that together we might begin to realize the full promise of the end of the Cold War -- recognizing clearly that this is a difficult economic time in Europe; there are still profound difficulties in the United States; and that is having an impact on the politics of Europe and of the United States and of what we might do.

Nonetheless, it seemed to me that the time had come to try to define, here on the verge of the 21st century, what the elements of a new security in Europe and in the United States should be in the aftermath of the Cold War -- one premised not on the division of Europe, but on the possibility of its integration, its political integration around democracies; its economic integration around market economics; and its defense integration around mutual defense cooperation.

Yesterday when the NATO Alliance adopted the concept of the Partnership For Peace, we did what I believe history will record as a very important thing. We opened up the possibility of expanded NATO membership to nations to our East, not only all the former Warsaw Pact countries, but also other non-NATO members in Europe, all who wish to begin to work on joint planning and operations with us and to work toward being able to assume the full responsibilities of membership. But we did it in a way by opening up the possibility to everyone and making no decisions now. We did it in a way that did not have the United States and NATO prematurely drawing another line in Europe to divide it in a different way, but instead gave us a chance to work for the best possible future for Europe -- one that includes not only the countries of Eastern Europe, but also countries that were part of the former Soviet Union and, indeed, Russia itself. So we have made, I think, a very good beginning in the right way.

We also are going to have today the first summit with the European Union after the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty to begin to talk about what we can do together to rebuild the rate of economic growth and opportunity here and throughout the world.

Our firms -- our American firms -- are deeply woven into the fabric of Europe's economies. Over 60 percent of all the overseas profits of American companies come from Europe. We have \$225 billion American dollars invested here, employing

MORE

- 2 -

nearly three million Western Europeans alone. And back home, trade with Europe generated \$120 billion worth of exports and about two and a half million jobs in 1993. We all know -- you know better than I -- that this continent favors -- excuse me -- faces high unemployment and very sluggish growth rates. We also see that in Japan. And even though in our country the unemployment rate is coming down, we see in every advanced economy great difficulty today in creating jobs and generating higher incomes even when people are working harder and working smarter.

The renewal of the Atlantic economies is critical to the future of America and, I would argue, critical to the future of our Alliance. For in a democracy, as we have seen time and time again in votes at home, in votes in Europe and in votes in Russia, when people feel that they are anchored and stable and secure, when they believe they will be rewarded for their work, when they believe that the future will be better than the past, they vote in a certain way. When they are in economic and emotional freefall, when they feel disoriented, when they don't know whether the future will be better than the past, they often vote in another way and in ways that, indeed, make their futures more difficult and life for all peoples more difficult.

When I became President, it seemed to me that my first order of business ought to be to put our own economic house in order. And so we worked hard to reverse the exploding deficits of the last 12 years, to begin to invest in our own people, to try to do it in a way that would keep interest rates low and inflation low and turn the tide of private investment in the United States. We have begun to do that. Last year more new jobs came into our economy than in the previous four years. Millions of Americans refinanced their homes and businesses. Consumer confidence at the end of the year rose to its highest level in many years, and people began to believe that they could pay their debts and control their lives. In November, delinquencies on home mortgage payments in America reached a 19-year low. So we are beginning to believe that we have some discipline, some control of our own destiny.

We also had to make a tough decision in America last year as a people. And that is whether we could grow internally or whether we could continue to grow by reaching out to compete and win in a global economy and helping our friends and neighbors to grow. That debate was, I suppose, captured more clearly for the people of our nation and the people of the world in the congressional debate over NAFTA than in any other thing.

But the issue was bigger and, in some ways, simpler than that. It seems to me clearly that there is no way in a global economy for a wealthy country to grow wealthier -- to generate more jobs and to raise incomes -- unless there are more customers for its goods and services, and customers beyond its own national borders; and that the United States can ill afford to be in the vanguard of those running away from that idea and, instead, should be in the vanguard of those promoting it. That's really what the NAFTA vote was all about.

To be sure, those who voted against NAFTA were responding to very legitimate pressures and very real fears. While workers all over the world believe now that they are too fungible, relatively unimportant to people who control their jobs and their lives; and that in the flash of an eye, their jobs and their livelihoods could be taken away by someone who could move money, information across the globe in a millisecond and, indeed, who could move management and technology across the globe in a short amount of time.

And so it is going to be a continuing challenge for us to keep Americans outward looking, committed to open trade and more open markets and still, at the same time, to make our working people more secure in the sense not that they will be

MORE

- 3 -

able to hold the job they have, because they won't -- the average American will now change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime -- but they must know that they are employable; that they will have their basic health care needs and the needs of their families taken care of; and that they will have a chance to make the changes that will dominate at least the foreseeable decades of the 21st century -- changes that are friendly, not hostile, to them. And that is our challenge as we begin the next session of Congress in 1994.

But because of the NAFTA agreement and because of the meeting that we had in Washington State with the leaders of the Asian-Pacific region, there was a new energy given to the prospect of successfully concluding the GATT Round. And after seven years of frustration and progress, we were able to do that. I was not fully satisfied with the Round. It was obviously not perfect from any nation's point of view, and there are clearly many things that still have to be done. But there is no doubt in my mind that it was in the interest of the United States to conclude the GATT Round successfully -- that it will lead to the creation of hundreds of thousands of jobs in our nation alone and millions worldwide by the end of the decade. (Applause.)

One person believed that. (Laughter.)

And I think now we have to ask ourselves where we go beyond GATT. There are several issues, of course, that we need to take up with our European friends and with others around the globe. And we will take them up.

We also have to deal with the structural challenges facing our economies, the economies of the advanced nations. In March we're going to have a jobs conference in the United States. We have a lot to learn from some European countries about training and retraining of the work force. They have something to learn, perhaps, from us in flexibility of the work force and mobility of the work force, and the creation of an entrepreneurial environment that will enable unemployment to be driven down to lower levels.

But it is clear that together, along with our friends in Japan, we all have to learn something about how to make technological and other changes that are going on, lead not only to higher productivity but the ability of working people to be rewarded for that productivity and the ability of nations to create more employment within their national borders.

Beyond that, let me emphasize that when I leave here today after the European Union Summit, I am going on to Prague to meet with the leaders of the Visegrad countries. And it seems to me that it is folly to believe that we can integrate Europe through NATO or just on the basis of affinity for democracies, unless we are also committed to the economic integration of all of Europe and to reaching out to our East.

I will be urging the leaders of the European Union today to work with the United States to further reduce trade barriers and increase trade and investment to our East. Today I say to all of you, I hope that you are representing companies that as a result of the activities taking place in these few days will take another and harder look about your prospects in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond, because without private investment, we cannot hope to have private economic development.

Oh, I know we have a lot to do in Russia. I know we have a lot to do in the other states of the former Soviet Union and still some work to do in Eastern Europe. And we are doing that. I am going onto Russia after I leave Prague. But in the end, private investment and the development of successful private sectors will determine the future of European integration economically. And without it, I don't believe we can hope to sustain the military and political ties that we are building up.

MORE

- 4 -

So I ask you to do that. The United States government has worked hard to eliminate outdated export controls and to support American companies in Europe. We hope that in turn you will feel embolden to make more investments further East and to do what you can to improve our prospects to generate higher levels of trade and investment across national borders in ways that benefit people everywhere. For in the end, governments do not create wealth, people like you do.

Soon, your efforts will be sending goods back and forth through the channel. Your capital already is building bonds of commerce and culture across the Atlantic. You are in many ways the pioneers of the new Europe we are trying to ensure. Just by instinct, you will want the kind of integration that we have to work for around the political conference tables. Your determination to enter new markets is a hallmark of the American spirit and can help make the 21st century an American century a well.

I hope you will do that. I assure you that we will work hard to do our part.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

8:20 A.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Minsk, Belarus)

For Immediate Release

January 15, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE FUTURE LEADERS OF BELARUS

Academy of Sciences
Minsk, Belarus

3:17 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Sergei Gaponenko, the President of the National Academy of Sciences; and to my friend, Chairman Shushkevich; ladies and gentlemen. Thank you all for coming here. I hope the translation is working well. (Laughter.) Does the laughing mean yes or no? (Laughter.) Yes, I think.

I'm delighted to be here at your National Academy of Sciences, with many representatives of my government and representatives of yours. But most of all, I'm glad to see so many young people here, because it is your future I wish to talk about today.

I want to thank Chairman Shushkevich for inviting me and for suggesting that I meet with you. The Chairman is a leader of real courage, in recording the terrible toll of Chernobyl and in leading your nation's reforms. And I'm delighted to be with him here today.

I wanted to come to Belarus because I am impressed with much of what you have done and because I believe you can and will do even more. Your generation has been given an opportunity to build a strong and free nation. While you face hard times today, you have much with which to build a better future. You stand at the crossroads of continents. You have a highly educated people and great institutions of higher learning. You have good, strong high technology industries. Above all, you have reclaimed your freedom and your destiny is now in your own hands.

And so now you must decide what to do with your nation and your future. You are, I assure you, not alone in facing that question. For this is a time of profound change all across the world. Nations everywhere face the challenge of shaping their future amid all the technological, economic and political changes sweeping the globe.

Nations everywhere must now grapple with the question of how to compete in a global economy; how to reward and support hard-working families and their children; how to make their governments more effective and more responsive; how to address social problems such as unemployment and inequality and crime; how to combine cultural and spiritual traditions with the demands of modern life; how to define, indeed, a nation's security and greatness in a modern era in which money and information and technological changes fly across the globe in a millisecond -- in which we will be judged, I believe, more on whether we can develop the full capacities of every man and woman within each nation's border than on whether we can tell other people beyond our borders what to do and how they must live.

I have not come here to tell you what I think the solutions should be to these questions for your nation and your future. That is for you alone to decide. But I do come here as a friend and supporter of the democratic and economic reforms you

- 2 -

are beginning in your nation. I've come to show my support for those reforms and for your determination to build a better and safer and stronger future -- for your nation and for this entire region.

The work of reform before you today also has a larger significance. For what you do here might encourage other nations facing the same challenges. It can help to build a broader Europe that is no longer divided, but integrated -- integrated by democratic governments, market economies and peaceful coexistence and respect for national borders.

If we can accomplish this kind of integration all across Europe, east and west, then we can make both Europe and America safer and more prosperous. This nation, which lost one in four of its citizens in the second world war, must surely know better than any other on the face of the earth the terrible price Europeans have paid for their constant divisions -- not only in the two world wars of the 20th century, but indeed throughout the entire history of nations in Europe.

Now for the first time we have a chance to build a Europe without divisions where all countries respect each other's borders, all countries observe democratic traditions of majority rule and individual and minority rights. All countries trade freely with each other and help each other to achieve the true measure of greatness developing the capacities of their people.

Today I want to speak briefly about three opportunities I see before you: the renewal of your economy, the reform of your political system, and your work to define a new security for a new era.

First, let me say a word about economic transition. Of course you inherited an economic system imposed from above. And it has left you with, frankly, a mixed legacy. On the one hand, clearly it helped to rebuild Belarus from the ruins of World War II. But that same centrally-planned system is ill-suited for the fast-changing global economy.

That is clear everywhere. Everywhere in the world and every in every continent the people that are doing well are people who live in economies where investment and a well-trained work force make it possible for people to produce high-quality goods and services which they sell to each other and beyond their borders.

So now you must face the challenge of taking what is best about your economy, your highly-skilled people and your advanced industries and adapting it to the rigors of this new global competition. It is a hard transition. Almost every place which has sought to do it has faced, as you have, among other things, very steep inflation -- something you faced in this summer's increases in the prices of meat and butter.

Many people are struggling to get by as a result of this inflation. In a cruel way, inflation hurts the people economies should reward the most, those who simply get up and go to work every day obeying the law and trying to make their contribution.

But there is cause for hope because, as you privatize more of your economy, as more of it works in a market system, people will have reason to invest more and generate more economic growth. The government's plan to privatize 20 percent of state property this year is, I believe, a step in the right direction.

The United States wishes to support this kind of change. Since you became independent, we have provided over \$150 million in food, medicine and other forms of assistance. During this trip I announced additional steps to assist your movement to

a market economy: The establishment of a business center here in your nation to help to coordinate business efforts both within the country and with other businesses not only in my country but around the world; a new regional enterprise fund to help to start new businesses, which will include Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova; and a U.S.-Belarus Investment Treaty to encourage more private trade and investment between our two countries.

Ultimately your economic success will depend upon your own efforts. But you must have good neighbors who wish to be good partners. The United States wants to be one of those. And I believe there is no reason that Belarus be left behind in this march to a global economy. I urge you to press ahead with these economic reforms; to do it in a sensible and a clear-headed way as possible; to learn from the experience of other nations because I believe that it is the key to a better future.

You also face the challenge of political transition. Just as modern economies need the benefit of every individual's productive capacity, modern nations need the benefit, indeed cannot do well without the benefit of the diverse and informed views of all of their people. The world does not work very well from the top down anymore. It requires the active engagement of all individuals.

When voices are silenced by authoritarianism, by closed political systems or, as in the case with too many democracies today, by the apathy of citizens themselves who stay home and stay out of political dialogue, then wisdom is lost, debate becomes more hollow, challenges are avoided instead of being faced, and in the end, tyrants find it easier to grab or to hold on to power. We know where that low road leads. It leads to economic stagnation and social intolerance.

You have learned from your own hard history that there is a better way. I applaud your democratic reforms. I hope you will follow through with the commitments that have been made to hold new elections in March of this year. I hope you will press ahead with plans to craft a new constitution. I hope you will, in short, create a foundation for your economic renewal by protecting and promoting the political and human rights of your people, without which, over the long run, it will be very difficult to have a strong economy.

One of the most encouraging signs of your economic renewal is the political ferment that is bubbling up from your people. You have new political movements such as the Belarusian Popular Front. I was pleased to meet some of their members early today. You have environment groups which formed after the Chernobyl disaster. Such groups along with free labor unions, business associations and others can help to create a culture of participation, of debate, of personal investment in your nation's future. These private associations are important, just almost as important as the right to vote in the elections. It requires both a participation in the decisions of who will represent you at the state and who will be able to organize privately to make life more satisfactory and they'll give views a wider range.

Finally, let me say a word about your efforts to build a new nation that defines its strength and greatness in new ways. There is no better example than your determination to live as a nuclear-free state. Since I became the President of the United States, I have been determined to work with the other nuclear nations, and especially with Russia, to try to help the other republics of the former Soviet Union become nuclear-free; and we have gone a long way to finance that. Belarus led the way, and you deserve the credit and thanks of citizens all over the world.

Seventy-six nuclear weapons were here when the Soviet Union dissolved. As a new nation, one of your first decisions was to do away with them. It would have been easier to

- 4 -

look backward and say, well, these 76 weapons somehow make us a great nation; they make us stronger, we will keep them, we will use them and rattle them around as threats if people don't help us or do what we want them to do. But you made a braver and a better choice -- to live nuclear-free.

I am sure that your tragic experience with Chernobyl helped to shape that choice. But I also imagine that many, many of you had a clear understanding that these weapons, powerful and intimidating though they might be, offer you little in the way of real security. Real security lies in the integration with your neighbors -- their political and economic values and respect for their borders.

So you freely chose to eliminate these weapons. You became the first of the newly-independent states of the former Soviet Union to ratify the START Treaty and to accede to the nonproliferation treaty. That is part of why I was so pleased to welcome Chairman Shushkevich to Washington last July, early in my administration. I wanted to express my admiration for the courage and the vision that he and that all of you have demonstrated by making the choice to be nuclear-free.

We are committed to helping you to prove to all the people of the world that that was the right choice, that you were building a new and a better security. We are helping you to remove these weapons safely and security technical advice. You suffered through one nuclear tragedy. We are determined to see that you do not endure another.

Today I informed the Chairman that the United States will make additional funds available to Belarus for this purpose which will bring the total we have provided over the last two years in '93 and '94 to \$100 million.

As you move away from the weapons of the old security, we want to help you to build a new security by helping you to be a part of a new and democratic Europe.

Earlier this week I joined our NATO allies in creating the Partnership For Peace. The Partnership For Peace invites all of the nations of the former Soviet Union and the former Warsaw Pact and all other non-NATO nations in Europe, all of them together to join with NATO in a partnership that will permit us together to provide for the common security. It will permit non-NATO members to do military planning and training and exercises with NATO members as long as they promise to respect the sovereignty, the independence and the existing territorial boundaries of all of the nations which participate.

I hope Belarus will give careful consideration to this partnership. It is a part of our strategy to try to have a Europe that is undivided for the first time in its history, that uses the prospect of military cooperation genuinely to ensure the peace instead of simply to prepare for war.

You are a new nation with a long history. During this century you have endured as much or more hardship as any people we have ever known. And now you face difficult and challenging political and economic transitions. They are so challenging that they can even be disorienting. And if you move to elections, which I hope and pray that you will, you will find that when people are in trouble they sometimes vote their frustrations as well as their hopes. That is still true in the United States, and we've been working at it for 200 years now.

But there is no substitute for putting the people of the nation in the driver's seat. Over the long -- (applause) -- and we must be aware of this, no matter how sophisticated a people are, no matter how much information is available to decision-makers. There is so much going on in this world today, economically, politically, culturally. The changes are so

MORE

sweeping there is no way that one group of people, sitting atop a society, can make decisions which suffice to guarantee the best possible life for all of the people who live in that society.

Therefore, I believe that free political systems and free economic systems also happen to be good economics for the world in which we are living and the world which we will live in the 21st century for the foreseeable future. You face possibilities that are as sweeping as your land. The new freedom you are building has many difficulties, but it can also work miracles. It can make your cities thrive, it can help your land to blossom. Most important of all, it can give the wonderful children that I was shaking hands with just a few moments ago real hope.

END

3 35 P M

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Brussels, Belgium)

For Immediate Release

January 10, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT INTERVENTION FOR THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL SUMMIT

NATO Headquarters
Brussels, Belgium

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary General, and distinguished leaders. I am deeply honored to represent my nation at the North Atlantic Council this morning, as eight previous Presidents have done before me.

Each of us came here for the same compelling reason: the security of the North Atlantic region is vital to the security of the United States. The founders of this Alliance created the greatest military alliance in history. It was a bold undertaking. I think all of us know that we have come together this week because history calls upon us to be equally bold once again in the aftermath of the Cold War. Now we no longer fear attack from a common enemy. But if our common adversary has vanished, we know our common dangers have not.

With the Cold War over, we must confront the destabilizing consequences of the unfreezing of history which the end of the Cold War has wrought.

The threat to us now is not of advancing armies so much as of creeping instability. The best strategy against this threat is to integrate the former communist states into our fabric of liberal democracy, economic prosperity and military cooperation. For our security in this generation will be shaped by whether reform in these nations succeeds in the face of their own very significant economic frustration, ethnic tensions, and intolerant nationalism.

The size of the reactionary vote in Russia's recent election reminds again of the strength of democracy's opponents. The ongoing slaughter in Bosnia tallies the price when those opponents prevail. If we don't meet our new challenge, then most assuredly, we will once again, someday down the road, face our old challenges again. If democracy in the East fails, then violence and disruption from the East will once again harm us and other democracies.

I believe our generation's stewardship of this grand Alliance, therefore, will most critically be judged by whether we succeed in integrating the nations to our east within the compass of Western security and Western values. For we've been granted an opportunity without precedent: We really have the chance to recast European security on historic new principles: the pursuit of economic and political freedom. And I would argue to you that we must work hard to succeed now, for this opportunity may not come to us again.

In effect, the world wonders now whether we have the foresight and the courage our predecessors had to act on our long-term interests. I'm confident that the steel in this Alliance has not rusted. Our nations have proved that by joining together in the common effort in the Gulf War. We proved it anew this past year by working together, after seven long years of effort, in a spirit of compromise and harmony to reach a new GATT agreement. And now we must do it once again.

MORE

- 2 -

To seize the great opportunity before us I have proposed that we forge what we have all decided to call the Partnership For Peace, opened to all the former communist states of the Warsaw Pact, along with other non-NATO states. The membership of the Partnership will plan and train and exercise together and work together on missions of common concern. They should be invited to work directly with NATO both here and in the Coordination Cell in Mons.

The Partnership will prepare the NATO Alliance to undertake new tasks that the times impose upon us. The Combined Joint Task Force Headquarters we are creating will let us act both effectively and with dispatch in helping to make and keep the peace, and in helping to head off some of the terrible problems we are now trying to solve today. We must also ready this Alliance to meet new threats, notably from weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them.

Building on NATO's creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council two years ago, the Partnership For Peace sets in motion a process that leads to the enlargement of NATO. We began this Alliance with 12 members; today there are 16, and each one has strengthened the Alliance. Indeed, our treaty always looked to the addition of new members who shared the Alliance's purposes and who could enlarge its orbit of democratic security. Thus, in leading us toward the addition of these Eastern states, the Partnership For Peace does not change NATO's original vision, it realizes that vision.

So let us say here to the people in Europe's East, we share with you a common destiny and we are committed to your success. The democratic community has grown, and now it is time to begin welcoming these newcomers to our neighborhood.

As President Mitterrand said so eloquently, some of the newcomers want to be members of NATO right away, and some have expressed reservations about this concept of the Partnership For Peace. Some have asked me in my own country, well, is this just the best you can do? Is this sort of splitting the difference between doing nothing and full membership at least for the Visegrad states? And to that, let me answer at least for my part an emphatic no, for many of the same reasons President Mitterrand has already outlined.

Why should we now draw a new line through Europe just a little further east? Why should we now do something which could foreclose the best possible future for Europe? The best possible future would be a democratic Russia committed to the security of all of its European neighbors. The best possible future would be a democratic Ukraine, a democratic government in every one of the newly-independent states of the former Soviet Union, all committed to market cooperation, to common security and to democratic ideals. We should not foreclose that possibility.

The Partnership For Peace, I would argue, gives us the best of both worlds. It enables us to prepare and to work toward the enlargement of NATO when other countries are capable of fulfilling their NATO responsibilities. It enables us to do it in a way that gives us the time to reach out to Russia and to these other nations of the former Soviet Union, which have been almost ignored through this entire debate by people around the world, in a way that leaves open the possibility of a future for Europe that totally breaks from the destructive past we have known.

So I say to you, I do not view this as some sort of half-hearted compromise. In substance, this is a good idea. It is the right thing to do at this moment in history. It leaves open the best possible future for Europe, and leaves us the means to settle for a future that is not the best but is much better

MORE

than the past. And I would argue that is the course that we all ought to pursue.

I think we have to be clear in doing it about certain assumptions and consequences. First, if we move forward in this manner, we must reaffirm the bonds of our own alliance. America pledges its efforts in that common purpose. I pledge to maintain roughly 100,000 troops in Europe, consistent with the expressed wishes of our allies. The people of Europe can count on America to maintain this commitment.

Second, we have to recognize that this new security challenge requires a range of responses different from the ones of the past. That is why our administration has broken with previous American administrations in going beyond what others have done to support European efforts to advance their own security and interests. All of you have received our support in moving in ways beyond NATO.

We supported the Maastricht Treaty. We support the commitment of the European Union to a Common Foreign and Security Policy. We support your efforts to refurbish the Western European Union so that it will assume a more vigorous role in keeping Europe secure.

Consistent with that goal, we have proposed making NATO assets available to WEU operations in which NATO itself is not involved. While NATO must remain the linchpin of our security, all these efforts will show our people and our legislatures a renewed purpose in European institutions and a better balance of responsibilities within the transatlantic community.

Finally, in developing the Partnership For Peace, each of us must willingly assume the burdens to make that succeed. This must not be a gesture. It is a forum -- it is not just a forum. This Partnership For Peace is also a military and security initiative, consistent with what NATO was established to achieve. There must be a somber appreciation that expanding our membership will mean extending commitments that must be supported by military strategies and postures. Adding new members entails not only hard decisions, but hard resources. Today those resources are not great, but nonetheless, as the Secretary General told me in the meeting this morning, they must be forthcoming in order for this to be taken seriously by our allies and our friends who will immediately subscribe to the Partnership.

Let me also, in response to something that President Mitterrand said and that is on all of our minds, the problem in Bosnia, say that when we talk about making hard decisions, we must be prepared to make them. And tonight I have been asked to talk a little bit about the work I have been doing with Russia and what I believe we all should be doing to support democracy and economic reform there. But I'd like to make two points about Bosnia.

First, I want to reaffirm that the United States remains ready to help NATO implement a viable settlement in Bosnia voluntarily reached by the parties. We would, of course, have to seek the support of our Congress in this, but let me say I think we can get it if such an operation would clearly be under NATO command, that the means of carrying out the mission be equivalent to its purposes, and that these purposes be clear in scope and in time.

Second, I welcome the reassertion by the Alliance in this declaration of our warning against the strangulation of Sarajevo and the safe areas. But if we are going to reassert this warning it cannot be seen as mere rhetoric. Those who attack Sarajevo must understand that we are serious. If we leave the sentence in the Declaration we have to mean it.

MORE

Those of us gathered here must understand that, therefore, if the situation does not improve, the Alliance must be prepared to act. What is at stake is not just the safety of the people in Sarajevo and any possibility of bringing this terrible conflict to an end, but the credibility of the Alliance itself. And that, make no mistake about it, will have great ramifications in the future in other contexts.

Therefore, in voting for this language, I expect the North Atlantic Council to take action when necessary. And I think if anyone here does not agree with that, you shouldn't vote for language. I think it is the appropriate language, but we have to be clear when we put something like this in the Declaration.

Let me say finally that I ran across the following quotation by a distinguished and now deceased American political writer, Walter Lippman. Three days after the North Atlantic Treaty was signed Lippman wrote this, prophetically: "The pact will be remembered long after the conditions that have provoked it are no longer the main business of mankind. For the treaty recognizes and proclaims a community of interest which is much older than the conflict with the Soviet Union, and come what may, will survive it."

Well, this meeting will prove him right. The Soviet Union is gone, but our community of interest endures. And now it is up to us to build a new security for a new future for the Atlantic people in the 21st century.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

END

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Brussels, Belgium)

For Immediate Release

January 9, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO MULTINATIONAL AUDIENCE OF FUTURE LEADERS OF EUROPE

Gothic Room
Hotel De Ville
Brussels, Belgium

6:00 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Mayor, distinguished leaders. I'm delighted to be here with the Prime Minister and with many of Europe's future leaders in this great hall of history.

I first came to Brussels as a young man in a very different, but a difficult time, when the future for us was uncertain. It is fitting that my first trip to Europe as President be about building a better future for the young people of Europe and the United States today, and that it begin here in Belgium. As a great capital and as the headquarters of NATO and the European Union, Brussels and Belgium have long been at the center of Europe's steady progress toward greater security and greater prosperity.

For those of you who know anything about me personally, I also have a great personal debt of nearly 40 years standing to this country because it was a Belgian, Adolf Sax, who invented the saxophone. (Laughter.)

I have come here at this time because I believe that it is time for us together to revitalize our partnership and to define a new security at a time of historic change. It is a new day for our transatlantic partnership: The Cold War is over; Germany is united; the Soviet Union is gone; and a constitutional democracy governs Russia. The specter that haunted our citizens for decades of tanks rolling in through Fulda Gap or nuclear annihilation raining from the sky -- that specter, thank God, has largely vanished. Your generation is the beneficiary of those miraculous transformations.

In the end, the Iron Curtain rusted from within, and was brought crashing down by the determination of brave men and women to live free -- by the Poles and the Czechs; by the Russians, the Ukrainians; the people of the Baltics. By all those who understood that neither economics nor consciences can be ordered from above.

Equally important, however, their heroic efforts succeeded because our resolve never failed, because the weapons of deterrence never disappeared and the message of democracy never disappeared.

As the East enjoys a new birth of freedom, one of freedom's great victories lives here in Europe's West -- the peaceful cleaving together of nations which clashed for centuries. The transformation was wrought by visionary leaders such as Monnet, Schumann, Spaak, and Marshall, who understood that modern nations can enrich their futures more through cooperation than conquest.

My administration supports European union, and Europe's development of stronger institutions of common purpose

MORE

- 2 -

and common action. We recognize we will benefit more from a strong and equal partner than from a weak one.

The fall of the Soviet empire and Western Europe's integration are the two greatest advances for peace in the last half of the 20th century. All of us are reaping their blessings. In particular, with the Cold War over and in spite of the present global recession which clouds your future, all our nations now have the opportunity to take long, deferred steps toward economic and social renewal. My own nation has made a beginning in putting our economic house in order, reducing our deficits, investing in our people, creating jobs and sparking an economic recovery that we hope will help not only the United States, but also will lift all nations.

We're also facing up to some of the social problems in our country we have ignored for too long: From the challenge to provide universal health care, to reducing crime in our streets, to dealing with the needs of our poor children. We have a truly multicultural society. In one of our counties there are people from over 150 different national and ethnic groups. But we are working to build an American community for the 21st century.

And with the European Union, we have recently led the world to a new GATT agreement that will create millions of new jobs in all our countries. In many ways it would be easy to offer you only a message of simple celebration, to trumpet our common heritage, to rejoice that our labors for peace have been rewarded, to cheer on the economic progress that is occurring. But this is not a time for self-congratulation. And certainly we have enough challenges that we should act true partners -- that is, we should share one another's burdens rather than only talking of triumphs. And we should speak honestly about what we feel about where we are and where we should go.

This is the truth as I see it. We served history well during the Cold War. But now history calls on us again to help consolidate freedom's new gains into a larger and a more lasting peace. We must build a new security for Europe, the old security was based on the defense of our bloc against another bloc. The new security must be found in Europe's integration -- an integration of security forces, of market economies of national democracies. The purpose of my trip to Europe is to help lead the movement to that integration and to assure you that America will be a strong partner in it.

For the peoples who broke communism's chains, we now see a race between rejuvenation and despair. And the outcome will -- bound to shape the security of every nation in the transatlantic alliance. Today that race is being played out from the Balkans to Central Asia. In one lane are the heirs of the enlightenment, who seek to consolidate freedom's gains by building free economies, open democracies and tolerant civic cultures. Pitted against them are the grim pretenders to tyranny's dark throne -- the militant nationalists and demagogues who fan suspicions that are ancient, and parade the pain of renewal in order to obscure the promise of reform.

We, none of us, can afford to be bystanders of that race. Too much is at stake. Consider this: The coming months and years may decide whether the Russian people continue to develop a peaceful market democracy or whether, in frustration, they elect leaders who incline back toward authoritarianism and empire. This period may determine whether the nations neighboring Russia thrive in freedom and join the ranks of nonnuclear states or founder under the strain of reform and cling to weapons that increase the risk of nuclear accident or diversion.

This period may decide whether the states of the former Soviet bloc are woven into the fabric of transatlantic

MORE

- 3 -

prosperity and security, or are simply left hanging in isolation as they face the same daunting changes gripping so many others in Europe.

These pivotal decisions ultimately rest with the people who threw off communism's yoke. They must make their own decisions about their own future. But we in the West can clearly help to shape their choices, and we must summon the political will to do so.

The task requires a steady and patient effort, guided by a strategic star that points us toward the integration of a broader Europe. It also requires a fair amount of humility -- understanding that we cannot control every event in every country on every day. But if we are willing to assume the central challenge, we can revitalize not only the nations of the East, but also our own transatlantic relationship.

Over the past half-century, the transatlantic community only realized half the promise of World War II's triumph over fascism. The other half lay captive behind Europe's walls of division. Now we have the chance to realize the full promise of Europe's victories without its great disappointment: Normandy without Yalta, the liberation of the low countries without the Berlin blockade.

During this past half-century, transatlantic security depended primarily on the deterrents provided by our military forces. Now the immediate threat to our East is not of advancing armies, but of creeping instability. Countering that threat requires not only military security, but also the promotion of democratic and economic renewal. Combined, these forces are the strongest bulwark against Europe's current dangers -- against ethnic conflict, the abuse of human rights, the destabilizing refugee flows, the rise of aggressive regimes and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

The integration of the former communist bloc with the rest of Europe will be gradual and often difficult, as Germany's bold efforts demonstrate. And like all great opportunities, we must remember that this one could be fleeting. We must not now let the Iron Curtain be replaced with a veil of indifference. For history will judge us as it judged with scorn those who preached isolationism between the world wars, and as it has judged with praise the bold architects of the transatlantic community after World War II.

With the Cold War over, some in America with short memories have called for us to pack up and go home. I am asked often: Why do you maintain a presence in Europe? How can you justify the expense when we have so many problems here at home? We tried that, right after World War I. But the American people this year proved their resistance to the siren song of global withdrawal. We did so when the Congress voted for the North American Free Trade Agreement, voted for America to compete in a global economy, not to retreat. And we did so when we reached out to Europe and to others, and in working with the European Union, led the world to accept a new GATT agreement on world trade.

I have come here today to declare and to demonstrate that Europe remains central to the interests of the United States, and that we will help to work with our partners in seizing the opportunities before us all.

Without question, Europe is not the only focus of our engagement, we must reach out to Latin America and to Asia -- areas that are increasingly important both to the United States and to Europe. And our bonds with Europe will be different than they were in the past, but make no mistake about it: the bonds that tie the United States and Europe are unique. We share a passionate faith that God has endowed us as individuals with

MORE

- 4 -

inalienable rights and a belief that the state exists by our consent solely to advance freedom and security and prosperity for all of us as individuals. That is still a radical idea in the world in which we live. Developed by Locke and Montesquieu, put into practice in my country by Jefferson and Madison, it has toppled tyrants, it has drawn millions to our country's shores.

Over three centuries, the ties of kinship between the United States and Europe have fostered bonds of commerce and you remain our most valued partner, not just in the cause of democracy and freedom, but also in the economics of trade and investment.

But above all, the core of our security remains with Europe. That is why America's commitment to Europe's safety and stability remains as strong as ever. That is why I urged NATO to convene this week's summit. It is why I am committed to keeping roughly 100,000 American troops stationed in Europe, consistent with the expressed desires of our allies here. It is not habit, but security and partnership that justifies this continuing commitment by the United States.

And just as we have worked in partnership with Europe of every major security challenge in this century, it is now time for us to join in building the new security for the 21st century, the century in which most of you in this room will live most of your lives. The new security must seek to bind a broader Europe together with a strong fabric woven of military cooperation, prosperous market economies and vital democracies.

Let me speak briefly about each of these. The first and most important element of the security must be military strength and cooperation. The Cold War is over, but war itself is not over. As we know it rages today not only in distant lands but right here in Europe and the former Yugoslavia. That murderous conflict reminds us that even after the Cold War, military forces remain relevant. It also reveals the difficulties of applying military force to conflicts within as well as among states. And it teaches us that it is best to act early to prevent conflicts that we may later not be able to control.

As we work to resolve that tragedy and ease the suffering of its victims we also need to change our security institutions so they can better address such conflicts and advance Europe's integration. Many institutions will play a role, including the European Union, the Western European Union, the Council of Europe, the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations. But NATO, history's greatest military alliance, must be central to that process.

Only NATO has the military forces, the integrated command, the broad legitimacy and the habits of cooperation that are essential to draw in new participants and respond to new challenges. One of the deepest transformations within the transatlantic community over the past half-century occurred because the armed forces of our respected nations trained, studied and marched through their careers together. It is not only the compatibility of our weapons, but the camaraderie of our warriors that provide the sinews behind our mutual security guarantees and our best hope for peace.

Two years ago our nations began to adapt NATO to this new era by creating the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. It includes all the state of the former Soviet bloc, as well as the 16 of NATO. Now it is time to move beyond that dialogue and create an operating partnership. That is why I have proposed that we create the Partnership For Peace.

This partnership will advance a process of evolution for NATO's formal enlargement. It looks to the day when NATO

MORE

- 3 -

will take on new members who assume the Alliance's full responsibilities. It will create a framework in which former communist states and others not now members of NATO can participate with NATO members in joint military planning, training, exercises and other efforts. This partnership will build new bonds of cooperation among the militaries of the East and the West. It will reinforce the development of democracies and democratic practices, such as respect for human rights and civilian control over military forces. It can give NATO new tools for responding to ethnic instability and other dangers of our era.

The use of NATO forces in such missions will always be considered and must be on a case-by-case basis. But tomorrow's summit will put us in a stronger position to make those decisions, and to make them early and wisely.

The Partnership For Peace will not alter NATO's fundamental mission of defending NATO territory from attack. We cannot afford to abandon that mission while the dream of empire still burns in the minds of some who look longingly toward a brutal past. But neither can we afford to draw a new line between East and West that could create a self-fulfilling prophecy of future confrontation.

This partnership opens the door to cooperation with all of NATO's former adversaries, including Russia, Ukraine and the other newly-independent states, based on a belief that freedom's boundaries must now be defined by new behavior, not old history.

I say to all those in Europe and the United States who would simply have us draw a new line in Europe further east that we should not foreclose the possibility of the best possible future for Europe which is a democracy everywhere, a market economy everywhere, people cooperating everywhere for mutual security. We can guard against a lesser future, but we should strive for the best future for you and your generation.

NATO can also help to meet Europe's new security challenges by doing more to counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. I tell you, frankly, it is one of our most difficult and challenging tasks. Countering those weapons and the missiles that deliver them will require close cooperation, honesty and discipline, and a willingness of some not now willing to do it to forego immediate financial gain.

The danger is clear and present. Growing missile capabilities are bringing more of Europe into the range of rogue states such as Iran and Libya. There are disturbing reports of efforts to smuggle nuclear materials into and out of Eastern Europe. And this eastward-looking summit will give us the chance to begin to address the threat on our own territory.

The second element of the new security we are building must be greater economic vitality, the issue which I would imagine is of most immediate concern to most of you. We must build it on vibrant and open market economies, the engines that have given us the greatest prosperity in human history over the last several decades in Europe and in the United States.

Our combined success in leading the world to a new GATT agreement capped seven years of effort to expand prosperity to all trading nations. Now we must define a successor agenda to GATT that focuses on the renewal of advanced economies and the enlargement of prosperities to the nations of our east that are making the difficult transitions to market economics.

First, the renewal of our own economies is critical. Unless we are creating jobs and unless we are raising incomes in Europe and in the United States and Japan, in the advanced

- 6 -

those nations, all our nations, to continue support of policy of involvement with the rest of the world.

The nations of the European Union face particular severe economic challenges with nearly 20 million people unemployed and, in Germany's case, the extraordinarily high costs of unification. All our nations have had to struggle against the restless forces of this new global economy, against the competition that comes from countries with lower wages or that is generated when technology enables us to do more with fewer workers, but there is not new technology to provide new jobs for those who are displaced. This is problem not just for Europe, but also for the United States, and now for Japan as well.

Among the Atlantic nations, economic stagnation has clearly eroded public support in finances for outward-looking foreign policies and for greater integration. Our respective effort to revive our own economies are, therefore, important not only for our own living standards, but also for our collective strength. And both of them will shape the future you and your children will have.

We must proceed quickly to implement the GATT agreement. But we also must learn together and from each other on making a broader and bolder series of adjustments to this new global economy.

We Americans have a lot to learn from Europe in matters of job training and apprenticeship, of moving our people from school to work and to good paying jobs with the capacity to continue to learn new skills as the economy forces them to do so. But we also may have something to teach in the area of the flexibility of our job structure and our capacity to generate work and new employment opportunities. This is an area in which we can usefully draw lessons from each other. And that is why I am pleased that in March our leading ministers will hold a jobs conference that I proposed last July. We simply must figure out how to create more jobs and how to reward people who work both harder and smarter in the workplace. It is the basis of all the other attitudes that we want to foster to remain engaged with one another and with the rest of the world.

But as we work to strengthen our own economies, we must know that we serve our own prosperity and our security by helping the new market economies of Europe's eastern half to thrive. Successful market reforms in those states will help to deflate the region's demagogues. It will help to ease ethnic tensions. It will help new democracies to take root. It is also in your long-term interest because one of the things that we have learned is that wealthy nations cannot grow richer unless they have customers beyond their borders for their goods and their services.

So the short-term difficulties of taking Eastern Europe into our economic alliance will be more than rewarded if they succeed and if they are customers for Western Europe's goods and services tomorrow. That is why early on in our administration we committed to increase support substantially for market reforms in the new states of the former Soviet Union, and why we have continued our support for economic transition in Central and Eastern Europe.

Ultimately, the success of market reforms to the East will depend more on trade than aid. None of us have enough money to markedly change the future of those countries as they move to free market systems in the government coffers. We cannot give them enough aid to make them full partners. They must grow and trade their way into full partnership with us.

One of our priorities, therefore, should be to reduce trade barriers to the former communist states. It will make little sense for us to applaud their market reforms on the

MORE

- 7 -

one hand while offering only selective access to our markets on the other. That's like inviting someone to a castle and refusing to let down the drawbridge. The United States has already eliminated many of our Cold War barriers to products from these countries. And all our nations must find more ways to do the same thing. The economic success of these states simply cannot be separated from our own renewal and security.

In 1931, a remarkable British political cartoon portrayed the United States and Europe in a rowboat. At the back end of the boat, where Europe's more Eastern powers sat, there was a terrible leak and it was sinking fast. The front end, where the United States and Western Europe were, was still afloat; the boat was sinking from the back end. And one of the figures in our end of the boat was saying, "Thank goodness, the leak's not at our end of the boat." In the end, the whole boat sank. That will happen again unless we work together. Europe's western half clearly, as history shows, cannot long be secure if the eastern half remains in turmoil.

The third and final imperative of this new security is to support the growth of democracy and individual freedoms that has begun throughout Europe's former communist states. The success of these democratic reforms make us all more secure because democracies tend not to wage war on one another, and they tend not to break their word to one another. Democratic governments nurture civil society, respect for human rights and habits of simple tolerance. The democratic values at the heart of the Western community are also our best answer to the aggressive nationalism and ethnic hatreds unleashed by the end of the Cold War.

We in the transatlantic community must commit ourselves to helping democracy succeed in all the former communist states that are Western Europe's immediate neighbors, because their security matters to our security. Nowhere is democracy's success more important to us all than there and then in Russia. I will say again, in Russia, if the nation continues to evolve as a market democracy, satisfied within her borders and at peace with her neighbors, defining her greatness in terms of the ability to enable all of the children of Russia to live to the fullest of their potential, then our role toward Europe's full integration will be wider and smoother and safer. As one Ukrainian legislator recently stated, if Russia is democratic, Europe will be calm.

The results of the recent elections in Russia and the statements of some Russian political figures have given us all genuine cause for concern. We must consistently condemn expressions of intolerance and threats of aggression. But we should also keep those concerns in some historical perspective. It was only two years ago, after all, that the Soviet Union dissolved. Just two months ago, Russia appeared to be on the brink of a civil war. But since then Russia has held a free and fair national election, its people have ratified a genuinely democratic constitution, and they have elected their first-ever post-Soviet legislature. And the government continues to pursue democratic and economic reform.

The transformation Russia is undertaking is absolutely staggering. If you just think about what the country has been like since 1917; if you go back to the 18th century and imagine the history of the nation from that point to this; the idea that the nation could seriously be involved by democratic vote in undertaking these transformations is absolutely staggering. We cannot expect them to correct overnight three-quarters of a century of repressive leadership, three-quarters of a century of totalitarian policy, or a whole national history in which there was no democracy.

As in the other communist nations, this will be the work of generations. We in the United States have been at it for

- 8 -

200 years now and we're still working to try to get it right. All of us have to recognize that there will be wrong turns and even reversals, as there have been in all of our own countries throughout our histories. But as long as these states continue their progress toward democracy and respect the rights of their own and other people, that they understand the rights of their minorities and their neighbors, then we should support their progress with a steady patience.

In order to support these new democracies, we are supporting grass-roots efforts to build the institutions of civil society, from community organizers in the Czech Republic to election volunteers in Bulgaria. We also will take steps to encourage cooperation among the new democracies. As with Western Europe after World War II, we must get regional neighbors working together rather than looking at each other with suspicion.

The broader integration in peace we are building is not only a European concern -- I say again, it is distinctly in the interests of the United States. My nation has thrilled at the progress of freedom on this continent over the past five years. And we understand well the toll that European discord ultimately takes on our own people.

Only a few hours of this place lie the graves of thousands of Americans who died in Europe's two great wars. History records where they fell -- at Flanders Field, on the shores of Normandy, and in the Battle of the Bulge. But let us remember as well why they came here; why they left the safety of their homes to fight in a distant land. They came because our security depends more on things that go far beyond geographical divides. Our security depends on more than the ocean that divides us. It depends on the existence of a strong and free and democratic Europe.

Today we can honor the sacrifice of those Americans buried here on your soil by expanding the reach of the freedoms they fought and gave their lives to preserve. The fight for your generation across a broader Europe will be joined and won not on this continent's beaches or across its plains, but rather in its new parliaments and city councils; in the offices and factories of its new market economies; in the hearts and minds of the young people like many of you here. You have the most to gain from a Europe that is integrated in terms of security, in terms of economics, in terms of democracies.

Ultimately, you will have to decide what sort of Europe you want and how hard you are willing to work for it. But I want you to know that the United States stands by you in that battle, as we have in the other battles of the 20th century.

I believe that our freedom is indivisible. I believe our destinies are joined. I believe that the 21st century can be the most exciting period that Europe and the United States have ever known, and that your future can be the richest and brightest of any generation. But we will have to work to make it so. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

6:32 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Brussels, Belgium)

For Immediate Release

January 11, 1994

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT

Joseph Luns Theatre
NATO Headquarters
Brussels, Belgium

10:50 A.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. As all of you know, this historic summit meeting of the North Atlantic Council was my first NATO meeting. I'm glad we were able to accomplish as much as we did here. I'm convinced that history will record this meeting as a major step in building a new security for the transatlantic community.

I'm very pleased that our NATO allies approved our proposal for the Partnership For Peace. I believe it will help our Alliance to meet Europe's new challenges, and I'm pleased by the response the Partnership has already generated from nations who have contacted us and said they are interested in being a part of it.

Ultimately, the Partnership will lead to the enlargement of NATO and help us to build a security based not on Europe's divisions, but on the potential of its integration. I look forward to working with NATO leaders in the coming months to prepare for exercises with the states that join the Partnership and to work on the next steps towards NATO's enlargement.

Today NATO also took dramatic steps to prepare for its new post-Cold War missions by calling for the creation of combined joint task forces. These task forces will make NATO's military structures more flexible and will prepare the Alliance for nontraditional missions. They will also help us to put the Partnership For Peace into action by serving as the vehicle for Eastern militaries to operate with NATO forces -- something that General Joulwan will begin to prepare for immediately.

I'm pleased that during this summit NATO began to address the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The agreement that the United States will sign with Ukraine and Russia this Friday will also make a major contribution to reducing that threat.

With the end of the Cold War we no longer face the threat of confrontation between nuclear powers, but we do face continuing conflicts, including the reality of the murderous conflict in Bosnia. At this meeting we discussed candidly and at some length, NATO's policy towards Bosnia. We reaffirmed our commitment to respond to the strangulation of Sarajevo, and to help to implement an enforceable peace agreement if one is reached by all the parties.

I want to discuss this with some precision, if I might. The United States last evening in our discussions took a very strong position that we ought to reaffirm our air warning, that is, the possibility of the use of air power, to relieve the strangulation or in retaliation for the strangulation of Sarajevo, but that the language ought to be left in our policy if, and only if, we were prepared to follow through. And I made it clear that for our part, we were prepared to follow through and, therefore, we supported leaving the language in. But along

MORE

- 2 -

with the Secretary General, I urged our allies not to leave it in unless we were prepared to follow through, on the theory that we should not say things that we do not intend to do.

In addition to that, I supported the United Kingdom and France and their call for plans to ensure that we can complete the bloc rotation of troops to Srebrenica, so that that can take place, the exchange of the Canadians for the Dutch forces, and to explore how Tuzla airstrip might be opened. Now, either of these activities could require the use of NATO, including United States air power. We also had a continuing commitment to and the opportunity to use air power to protect the United Nations troops there if that is needed for close air support.

Now, these are the actions which have been taken. In other words, we have reaffirmed our position of last August, which is an important thing to have done in light of the recent shelling of Sarajevo. We have instructed our military command to come up with plans to see what can be done to ensure the rotation of the troops in Srebrenica and the opening of the Tuzla airstrip. And those plans, as has been said by the Secretary General, can include the use of air power.

Let me just mention one or two other things. While the WEU and other European international bodies would play an important role in meeting the security challenges in Europe in the coming years, I still believe that NATO remains the linchpin of our mutual security. And so, as we finish this summit, I want to say a special word of thanks to Secretary General Woerner for his remarkable leadership. I have had the opportunity now to meet and work with many leaders around the world. He is a genuine statesman. He understands what is at stake here. He has a vision of the future, and he leads this Alliance with great vision and discipline. And I thank him for that.

I also want to thank the other NATO leaders for their hospitality, and especially the Prime Minister of Belgium and the people of Belgium and Brussels for their hospitality to us. I believe this was a very successful meeting. They had accomplished everything that I hoped, and I think as the years go by we will be glad that it occurred.

Q Could you please tell us whether or not there was unanimous belief by the NATO allies that these air strikes could go forward, or is there something that still needs to be done before you can actually commit to movement?

THE PRESIDENT: There was unanimous -- and I want to be very clear on this -- there was unanimous support for the policy as it is written. Everybody voted for it. In order to trigger the air strikes, what must happen? I want to emphasize two things. One is, whether they occur or not depends upon the behavior of the Bosnian Serbs from this moment forward. Secondly, based on that behavior, our military personnel will take this issue back to the NAC in our absence, and we will deal with it. And, of course, we will consult with the U.N. if it is something that involves the use of air power other than to give support to the U.N. forces as already approved.

So that is what I think -- at that point, we'll deal with the facts. Some of us, I think it's clear, were stronger than others about the appropriateness of it under the circumstances that we now know about or could imagine. But I think the accurate thing is, there was unanimous support for the policy, which means everybody who voted for it recognized that air power might well be used.

What happens now depends upon the behavior of the combatants, principally the Bosnian Serbs, and what the military commanders come back and recommend.

MORE

- 3 -

Q When you get to Prague, in light of this meeting and in light of your own feelings, will you be in a position to tell us at least some of the Visegrad leaders that they are in fact on a fast track toward membership in NATO?

THE PRESIDENT: I think I'll be in a position to tell them, number one, the purpose of the Partnership For Peace is to open the possibility of NATO's enlargement as well as to give all the former Warsaw Pact countries and other non-NATO nations in Europe the chance to cooperate with us militarily; that NATO is an alliance with mutual responsibilities as well as the security guarantee. And we are clearly serious about pursuing this, including ultimate membership, as evidenced by the fact that the Secretary General said in his closing remarks -- I don't know what he said here in the press conference because I didn't hear it -- he said in his closing remarks that General Joulwan would immediately contact the military leaders of these countries, including the Visegrad countries, to talk about how we could begin planning for mutual operations in training and exercise.

So I think that they will clearly understand that this is a very serious proposal that opens the possibility of membership, not one that limits it.

Q Mr. President, the Secretary General said in his remarks that the instrument is there regarding Bosnia and other threats, but he's not sure that the will is there. Now, you just mentioned unanimity. It was a unanimous vote, as we understand it, last August for the same policy, yet many attacks have taken place in Sarajevo and have been unanswered by NATO. So, first, do you think that there is a greater will now, do you sense a greater determination despite the misgivings of those peacekeepers on the ground? And secondly, is there a lower threshold, do you think, given this language that the British and the French, we understand, proposed on Tuzla and Srebrenica? Is there a lower threshold to use air power in those instances than for the wider air attacks regarding Sarajevo?

THE PRESIDENT: I would answer -- make two points in response to your question. One is, I don't know that the threshold is lower, but there are more instances in which air power can be used now under the NATO policy. That is, clearly, the policy asks our military command to explain how we can guarantee the troop rotation in Srebrenica and how we can open the airstrip at Tuzla, including the use of air power. So there are clearly more opportunities for it.

Secondly, is there still a difference of opinion about whether and how quickly we should use air power especially to relieve a shelling of Sarajevo? I think on today's facts there are clearly some differences among the allies. And let me just mention one consideration. Those countries that have troops there are understandably concerned about the danger to their troops -- if we use air power are they more likely to be retaliated against? On the other hand, I think they're closer to being willing to use it than they were in August because a lot of them are very sensitive to the fact that their troops seem to be in more danger now than they were in August, and that their casualties are increasing.

So do I think we are closer to real unanimity than we were in August? I do. Would they all vote the same in a given fact situation? I don't know. That's why I think it depends largely on what the Bosnian Serbs do.

Q Given the fact that there is still some difference of opinion, doesn't this come close to failing your own test from your intervention, that why threaten if you're not going to have the will to --

MORE

- 4 -

THE PRESIDENT: But I believe, based on what several of them said to me privately -- I believe based on what several of them said to me privately, they are more prepared to deal with this than they were in August. That is, Secretary General Woerner and I both said, let us not put this language back in unless we mean it. Let us clearly understand that we must mean it if we put it in this time. And they voted unanimously to put it in. And afterward several of them came to me privately and said, of course, we have reservations about what happens to our troops, but we have reservations about what happens to our troops under the status quo, and we are prepared to go forward with this.

Q Concerning Bosnia, can we say today that you and President Mitterrand are on the same wave length; do you agree, no more bones of contention?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I've been a little surprised by the press reports that indicate to the contrary. I strongly supported President Mitterrand and Prime Minister Majors' amendment adding to Tuzla and Srebrenica to the resolution. I did not support substituting Tuzla and Srebrenica for the general commitment to use air power to relieve the siege of Sarajevo, for a very important reason. I think that it will be very hard for the U.N. mission to succeed -- that is, keep in mind what the U.N. mission is doing, by the way, folks. We have the longest airlift in history there. We are trying to enforce the embargo. We are trying to enforce the no-fly zone. In other words, we are trying to contain the combat and the loss and trying to keep open humanitarian aid, hoping that we can all do something to convince all three sides that they have a real interest in stopping killing each other and taking whatever agreement they can get now.

Now, I believe if Sarajevo is destroyed and cannot function as a center for all kinds of activities, it will be very difficult for the U.N. mission to succeed. The French and the British have troops on the ground there. They naturally have more reservation about the use of air power in response to the shelling of Sarajevo than nations that may not have troops on the ground there. I understand that. They agreed with my position and I strongly agreed with theirs. I do not believe there is a difference of opinion between us on this policy now.

Q The Ukrainian opposition is now saying that President Kravchuk does not have the authority to go ahead and sign an agreement, and there's also some sign from some Ukrainian officials who are saying that a final -- the terms of a final agreement are yet to be determined. How sure are you at this point that this deal will not fall apart?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I believe President Kravchuk will honor the deal. They've already started to dismantle the missiles. And I think that the other thing that's very important to emphasize here is that this agreement guarantees compensation for Ukraine for their highly enriched uranium, something they have wanted and demanded. And so I think, as the details of it become known in the Rada, there will be more support for it.

Let me just try to give you an American analogy here, if I might. It's not an exact analogy, but when President Bush signed the original NAFTA treaty -- or when I -- we approved the side agreements with NAFTA, we didn't know at the time whether everybody in Congress would think it was a wonderful idea or ratify it or try to derail it. But we went through with it and, eventually, the United States stood firm behind it. Executives often have to sell to their legislative branches what they know is in the national interest of their country.

This agreement, reached by President Kravchuk I think was reached with the full understanding in his mind that he would have to sell it, but that it contained advantages for

MORE

- 5 -

Ukraine far more than had previously been recognized. And I think as they know more about the details and the facts, that he will prevail there. And I expect the agreement to stand up. Because it's clearly in the interest of the country. They get far more than they give up on this.

Q Have you spoken with President Yeltsin about Bosnia and does he agree with what you describe as a new resolve to deal with it?

THE PRESIDENT: No, we have not had this discussion. But last August when all this came up, the Russians knew that what we were doing was taking a position with regard to the use of air power that was clearly tied to behavior by the Bosnian Serbs. And at the time, and I think still, no one considered that the United Nations mission could proceed and could function if Sarajevo were completely destroyed. No one believed that. So I don't believe that anything that happened today, once fully understood -- I'll be glad to -- I'm sure we'll have the chance to talk about it in some detail -- I don't believe that anything that happened today will undermine the understandings that we have with the Russians.

Thank you very much.

Q -- (inaudible.)

THE PRESIDENT: -- I don't want to say that. What I'm trying to tell you is, that that's why I said it was not an exact analogy. What I'm saying is that any time an executive makes a deal in any country in the world with a legislative branch, there are going to be people in the legislative branch who don't agree with it or who just don't know if they can agree with it until they know what the facts of it are. That's the only point I'm trying to make. I am not making any judgment about how the Ukrainian government works, but simply that this always happens. This shouldn't surprise anybody. This always happens. Every decision every executive makes is going to be second-guessed by people of the legislature. It's almost the way the system's set up.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

11:09 A.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Brussels, Belgium)

For Immediate Release

January 11, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN MEETING WITH AMERICAN BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Conrad Hotel
Brussels, Belgium

8:06 A.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Thank you, Jim, and good morning ladies and gentlemen. I got here in time to hear the last several moments of the Secretary of State's remarks and all that stuff where he was bragging on me, and it reminded me of Clinton's fourth law of politics, which is whenever possible, be preceded on the platform by someone you've appointed to an important position. (Laughter.)

Nonetheless, we did have a good day yesterday -- the United States did -- and I think the Atlantic Alliance did. I came here to Europe hoping that together we might begin to realize the full promise of the end of the Cold War -- recognizing clearly that this is a difficult economic time in Europe; there are still profound difficulties in the United States; and that is having an impact on the politics of Europe and of the United States and of what we might do.

Nonetheless, it seemed to me that the time had come to try to define, here on the verge of the 21st century, what the elements of a new security in Europe and in the United States should be in the aftermath of the Cold War -- one premised not on the division of Europe, but on the possibility of its integration, its political integration around democracies; its economic integration around market economics; and its defense integration around mutual defense cooperation.

Yesterday when the NATO Alliance adopted the concept of the Partnership For Peace, we did what I believe history will record as a very important thing. We opened up the possibility of expanded NATO membership to nations to our East, not only all the former Warsaw Pact countries, but also other non-NATO members in Europe, all who wish to begin to work on joint planning and operations with us and to work toward being able to assume the full responsibilities of membership. But we did it in a way by opening up the possibility to everyone and making no decisions now. We did it in a way that did not have the United States and NATO prematurely drawing another line in Europe to divide it in a different way, but instead gave us a chance to work for the best possible future for Europe -- one that includes not only the countries of Eastern Europe, but also countries that were part of the former Soviet Union and, indeed, Russia itself. So we have made, I think, a very good beginning in the right way.

We also are going to have today the first summit with the European Union after the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty to begin to talk about what we can do together to rebuild the rate of economic growth and opportunity here and throughout the world.

Our firms -- our American firms -- are deeply woven into the fabric of Europe's economies. Over 60 percent of all the overseas profits of American companies come from Europe. We have \$225 billion American dollars invested here, employing

MORE

- 2 -

nearly three million Western Europeans alone. And back home, trade with Europe generated \$120 billion worth of exports and about two and a half million jobs in 1993. We all know -- you know better than I -- that this continent favors -- excuse me -- faces high unemployment and very sluggish growth rates. We also see that in Japan. And even though in our country the unemployment rate is coming down, we see in every advanced economy great difficulty today in creating jobs and generating higher incomes even when people are working harder and working smarter.

The renewal of the Atlantic economies is critical to the future of America and, I would argue, critical to the future of our Alliance. For in a democracy, as we have seen time and time again in votes at home, in votes in Europe and in votes in Russia, when people feel that they are anchored and stable and secure, when they believe they will be rewarded for their work, when they believe that the future will be better than the past, they vote in a certain way. When they are in economic and emotional freefall, when they feel disoriented, when they don't know whether the future will be better than the past, they often vote in another way and in ways that, indeed, make their futures more difficult and life for all peoples more difficult.

When I became President, it seemed to me that my first order of business ought to be to put our own economic house in order. And so we worked hard to reverse the exploding deficits of the last 12 years, to begin to invest in our own people, to try to do it in a way that would keep interest rates low and inflation low and turn the tide of private investment in the United States. We have begun to do that. Last year more new jobs came into our economy than in the previous four years. Millions of Americans refinanced their homes and businesses. Consumer confidence at the end of the year rose to its highest level in many years, and people began to believe that they could pay their debts and control their lives. In November, delinquencies on home mortgage payments in America reached a 19-year low. So we are beginning to believe that we have some discipline, some control of our own destiny.

We also had to make a tough decision in America last year as a people. And that is whether we could grow internally or whether we could continue to grow by reaching out to compete and win in a global economy and helping our friends and neighbors to grow. That debate was, I suppose, captured more clearly for the people of our nation and the people of the world in the congressional debate over NAFTA than in any other thing.

But the issue was bigger and, in some ways, simpler than that. It seems to me clearly that there is no way in a global economy for a wealthy country to grow wealthier -- to generate more jobs and to raise incomes -- unless there are more customers for its goods and services, and customers beyond its own national borders; and that the United States can ill afford to be in the vanguard of those running away from that idea and, instead, should be in the vanguard of those promoting it. That's really what the NAFTA vote was all about.

To be sure, those who voted against NAFTA were responding to very legitimate pressures and very real fears. While workers all over the world believe now that they are too fungible, relatively unimportant to people who control their jobs and their lives; and that in the flash of an eye, their jobs and their livelihoods could be taken away by someone who could move money, information across the globe in a millisecond and, indeed, who could move management and technology across the globe in a short amount of time.

And so it is going to be a continuing challenge for us to keep Americans outward looking, committed to open trade and more open markets and still, at the same time, to make our working people more secure in the sense not that they will be

MORE

- 3 -

able to hold the job they have, because they won't -- the average American will now change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime -- but they must know that they are employable; that they will have their basic health care needs and the needs of their families taken care of; and that they will have a chance to make the changes that will dominate at least the foreseeable decades of the 21st century -- changes that are friendly, not hostile, to them. And that is our challenge as we begin the next session of Congress in 1994.

But because of the NAFTA agreement and because of the meeting that we had in Washington State with the leaders of the Asian-Pacific region, there was a new energy given to the prospect of successfully concluding the GATT Round. And after seven years of frustration and progress, we were able to do that. I was not fully satisfied with the Round. It was obviously not perfect from any nation's point of view, and there are clearly many things that still have to be done. But there is no doubt in my mind that it was in the interest of the United States to conclude the GATT Round successfully -- that it will lead to the creation of hundreds of thousands of jobs in our nation alone and millions worldwide by the end of the decade. (Applause.)

One person believed that. (Laughter.)

And I think now we have to ask ourselves where we go beyond GATT. There are several issues, of course, that we need to take up with our European friends and with others around the globe. And we will take them up.

We also have to deal with the structural challenges facing our economies, the economies of the advanced nations. In March we're going to have a jobs conference in the United States. We have a lot to learn from some European countries about training and retraining of the work force. They have something to learn, perhaps, from us in flexibility of the work force and mobility of the work force, and the creation of an entrepreneurial environment that will enable unemployment to be driven down to lower levels.

But it is clear that together, along with our friends in Japan, we all have to learn something about how to make technological and other changes that are going on, lead not only to higher productivity but the ability of working people to be rewarded for that productivity and the ability of nations to create more employment within their national borders.

Beyond that, let me emphasize that when I leave here today after the European Union Summit, I am going on to Prague to meet with the leaders of the Visegrad countries. And it seems to me that it is folly to believe that we can integrate Europe through NATO or just on the basis of affinity for democracies, unless we are also committed to the economic integration of all of Europe and to reaching out to our East.

I will be urging the leaders of the European Union today to work with the United States to further reduce trade barriers and increase trade and investment to our East. Today I say to all of you, I hope that you are representing companies that as a result of the activities taking place in these few days will take another and harder look about your prospects in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond, because without private investment, we cannot hope to have private economic development.

Oh, I know we have a lot to do in Russia. I know we have a lot to do in the other states of the former Soviet Union and still some work to do in Eastern Europe. And we are doing that. I am going onto Russia after I leave Prague. But in the end, private investment and the development of successful private sectors will determine the future of European integration economically. And without it, I don't believe we can hope to sustain the military and political ties that we are building up.

MORE

- 4 -

So I ask you to do that. The United States government has worked hard to eliminate outdated export controls and to support American companies in Europe. We hope that in turn you will feel embolden to make more investments further East and to do what you can to improve our prospects to generate higher levels of trade and investment across national borders in ways that benefit people everywhere. For in the end, governments do not create wealth, people like you do.

Soon, your efforts will be sending goods back and forth through the channel. Your capital already is building bonds of commerce and culture across the Atlantic. You are in many ways the pioneers of the new Europe we are trying to ensure. Just by instinct, you will want the kind of integration that we have to work for around the political conference tables. Your determination to enter new markets is a hallmark of the American spirit and can help make the 21st century an American century a well.

I hope you will do that. I assure you that we will work hard to do our part.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

8:20 A.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Brussels, Belgium)

For Immediate Release

January 9, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO MULTINATIONAL AUDIENCE OF FUTURE LEADERS OF EUROPE

Gothic Room
Hotel De Ville
Brussels, Belgium

6:00 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Mayor, distinguished leaders. I'm delighted to be here with the Prime Minister and with many of Europe's future leaders in this great hall of history.

I first came to Brussels as a young man in a very different, but a difficult time, when the future for us was uncertain. It is fitting that my first trip to Europe as President be about building a better future for the young people of Europe and the United States today, and that it begin here in Belgium. As a great capital and as the headquarters of NATO and the European Union, Brussels and Belgium have long been at the center of Europe's steady progress toward greater security and greater prosperity.

For those of you who know anything about me personally, I also have a great personal debt of nearly 40 years standing to this country because it was a Belgian, Adolf Sax, who invented the saxophone. (Laughter.)

I have come here at this time because I believe that it is time for us together to revitalize our partnership and to define a new security at a time of historic change. It is a new day for our transatlantic partnership: The Cold War is over; Germany is united; the Soviet Union is gone; and a constitutional democracy governs Russia. The specter that haunted our citizens for decades of tanks rolling in through Fulda Gap or nuclear annihilation raining from the sky -- that specter, thank God, has largely vanished. Your generation is the beneficiary of those miraculous transformations.

In the end, the Iron Curtain rusted from within, and was brought crashing down by the determination of brave men and women to live free -- by the Poles and the Czechs; by the Russians, the Ukrainians; the people of the Baltics. By all those who understood that neither economics nor consciences can be ordered from above.

Equally important, however, their heroic efforts succeeded because our resolve never failed, because the weapons of deterrence never disappeared and the message of democracy never disappeared.

As the East enjoys a new birth of freedom, one of freedom's great victories lives here in Europe's West -- the peaceful cleaving together of nations which clashed for centuries. The transformation was wrought by visionary leaders such as Monnet, Schumann, Spaak, and Marshall, who understood that modern nations can enrich their futures more through cooperation than conquest.

My administration supports European union, and Europe's development of stronger institutions of common purpose

MORE

- 2 -

and common action. We recognize we will benefit more from a strong and equal partner than from a weak one.

The fall of the Soviet empire and Western Europe's integration are the two greatest advances for peace in the last half of the 20th century. All of us are reaping their blessings. In particular, with the Cold War over and in spite of the present global recession which clouds your future, all our nations now have the opportunity to take long, deferred steps toward economic and social renewal. My own nation has made a beginning in putting our economic house in order, reducing our deficits, investing in our people, creating jobs and sparking an economic recovery that we hope will help not only the United States, but also will lift all nations.

We're also facing up to some of the social problems in our country we have ignored for too long: From the challenge to provide universal health care, to reducing crime in our streets, to dealing with the needs of our poor children. We have a truly multicultural society. In one of our counties there are people from over 150 different national and ethnic groups. But we are working to build an American community for the 21st century.

And with the European Union, we have recently led the world to a new GATT agreement that will create millions of new jobs in all our countries. In many ways it would be easy to offer you only a message of simple celebration, to trumpet our common heritage, to rejoice that our labors for peace have been rewarded, to cheer on the economic progress that is occurring. But this is not a time for self-congratulation. And certainly we have enough challenges that we should act true partners -- that is, we should share one another's burdens rather than only talking of triumphs. And we should speak honestly about what we feel about where we are and where we should go.

This is the truth as I see it. We served history well during the Cold War. But now history calls on us again to help consolidate freedom's new gains into a larger and a more lasting peace. We must build a new security for Europe, the old security was based on the defense of our bloc against another bloc. The new security must be found in Europe's integration -- an integration of security forces, of market economies of national democracies. The purpose of my trip to Europe is to help lead the movement to that integration and to assure you that America will be a strong partner in it.

For the peoples who broke communism's chains, we now see a race between rejuvenation and despair. And the outcome will -- bound to shape the security of every nation in the transatlantic alliance. Today that race is being played out from the Balkans to Central Asia. In one lane are the heirs of the enlightenment, who seek to consolidate freedom's gains by building free economies, open democracies and tolerant civic cultures. Pitted against them are the grim pretenders to tyranny's dark throne -- the militant nationalists and demagogues who fan suspicions that are ancient, and parade the pain of renewal in order to obscure the promise of reform.

We, none of us, can afford to be bystanders of that race. Too much is at stake. Consider this: The coming months and years may decide whether the Russian people continue to develop a peaceful market democracy or whether, in frustration, they elect leaders who incline back toward authoritarianism and empire. This period may determine whether the nations neighboring Russia thrive in freedom and join the ranks of nonnuclear states or founder under the strain of reform and cling to weapons that increase the risk of nuclear accident or diversion.

This period may decide whether the states of the former Soviet bloc are woven into the fabric of transatlantic

MORE

- 3 -

prosperity and security, or are simply left hanging in isolation as they face the same daunting changes gripping so many others in Europe.

These pivotal decisions ultimately rest with the people who threw off communism's yoke. They must make their own decisions about their own future. But we in the West can clearly help to shape their choices, and we must summon the political will to do so.

The task requires a steady and patient effort, guided by a strategic star that points us toward the integration of a broader Europe. It also requires a fair amount of humility -- understanding that we cannot control every event in every country on every day. But if we are willing to assume the central challenge, we can revitalize not only the nations of the East, but also our own transatlantic relationship.

Over the past half-century, the transatlantic community only realized half the promise of World War II's triumph over fascism. The other half lay captive behind Europe's walls of division. Now we have the chance to realize the full promise of Europe's victories without its great disappointment: Normandy without Yalta, the liberation of the low countries without the Berlin blockade.

During this past half-century, transatlantic security depended primarily on the deterrents provided by our military forces. Now the immediate threat to our East is not of advancing armies, but of creeping instability. Countering that threat requires not only military security, but also the promotion of democratic and economic renewal. Combined, these forces are the strongest bulwark against Europe's current dangers -- against ethnic conflict, the abuse of human rights, the destabilizing refugee flows, the rise of aggressive regimes and the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

The integration of the former communist bloc with the rest of Europe will be gradual and often difficult, as Germany's bold efforts demonstrate. And like all great opportunities, we must remember that this one could be fleeting. We must not now let the Iron Curtain be replaced with a veil of indifference. For history will judge us as it judged with scorn those who preached isolationism between the world wars, and as it has judged with praise the bold architects of the transatlantic community after World War II.

With the Cold War over, some in America with short memories have called for us to pack up and go home. I am asked often: Why do you maintain a presence in Europe? How can you justify the expense when we have so many problems here at home? We tried that, right after World War I. But the American people this year proved their resistance to the siren song of global withdrawal. We did so when the Congress voted for the North American Free Trade Agreement, voted for America to compete in a global economy, not to retreat. And we did so when we reached out to Europe and to others, and in working with the European Union, led the world to accept a new GATT agreement on world trade.

I have come here today to declare and to demonstrate that Europe remains central to the interests of the United States, and that we will help to work with our partners in seizing the opportunities before us all.

Without question, Europe is not the only focus of our engagement, we must reach out to Latin America and to Asia -- areas that are increasingly important both to the United States and to Europe. And our bonds with Europe will be different than they were in the past, but make no mistake about it: the bonds that tie the United States and Europe are unique. We share a passionate faith that God has endowed us as individuals with

MORE

- 4 -

inalienable rights and a belief that the state exists by our consent solely to advance freedom and security and prosperity for all of us as individuals. That is still a radical idea in the world in which we live. Developed by Locke and Montesquieu, put into practice in my country by Jefferson and Madison, it has toppled tyrants, it has drawn millions to our country's shores.

Over three centuries, the ties of kinship between the United States and Europe have fostered bonds of commerce and you remain our most valued partner, not just in the cause of democracy and freedom, but also in the economics of trade and investment.

But above all, the core of our security remains with Europe. That is why America's commitment to Europe's safety and stability remains as strong as ever. That is why I urged NATO to convene this week's summit. It is why I am committed to keeping roughly 100,000 American troops stationed in Europe, consistent with the expressed desires of our allies here. It is not habit, but security and partnership that justifies this continuing commitment by the United States.

And just as we have worked in partnership with Europe of every major security challenge in this century, it is now time for us to join in building the new security for the 21st century, the century in which most of you in this room will live most of your lives. The new security must seek to bind a broader Europe together with a strong fabric woven of military cooperation, prosperous market economies and vital democracies.

Let me speak briefly about each of these. The first and most important element of the security must be military strength and cooperation. The Cold War is over, but war itself is not over. As we know it rages today not only in distant lands but right here in Europe and the former Yugoslavia. That murderous conflict reminds us that even after the Cold War, military forces remain relevant. It also reveals the difficulties of applying military force to conflicts within as well as among states. And it teaches us that it is best to act early to prevent conflicts that we may later not be able to control.

As we work to resolve that tragedy and ease the suffering of its victims we also need to change our security institutions so they can better address such conflicts and advance Europe's integration. Many institutions will play a role, including the European Union, the Western European Union, the Council of Europe, the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations. But NATO, history's greatest military alliance, must be central to that process.

Only NATO has the military forces, the integrated command, the broad legitimacy and the habits of cooperation that are essential to draw in new participants and respond to new challenges. One of the deepest transformations within the transatlantic community over the past half-century occurred because the armed forces of our respected nations trained, studied and marched through their careers together. It is not only the compatibility of our weapons, but the camaraderie of our warriors that provide the sinews behind our mutual security guarantees and our best hope for peace.

Two years ago our nations began to adapt NATO to this new era by creating the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. It includes all the state of the former Soviet bloc, as well as the 16 of NATO. Now it is time to move beyond that dialogue and create an operating partnership. That is why I have proposed that we create the Partnership For Peace.

This partnership will advance a process of evolution for NATO's formal enlargement. It looks to the day when NATO

MORE

- 5 -

will take on new members who assume the Alliance's full responsibilities. It will create a framework in which former communist states and others not now members of NATO can participate with NATO members in joint military planning, training, exercises and other efforts. This partnership will build new bonds of cooperation among the militaries of the East and the West. It will reinforce the development of democracies and democratic practices, such as respect for human rights and civilian control over military forces. It can give NATO new tools for responding to ethnic instability and other dangers of our era.

The use of NATO forces in such missions will always be considered and must be on a case-by-case basis. But tomorrow's summit will put us in a stronger position to make those decisions, and to make them early and wisely.

The Partnership For Peace will not alter NATO's fundamental mission of defending NATO territory from attack. We cannot afford to abandon that mission while the dream of empire still burns in the minds of some who look longingly toward a brutal past. But neither can we afford to draw a new line between East and West that could create a self-fulfilling prophecy of future confrontation.

This partnership opens the door to cooperation with all of NATO's former adversaries, including Russia, Ukraine and the other newly-independent states, based on a belief that freedom's boundaries must now be defined by new behavior, not old history.

I say to all those in Europe and the United States who would simply have us draw a new line in Europe further east that we should not foreclose the possibility of the best possible future for Europe which is a democracy everywhere, a market economy everywhere, people cooperating everywhere for mutual security. We can guard against a lesser future, but we should strive for the best future for you and your generation.

NATO can also help to meet Europe's new security challenges by doing more to counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. I tell you, frankly, it is one of our most difficult and challenging tasks. Countering those weapons and the missiles that deliver them will require close cooperation, honesty and discipline, and a willingness of some not now willing to do it to forego immediate financial gain.

The danger is clear and present. Growing missile capabilities are bringing more of Europe into the range of rogue states such as Iran and Libya. There are disturbing reports of efforts to smuggle nuclear materials into and out of Eastern Europe. And this eastward-looking summit will give us the chance to begin to address the threat on our own territory.

The second element of the new security we are building must be greater economic vitality, the issue which I would imagine is of most immediate concern to most of you. We must build it on vibrant and open market economies, the engines that have given us the greatest prosperity in human history over the last several decades in Europe and in the United States.

Our combined success in leading the world to a new GATT agreement capped seven years of effort to expand prosperity to all trading nations. Now we must define a successor agenda to GATT that focuses on the renewal of advanced economies and the enlargement of prosperities to the nations of our east that are making the difficult transitions to market economics.

First, the renewal of our own economies is critical. Unless we are creating jobs and unless we are raising incomes in Europe and in the United States and Japan, in the advanced economies, the people of

- 6 -

those nations, all our nations, to continue support of policy of involvement with the rest of the world.

The nations of the European Union face particular severe economic challenges with nearly 20 million people unemployed and, in Germany's case, the extraordinarily high costs of unification. All our nations have had to struggle against the restless forces of this new global economy, against the competition that comes from countries with lower wages or that is generated when technology enables us to do more with fewer workers, but there is not new technology to provide new jobs for those who are displaced. This is problem not just for Europe, but also for the United States, and now for Japan as well.

Among the Atlantic nations, economic stagnation has clearly eroded public support in finances for outward-looking foreign policies and for greater integration. Our respective effort to revive our own economies are, therefore, important not only for our own living standards, but also for our collective strength. And both of them will shape the future you and your children will have.

We must proceed quickly to implement the GATT agreement. But we also must learn together and from each other on making a broader and bolder series of adjustments to this new global economy.

We Americans have a lot to learn from Europe in matters of job training and apprenticeship, of moving our people from school to work and to good paying jobs with the capacity to continue to learn new skills as the economy forces them to do so. But we also may have something to teach in the area of the flexibility of our job structure and our capacity to generate work and new employment opportunities. This is an area in which we can usefully draw lessons from each other. And that is why I am pleased that in March our leading ministers will hold a jobs conference that I proposed last July. We simply must figure out how to create more jobs and how to reward people who work both harder and smarter in the workplace. It is the basis of all the other attitudes that we want to foster to remain engaged with one another and with the rest of the world.

But as we work to strengthen our own economies, we must know that we serve our own prosperity and our security by helping the new market economies of Europe's eastern half to thrive. Successful market reforms in those states will help to deflate the region's demagogues. It will help to ease ethnic tensions. It will help new democracies to take root. It is also in your long-term interest because one of the things that we have learned is that wealthy nations cannot grow richer unless they have customers beyond their borders for their goods and their services.

So the short-term difficulties of taking Eastern Europe into our economic alliance will be more than rewarded if they succeed and if they are customers for Western Europe's goods and services tomorrow. That is why early on in our administration we committed to increase support substantially for market reforms in the new states of the former Soviet Union, and why we have continued our support for economic transition in Central and Eastern Europe.

Ultimately, the success of market reforms to the East will depend more on trade than aid. None of us have enough money to markedly change the future of those countries as they move to free market systems in the government coffers. We cannot give them enough aid to make them full partners. They must grow and trade their way into full partnership with us.

One of our priorities, therefore, should be to reduce trade barriers to the former communist states. It will make little sense for us to applaud their market reforms on the

MORE

- 7 -

one hand while offering only selective access to our markets on the other. That's like inviting someone to a castle and refusing to let down the drawbridge. The United States has already eliminated many of our Cold War barriers to products from these countries. And all our nations must find more ways to do the same thing. The economic success of these states simply cannot be separated from our own renewal and security.

In 1931, a remarkable British political cartoon portrayed the United States and Europe in a rowboat. At the back end of the boat, where Europe's more Eastern powers sat, there was a terrible leak and it was sinking fast. The front end, where the United States and Western Europe were, was still afloat; the boat was sinking from the back end. And one of the figures in our end of the boat was saying, "Thank goodness, the leak's not at our end of the boat." In the end, the whole boat sank. That will happen again unless we work together. Europe's western half clearly, as history shows, cannot long be secure if the eastern half remains in turmoil.

The third and final imperative of this new security is to support the growth of democracy and individual freedoms that has begun throughout Europe's former communist states. The success of these democratic reforms make us all more secure because democracies tend not to wage war on one another, and they tend not to break their word to one another. Democratic governments nurture civil society, respect for human rights and habits of simple tolerance. The democratic values at the heart of the Western community are also our best answer to the aggressive nationalism and ethnic hatreds unleashed by the end of the Cold War.

We in the transatlantic community must commit ourselves to helping democracy succeed in all the former communist states that are Western Europe's immediate neighbors, because their security matters to our security. Nowhere is democracy's success more important to us all than there and then in Russia. I will say again, in Russia, if the nation continues to evolve as a market democracy, satisfied within her borders and at peace with her neighbors, defining her greatness in terms of the ability to enable all of the children of Russia to live to the fullest of their potential, then our role toward Europe's full integration will be wider and smoother and safer. As one Ukrainian legislator recently stated, if Russia is democratic, Europe will be calm.

The results of the recent elections in Russia and the statements of some Russian political figures have given us all genuine cause for concern. We must consistently condemn expressions of intolerance and threats of aggression. But we should also keep those concerns in some historical perspective. It was only two years ago, after all, that the Soviet Union dissolved. Just two months ago, Russia appeared to be on the brink of a civil war. But since then Russia has held a free and fair national election, its people have ratified a genuinely democratic constitution, and they have elected their first-ever post-Soviet legislature. And the government continues to pursue democratic and economic reform.

The transformation Russia is undertaking is absolutely staggering. If you just think about what the country has been like since 1917; if you go back to the 18th century and imagine the history of the nation from that point to this; the idea that the nation could seriously be involved by democratic vote in undertaking these transformations is absolutely staggering. We cannot expect them to correct overnight three-quarters of a century of repressive leadership, three-quarters of a century of totalitarian policy, or a whole national history in which there was no democracy.

As in the other communist nations, this will be the work of generations. We in the United States have been at it for

- 9 -

200 years now and we're still working to try to get it right. All of us have to recognize that there will be wrong turns and even reversals, as there have been in all of our own countries throughout our histories. But as long as these states continue their progress toward democracy and respect the rights of their own and other people, that they understand the rights of their minorities and their neighbors, then we should support their progress with a steady patience.

In order to support these new democracies, we are supporting grass-roots efforts to build the institutions of civil society, from community organizers in the Czech Republic to election volunteers in Bulgaria. We also will take steps to encourage cooperation among the new democracies. As with Western Europe after World War II, we must get regional neighbors working together rather than looking at each other with suspicion.

The broader integration in peace we are building is not only a European concern -- I say again, it is distinctly in the interests of the United States. My nation has thrilled at the progress of freedom on this continent over the past five years. And we understand well the toll that European discord ultimately takes on our own people.

Only a few hours of this place lie the graves of thousands of Americans who died in Europe's two great wars. History records where they fell -- at Flanders Field, on the shores of Normandy, and in the Battle of the Bulge. But let us remember as well why they came here; why they left the safety of their homes to fight in a distant land. They came because our security depends more on things that go far beyond geographical divides. Our security depends on more than the ocean that divides us. It depends on the existence of a strong and free and democratic Europe.

Today we can honor the sacrifice of those Americans buried here on your soil by expanding the reach of the freedoms they fought and gave their lives to preserve. The fight for your generation across a broader Europe will be joined and won not on this continent's beaches or across its plains, but rather in its new parliaments and city councils; in the offices and factories of its new market economies; in the hearts and minds of the young people like many of you here. You have the most to gain from a Europe that is integrated in terms of security, in terms of economics, in terms of democracies.

Ultimately, you will have to decide what sort of Europe you want and how hard you are willing to work for it. But I want you to know that the United States stands by you in that battle, as we have in the other battles of the 20th century.

I believe that our freedom is indivisible. I believe our destinies are joined. I believe that the 21st century can be the most exciting period that Europe and the United States have ever known, and that your future can be the richest and brightest of any generation. But we will have to work to make it so. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

6:32 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Brussels, Belgium)

For Immediate Release

January 10, 1994

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT

The Conrad Hotel
Brussels, Belgium

6:42 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, I came to Europe to help strengthen European integration, to create a new security for the United States and its Atlantic partners, based on the idea that we have a real chance to integrate rather than to divide Europe, both East and West; an integration based on shared democracies, market economies, and defense cooperation.

Today we have taken two giant steps toward greater security for the United States, for Europe and the world. First, this afternoon I joined our NATO allies in signing the documents that create the Partnership For Peace. The United States proposed this Partnership to lay the foundation for intensive cooperation among the armed forces of our NATO members, all former Warsaw Pact states, and other non-NATO European states who wish to join the Partnership.

By providing for the practical integration and cooperation of these diverse military forces, the Partnership For Peace will lead to the enlargement of NATO membership and will support our efforts to integrate Europe.

I'm also pleased to announce that on Friday the United States will sign with Ukraine and Russia an agreement which commits Ukraine to eliminate nuclear weapons from its territory. These include 176 intercontinental ballistic missiles and some 1,500 warheads targeted at the United States. This is a hopeful and historic breakthrough that enhances the security of all three parties and every other nation as well.

When I came into office, I said that one of my highest priorities was combating the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The issue of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union was the most important nonproliferation challenge facing the world. With the Soviet Union dissolved, four countries were left with nuclear weapons: Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus. I have sought to ensure that the break-up of the Soviet Union does not result in the birth of new nuclear states which could raise the chances for nuclear accident, nuclear terrorism or nuclear proliferation.

In just one year, after an intensive diplomatic effort by the United States, both Kazakhstan and Belarus agreed to accede to the nuclear nonproliferation treaty and to join the ranks of nonnuclear nations. Much credit for these actions goes to President Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan -- whom I will be welcoming to Washington in February -- and Chairman Shushkevich of Belarus, whom I will meet in Minsk later this week, as well as to the people and parliaments of those two countries.

My administration has been working with the governments of Ukraine and Russia to address Ukraine's security concerns so that it could follow suit. The trilateral accord we will sign will lead to the complete removal of nuclear weapons from Ukraine.

MORE

- 2 -

I want to congratulate both President Yeltsin and President Kravchuk of Ukraine for their statesmanship in negotiating this accord with us. I want to commend President Kravchuk and to thank him for his leadership. I look forward to consulting with him personally during the brief stop at Borispol Airport in Kiev on Wednesday evening. President Kravchuk will later join President Yeltsin and me in Moscow on Friday to finalize the agreement in a trilateral meeting.

This agreement opens a new era in our relationship with Ukraine, an important country at the center of Europe -- a country, I might add, which was mentioned frequently during our meetings today. We expect to expand our cooperation with Ukraine especially in the economic area. We look forward to Ukraine's playing an important role in efforts to move toward the integration of a broader Europe.

Today, I spent the day at NATO Headquarters, one of the pillars of our security in the post-World War II era. Throughout that era, our security was defined by the stability of Europe's division. But with the two breakthroughs for peace announced today, we can begin to imagine as well as to define a new security for the post-Cold War era founded not on Europe's division, but instead on its integration.

Throughout the 20th century, now drawing to a close, Europe has seen far too much bloodshed based on these divisions. But with strong democracies, strong market economies, strong bonds of defense cooperation and this strong step to combat nuclear weapons proliferation, we can make the next century far more secure for all of our people by building a united Europe.

Q Mr. President, there is some who have suggested that even this Partnership For Peace is going to be too much of an exacerbation to the nationalist tendencies in Russia. And today Mr. Zhirinovsky said that if NATO troops are ever stationed near the borders of Russia, it's a mistake, it's finished for NATO and/or other forces who have supported this organization; it's the beginning of a third world war if the NATO or other forces are along those borders. How do you respond to that and to the concerns that there are people in Russia who will not even take this step kindly?

THE PRESIDENT: My response to that is his, thank goodness, is not the governing voice in Russia, and that we have offered to the Russians, to all the states of the former Soviet Union and to all the Eastern European countries which were in the Warsaw Pact the opportunity to participate in this Partnership For Peace.

The reason I wanted the Partnership For Peace rather than nothing, which perhaps Mr. Zhirinovsky would have preferred, or immediate membership, which others would have preferred, is that I thought it gave us the best chance, first, to develop substantive military and defense cooperation for these countries; second, to give nations who wish to be members -- full members of NATO the chance to develop the capacity to assume their responsibilities; and third, to give us the chance, most importantly of all, to create a Europe that really is integrated, that is based on unity and not some dividing line that at least is further east than the Cold War dividing line was.

So I simply -- I disagree with the position that he's taken, but that is not the position that govern Russia, thank goodness.

Q Do you think, just to follow, that Russia would be joining the Partnership For Peace?

THE PRESIDENT: They are certainly welcome to do so. We've issued --

- 3 -

Q Could that happen in the next few days?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that all the nations to whom the welcome mat has been put out may want to take some -- some may want to take more time than others to think about it. But we certainly expect to have some sort of continuing defense cooperation with Russia, and they are certainly welcome to be a part of this.

Q On the subject of Bosnia, earlier today you said that NATO would be reasserting its warning against the strangulation of Sarajevo. You said if we're going to reassert this warning, it cannot be seen as mere rhetoric. Yet, NATO has done nothing in Bosnia really. What changed today after your meeting?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me point out, NATO has done everything that the United Nations has asked it to do. NATO -- with our allies, we have conducted the longest airlift in history to bring supplies to the people of Bosnia. We have supported working with our allies' operations in the Adriatic and other operations designed to support the embargo. We have supported the no-fly zone. We have done everything the United Nations has asked us to do.

What we are going to discuss tonight in greater detail -- let me say, I don't want to say any -- I'll be glad to talk about my comment today, but I do want to tell you we're going to have more discussions about this tonight at dinner.

The point I was trying to make today that Secretary General Woerner also wanted to make was that if we were going to restate, in effect, the warning we adopted in August that if Sarajevo were subject to undue and continued shelling in a way that threatened it significantly -- and there was more shelling today -- that we would consider having air strikes, that we had to be prepared to do that. And I can tell you that on behalf of the United States that if the facts warrant that we would certainly ask the North Atlantic Council to take it up. That is, we would ask all of our allies and NATO to consider an appropriate response. Now, there's still the U.N. to deal with and other things, but we believe we can -- we should go forward.

The question of what we can do to get a peace in Bosnia, however, I want to caution you, goes far beyond that. That is, it depends upon the willingness of all the parties to agree to a reasonable settlement; and what may be appropriate in dealing with relieving the siege of Sarajevo may or may not actually hasten an end to the war.

So we'll be discussing that in greater detail.

Q You're not ready for the air strikes yet, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say, what I want to do at this meeting -- this meeting is not about air strikes. This meeting is about whether we're going to reaffirm our position. I can just tell you that the United States would be prepared to ask the North Atlantic Council to consider that if the siege of Sarajevo continues and the facts warrant it.

Q You made one of the toughest statements you ever have made for an international group. What was the response of the allies? I mean, how did they take it? Did they say they would go along?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're going to talk about it tonight. Some did, some have not commented yet. But let me say today the most important thing and the thing we talked about today was our agreement on the strategy for reaching out to the

MORE

- 4 -

East. Over the long run, that will have a greater significance, in my judgement, for the future of Europe than whatever is or is not done with the tragedy in Bosnia at this late date. So we spent most of our time today fleshing out, dealing with, working through this whole concept of the Partnership For Peace. And I was, frankly, very gratified that so many of the leaders of the other countries believe that it is the right way to go and understand it's not just a compromise, but it's a vibrant concept that gives us a chance to build the best possible future for Europe. That to me was the best thing we were doing.

Q Mr. President, what assurances do you have from President Kravchuk that he can sell this arms deal to his Parliament this time? There have been difficulties in the past. And what are the costs, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say, first of all, that -- let me deal with the cost first. As you all know -- and then I'll get to the other point -- you all know how the Nunn-Lugar funds work. The only cost to the United States taxpayers in this agreement will be the continuation of the Nunn-Lugar program; that is the funds that we provide to help people dismantle their nuclear weapons. What does Ukraine get out of this? They get security assurances that go with this sort of agreement. That is, once you become a nonnuclear state, the states that have nuclear weapons promise not to use them against them ever under any circumstances. They get various kinds of technical assistance to carry out this. And they get paid for their highly enriched uranium; they are compensated. That is a commercial transaction involving no cost to the American taxpayer. So there is no cost.

In terms of the assurances, let me say that President Kravchuk has continued to work on -- progress on previous agreements he has made. He has shown, I think, great courage in the last few months in working through this very difficult and complex set of negotiations with us that has involved me, the Vice President, the State Department and everybody else that's appropriate on our side. And we have no reason to doubt the ability of the President to keep the commitment that he is prepared to make.

Q Mr. President, now that you have a deal with Ukraine, what can we anticipate Sunday when you meet with Syrian President Assad? Will there be some sort of dramatic announcement there, as well?

THE PRESIDENT: I've already got -- we've already bunched too many stories in one day, haven't we? (Laughter.) I really can't -- I can't say anymore at this point than you already know about that. We're going to try to keep the Middle East peace process going.

Thank you very much.

END

6:56 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Moscow, Russia)

For Immediate Release

January 14, 1994

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN LIVE TELECAST TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Ostankino TV Station
Moscow, Russia

3:30 P.M. (L)

MR. NIKOLAIOVICH: Ladies and gentlemen, several years ago, the United States and the Soviet Union got a wonderful opportunity to lose the Cold War. And they did that with courage in a noble way and with dignity, thereby opening up a new path for human development. And the very difficult burden of reconstructing the world, this problem stands before us now, is to a great extent on the shoulders of two leaders of two states, on the United States and of Russia -- and, of course, the leaders of the rest of the world.

It is in this context that the Russian people view this serious and historic visit of the President of the United States of America to Russia. And I'm glad for the opportunity to welcome the President to our studio. The President of the United States of America. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Alexander Nikolaiovich, for that introduction, for your lifetime of accomplishment and your support for free speech and for reform.

I am deeply honored to be here today at this station, which has become for all the world a beacon of information and truth. Attacked three months ago by opponents of reform, Ostankino stands as a symbol of the power of free expression and of the brave sacrifices the Russian people have been making to build a great and free future.

I'm so glad there are many young people here and I hope there are many, many more watching us on television, because it is the future of the youth of Russia that I wish to speak about. Once every generation or two all great nations must stop and think about where they are in time. They must regenerate themselves. They must imagine their future in a new way. Your generation has come of age at one of those moments.

Yesterday I walked through Moscow. I stopped at a bakery and bought some bread. I went into another shop and talked to the people there. I talked with an awful lot of people on the street. I went to Kazan Cathedral and lit a candle in memory of my mother. It is a cathedral which, like Russia itself, has been built anew on old foundations.

Over the centuries the Russian people have shown their greatness in many ways, in the arts and literature, on the battlefield, in the university and in space. Though the communist system suppressed human rights and human initiative and repressed your neighbors and brought the world the Cold War, still the greatness of the Russian people shown through.

Now on the brink of the 21st century, your nation is being called upon once again to redefine its greatness in terms that are appropriate to the present day and to the future, in ways that will enable your nation to be strong and free and prosperous and at peace.

We live in a curious time. Modern revolutions are changing life for the better all over the world. Revolutions and information and communications and technology and production, all these things make democracy more likely. They make isolated, state-controlled economies even more dysfunctional. They make opportunities for those able to seize them more numerous and richer than ever before. And yet even in this modern world, the oldest of humanity's demons still plague us: the hatreds of people for one another based solely on their religion or their race, or their ethnic backgrounds, or sometimes simply on the piece of ground they happen to have been born upon.

In the midst of these conflicts between the faces and forces of tomorrow and the forces of yesterday, I believe that the greatness of nations in the 21st century will be defined not by whether they can dictate to millions and millions of people within and beyond their borders, but instead by whether they can provide their citizens, without regard to their race or their gender, the opportunity to live up to the fullest of their ability, to take full advantage of the incredible things that are in the world of today and tomorrow.

Therefore, if we are to realize the greatness of Russia in the 21st century, I believe your nation must be strong democratically and economically. And in this increasingly interconnected world, you must be able to get along together and to get along with and trade with your neighbors close at hand and all around the globe. To do that, I think we will have to write an entirely new future for all of Europe -- a future in which security is based not on old divisions, but on a new integration of nations by means of their shared commitment to democracy, to open economies, and to peaceful military cooperation.

I come here as a friend and supporter of the democratic changes going on in this nation. I hope that my nation and I can make a positive contribution in the spirit of genuine and equal partnership, not simply to these large changes, but a positive contribution to the everyday lives of ordinary citizens of this great nation.

In the end, you will have to decide your own future. I do not presume to do that. Your future is still yours to make, yours to write, yours to shape. But I do come to say that my nation and its President want very much to be your equal partners and genuine friends.

If I were in your place listening to this speech, I might ask myself: Why is this guy saying this? What is on his mind? Why is he really eager to work with us? First of all, I identify with and even sympathize with the difficulty of the changes you face. I ran for President of the United States in 1992 because I was convinced that my nation had to make some very hard changes and some tough changes in order to keep the dream that had inspired Americans for 200 years alive; in order to keep the hopes of our working people alive in a fierce and difficult and ever-changing new global economy. So I understand that.

I have devoted myself at home to making those changes, and I know the changes are difficult, even in an environment in which they are easier than the ones you face. So I come here in genuine sympathy and understanding.

Secondly, I am interested in supporting these changes because my nation stood for so long against a communist system, against its lack of freedom, against its excessive dictates, against its imperial impulses, and I could not bear to think that a majority of your people would ever be sorry to have given it up.

I come here because I believe that, together, we can write a new future for Europe and help the entire world to have a

more peaceful and prosperous future. And, frankly, I come here because I believe your success is clearly in the best interests of the United States and of ordinary American citizens. For it is in our interest to be able to spend less on defense and to invest more in our own people, in the education and health and welfare and technology that will help to carry us into a better time in the 21st century.

It is in our interest to curb the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to cooperate with you in reducing threats to peace all around the world. It is in our interest to develop new trade ties and new customers. And each of these developments is more likely if we have a genuine, equal partnership with a strong and free Russia. (Applause.)

I believe how you define your future will be determined in large measure by how you decide to respond as a people to the three great challenges facing you. First, will you continue to work for a genuine market economy, or will you slow down or turn back? Second, will you continue to strengthen and deepen your commitment to democracy, or will you allow it to be restricted? And third, how will you define your role in the world as a great power? Will you define it in yesterday's terms or tomorrow's?

Let me begin with a challenge that clearly most affects the daily lives of the people of this nation -- the economic one. I know that your transition to a market economy has been hard, painful, even emotionally disorienting to millions of people. But if the change seems costly, consider the price of standing still or trying to go back. A rigid, state-run economy simply does not work in the modern world.

To be sure, the system you had produced a very literate society, made some of you the best educated people in the world; developed a high-tech base and developed a strong industrial base tied quite closely to her military might. But it is inadequate to a dramatically changing, highly competitive, increasingly flexible global economy in which all decisions simply cannot be made by a handful of people from the top down and in which no country is immune from the forces without.

The old system failed before. That is why you are in the present period of transition. If you attempted to reimpose it, it would fail you again. Let me make it clear that I do not suggest that markets solve all problems. They clearly do not solve all of society's problems. And indeed, they create some problems for every society -- problems which must be frankly and forthrightly addressed by people who propose to have a strong community of common interest and common concern within their nation.

Yet it is clear that the surest way to prosperity in the world in which we live is the ability of people to produce and to sell high-quality goods and services both within and beyond their borders. There is no other clear path to prosperity.

Russia clearly has the capacity to do well in this kind of economy. You have enormous technological prowess, a highly educated citizenry that is known and respected around the world. You have immensely valuable natural resources. It is clear that you have the capacity to do well. You have a rapidly growing private sector. Already your nation has privatized nearly one-third of its industry. About 600 businesses a month are privatizing. Tens of millions of your people now own private property and are gaining daily experience in market economies. But there remain serious problems -- the most profound, of course, is high rates of inflation.

Inflation at high rates destroys wages. It makes people feel that they can't keep up and that no matter how hard

they work, they will not be rewarded for their labor. It hurts the ordinary working people, the very people that are the backbone of any society who have to believe that the future can be better than the present. It undermines that very belief and makes it so difficult to develop and maintain a majority for the changes and the short-term sacrifices that have to be made. So inflation must be tamed. And as everyone knows, that also has its price, for inflation can only be tamed if the government is willing to print less money and therefore to spend less.

The next problem you have, it seems to me as an outside observer, is that even though you have a lot of privatization of companies, the systems on which every private economy depends are not as well-developed as they ought to be. There are not enough laws which clarify and protect contracts, which makes tax systems clear, which provide, in other words, the framework within which all different kinds of transactions can occur. But that can be rather easily corrected.

There are other problems. I might just mention one other that President Yeltsin has talked about quite a lot lately and that has received a lot of attention all around the world since the last election here in Russia, and that is that your country must develop some sort of social safety net as all other successful market economies have to deal with the fact that some people are always going to have difficulties in a rapidly changing economy.

Most people can be restored to participation in the economy in times of prosperity, but in any market economy there will always be people who are dislocated. So you have to have training systems, retraining systems, systems to make sure that new businesses can always be started when old businesses are stopping; and systems to deal with people who simply are not competitive in difficult times.

Now, you must determine how to do this. No one can determine how to do it for you, or even whether to do it. But as your partner, I can tell you that the United States will do what we can to help to ease your hardships as you move forward on this path, and do what we can to help you make the decisions that you are prepared to make. (Applause.)

Let me say that I think this has been one of -- in some ways, the most difficult period of all for you because you have taken a lot of risks, you have made a lot of changes already, and yet the changes have not been felt tangibly in the lives of most ordinary citizens in the country. And that is very difficult. But I can say that just as an outside observer, it seems to me that it is likely that you will begin to see those changes.

Let me just give you a couple of examples. I asked Vice President Gore and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin to work on a program of economic cooperation in the fields of energy, the environment and space. You have massive energy resources. If we can just get a few more things worked out, it will lead to big flows of money and investment, prosperity and jobs into this nation.

We have reached an agreement, an unprecedented agreement for cooperation in space. Next month, Russian cosmonauts will serve on our space shuttle. We will share our resources, share our knowledge, share our training. And we will uncover things in space and in our venture which will have direct economic benefits to the people of Russia and the people of the United States. We both have different but very significant environmental problems which require high levels of skill and technology, but which generate enormous economic opportunity and large numbers of jobs. These things will come.

Secondly, last April when I met with President Yeltsin, I pledged \$1.6 billion in United States aid. We have now committed all that aid, and 70 percent of the money has been spent. And I provided a map the other day to show that it had been spent all over the country in all kinds of different ways -- mostly to help you to develop a private economy. You will begin to see the benefits of that.

Just this week, the G-7 big industrial nations opened an office in this city, led by an American, for the purpose of making sure that we speed up the aid that was promised last summer, but which has been coming too slow. In September, the Congress of the United States approved another \$2.5 billion aid package which can now begin to flow again to try to create jobs and opportunities, and to help slow the rate of inflation in this country. So I believe that specific benefits will begin to be felt, and people will come to see that there is a light at the end of this long tunnel. (Applause.)

Just today we announced the signing of a contract for the purchase of highly enriched uranium, a contract which will bring another \$12 billion to this nation over the next several years. And we are working hard to get assistance to the nations which buy your energy because so many of them cannot afford to pay for it; to make sure that you can be paid in cash, promptly, as you sell your energy resources. All these things will begin to have an impact on the lives of ordinary citizens. That is something that, as someone who also has to run for election on a periodic basis, I am sensitive to that.

In a democracy, if you put people in the driver's seat, they are going to drive. So it is best to give them a good road to drive on, and we are working with that.

The next great challenge Russia faces is the consolidation of democracy, and I want to say just a few words about that. Just like the market, democracy is no cure-all for all economic troubles or social strains. It is always a noisy and messy system. Our common ally in World War II, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill once said that "Democracy is the worst possible form of government, except for all of the others." Why did he say that? Because the debate is so wide, the opinions are so different and, sometimes, the differences are so sharp that you wonder if anything will ever be done. But democracy still offers the best guarantee of good decision-making and the protection of individual and minority rights.

In a society like yours and mine, and throughout the multiethnic expanse of Europe, democracy offers the best hope of protecting diversity and of making diversity a source of strength, harnessing it to a world in which diversity is perhaps the overwhelming fact of life.

That is why I would argue to you that each of us, in order to protect your democracy and mine, has a personal responsibility to denounce intolerance and ethnic hatred and anti-semitism, and anything that undermines the ability of everybody who lives within our national borders to be as productive as possible. Because, keep in mind, in the world in which we live, if you make any decision that deprives anybody who lives in your country of the right to live up to the fullest of their capacity, you have weakened your own ability to be free and prosperous and successful. (Applause.)

I might say it is also why the United States has cautioned other nations to respect the rights of ethnic Russians and other minorities within their borders. In both our nations the success of democracy depends partly on a formal constitution and partly on regular elections and respecting those elections. But it also depends upon a full array of other free associations that give real life and texture to democracies; independent trade

unions, newspapers, and a wide variety of civic and cultural associations.

If, like me, you are in a position of authority, you know that the freedom of speech can sometimes be a painful thing. Even in Roman times the great Emperor Marcus Aurelius said that the freedom of speech for someone in power was something to be endured, not enjoyed. But it is essential to democratic life that people feel free to say what they believe without fear of retaliation.

We are committing to fostering this kind of democratic ferment, and we are prepared to provide whatever kind of technical assistance we can to help it do well here. I say that because some people are concerned at the wide variety of views and the loud expression of those views we see in the Duma here after the last election. That can be a healthy thing if, but only if, everybody else's views are respected and protected, too. For once democracy becomes an instrument of crushing the views of the minorities, those who disagree, those who don't have the muscle, then democracy itself soon disappears.

The third great challenge you face today is redefining the role of your great nation in this age: What does it mean to be a great power in this 21st century? How will you define it? How will you know Russia is a great nation? If someone asked you to describe it, looking to the future, how would know? If someone asked you to describe it looking back in the early 1800s, you would say we are a great nation because we beat Napoleon and ran him out of Russia. Right? Whether you agree or disagree with the communist system you can say you were a great nation in the sense that you loomed large at the height of the Soviet empire with the Warsaw Pact. Great does not always mean good, but at least it's large.

How will you define your greatness? It is a profoundly important question that you must answer. I think there are some different ways to describe it. Russia co-sponsored with the United States the Middle East peace process. I think it was a very great thing when Israel and the PLO signed their accord on September 13, 1993. I think it is a good thing that we are continuing to work until a comprehensive settlement is reached in that troubled area.

I think it was a great thing what we did today with the Presidents of Ukraine and Russia and the United States agreeing to get all the nuclear weapons out of Ukraine and to give fair compensation to that nation for the uranium they are giving up. It makes the world a safer place. It makes your nation and mine less vulnerable to nuclear terrorism or threats. It shows that we can move beyond the nuclear age entirely.

There are still questions, you know, in the world about how you will define your greatness. When I was at the NATO Conference and afterward, there are nations that live between Western Europe and the border of Russia who still wonder what the future holds; nations who said, "Put me in NATO now just in case. Oh, I believe this President of Russia when he says he respects the territorial borders of other nations, but look at the history of Russia. Think of the national impulse. Draw another line across Europe while you have a chance."

There are people who are in the Baltic nations now who hear some of the debate in your politics; who hear the threats to take them over again. One of your political leaders even suggested you might like to have Alaska back. I don't think I can go along with that. (Laughter.)

I say that because all those definitions I would argue to you are looking to yesterday. What in the world would you do with an army of occupation to the East? How would you pay for it? And what would it give you? How would you be more

powerful than some small nation, one of the industrial tigers of Asia, for example, producing and selling goods and services at such a rate that their people's incomes are going up by 10 percent a year, and they are giving the people who live their the opportunity to do things that would have been undreamed of by their parents or grandparents? This is a very serious thing.

I believe that the greatness of a nation that lasts for centuries and centuries and centuries, as this nation has, is the ability to redefine itself in every age and time. The young people of Russia especially now have a chance to show that a great power can promote patriotism without expansionism; that a great power can promote national pride without national prejudice. That, I submit, is your challenge.

Today you face no threat from invasion. That was a legitimate concern of Russia for decades and decades, a legitimate reason to want to buffer zone around your borders in former times. It is not there now. I believe the measure of your greatness in the future will be whether Russia, the big neighbor, can be the good neighbor.

That is why it is so important that as your forces operate beyond your borders, they do so according to international law; why it is important that you continue your planned withdrawal from all the Baltic states; why it is important that your nation work with the United States and the rest of Europe to build the Partnership For Peace called for at the NATO Conference this year, so that for the first time in the history of nation states we can have a Europe that is united by a shared commitment to democracy, free-market economies and mutual respect for borders, instead of the Europe that is divided for the first time in history. (Applause.)

I'm very proud and pleased that President Yeltsin decided to participate in the Partnership For Peace and work for an integrated Europe; that he signed the historic accord with President Kravchuk and with me today to eliminate over 1,800 nuclear warheads. These are hopeful signs, and I believe signs that indicate you can make a future that is different from the past.

Yours is a history of heroism and of persistent hope. The question now is, can we make the economic decisions, the political decisions that foster hope? You will have to decide these things. I'm amused when I come here in the spirit of genuine partnership and respect and some people say, well, the United States is trying to dictate our course. Nothing could be further from the truth. Believe me, my friends, it's all we can do to deal with our own problems. We don't have time to try to dictate your course. But the course you take will affect us and so we want you to make decisions that are best for you.

And I will close as I began: Will you define your future greatness in terms that were relevant to the past or terms that will shape the future? This is a crossroad, and a difficult one. But the younger generations of Russians will look back on this time with either gratitude or regret, depending on how those questions are answered -- the economic, the political, the military questions.

I believe you will choose the future. After all, Russia did not get to this point by making all that many wrong decisions in the past. And every nation makes a few mistakes. There are few people anywhere that have more knowledge of history, both positive and negative, that have more reason to hope for the future than you do. I know the present is difficult, but if you make the right decisions, if you choose hope over fear, then the future will reward your courage and your vision.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

* * * *

THE PRESIDENT: Now we're going to take some questions from the audience. And what I will do is, we have also some remote sites, so I'll take one from the right, one from the left, I'll do the screen and come back, okay. I can't see so well, so --

Q Do I need to speak Russian or English?

THE PRESIDENT: Speak English. And they they can listen to the translation and I'll listen to you.

Q I am a student of Moscow University. Mr. Clinton, what do you think about the future education in Russia, what it needs to be, how it needs to be done, and what changes are needed?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'm not an expert in your education system, although I have spent a little time trying to find out about it, because in my career in the U.S., my major area of interest was education. I think first you have a very strong basic system. Virtually all your people are literate. An enormous number of your people speak more than one language. And you have very strong technical programs.

I would say you need to develop some of your educational programs for the professions that manage market economies. Do you have enough people who can run things in a very rapidly changing world. I think there are some gaps here, in other words, in the kinds of training you have for the kind of economy you're trying to develop. And I think some studies should be done about that, and you should provide those education programs. But you're actually quite fortunate in having a very literate society and a very strong background in the arts, the humanities and in science and technology.

Keep in mind one other thing. In most modern market economies, the average person, even if he or she stays with the same employer will change the nature of their work seven or eight times in a lifetime. So it's impossible to give someone, even a university degree, that answers all the questions they will face in the workplace forever. So you have to develop systems of learning for a lifetime. And the most important thing is that you just get a good basic foundation that enables you to think well, to solve problems and to change, to learn as new things come along.

Q I am a first-year student at the Department of Foreign Languages at Moscow University. First, I'd like to --

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I'd say you're a successful student. No accent. (Laughter.)

Q I'd like to thank you for what you think about our future in economics and in democracy. But I'd like to remind you that -- how I see tomorrow of our country is the spiritual power. Some astrologists say that Russia will soon become the center of everything because we have this spiritual energy here. What do you think of that? You didn't mention anything about our cultural future. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: I do think -- well, I mentioned a little bit about it, but I think you have enormous cultural power. I think you also have enormous spiritual power. There is a great energy in this country that communicates itself. It's always been here, I think. And in some ways it was repressed in the last several decades. And it's coming out now in all kinds of ways, not only in terms of creative culture, but also in terms of new interest in religion and faith and all kinds of things

that show the character and depth of the nation. And I would urge you to cultivate that, both in terms of culture and faith.

Someone ask a question, I can't pick anyone there. You'll have to be self-selective.

Q Good day, Mr. President. This is the cradle of perestroika. This is the birthplace of the last President of the Soviet Union. (Applause.) This is a multinational area. We have all kinds of people here -- students, workers, office workers, representatives from the Cossacks, also refugees from the hotpoints in the former Soviet Union.

Mr. President, on the territory of the former Soviet Union, civil wars go on without end. Russia, unfortunately, either cannot or doesn't want to settle the civil strife. What is your feeling? Does the United States of America plan to get involved in these conflicts? And if so, in what way? And more so because there is an example of Yugoslavia. There is a danger here of taking sides in the West -- the West is supporting the Muslims in Yugoslavia.

Let me repeat the question: If there will be an involvement in the United States, what kind of involvement would this be?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first, I don't think it's entirely accurate that Russia has not been involved at all. There's no question that Russia and the Russian military was very instrumental in stabilizing Mr. Shevardnadze's position in Georgia. So I think there will be times when you will be involved, and you will be more likely to be involved in some of these areas near you, just like the United States has been involved in the last several years in Panama and Grenada near our area.

The thing I think that we have to try to do, as I said in my speech, that when there is an involvement beyond the borders of the nation, that it is consistent with international law and, whenever possible, actually supported through other nations either through the United Nations or through some other instrument of international law.

Now, let us also frankly acknowledge that some of these conflicts -- take the one in Yugoslavia, Bosnia, for example -- some of these conflicts represent longstanding conflicts that were actually repressed during the time when these countries were effectively controlled from above and when the various warring factions were, in effect, occupied.

What happened in Yugoslavia was when Mr. Tito died and then the central government's authority began to erode and then all the various parts of Yugoslavia began to try to be independent, Bosnia-Herzegovina, which always had these three different factions, basically degenerated back to the conflict which had been there for hundreds of years.

And you can -- there is no perfect solution to any of life's problems, you know, and I still think, on balance, we're better off without empires and countries are better off seeking their own determination. But in this case, the truth is people there keep killing each other.

Now, what I have done is -- the reason that you say that we have supported the Muslims in Yugoslavia, we supported the multiethnic government in Bosnia because it was recognized by the United Nations. So the United States supported it because it was recognized by the United Nations. However, we also support a peace process which would give some territory to the Muslim-dominated government, to the Serbs and to the Croats. So what we're doing in Bosnia is to try to support the U.N. mission and trying to urge the parties to stop killing each other.

If you don't have an imperial army, if you don't just go in and take people over and tell them what to do, then you have to make some allowances for the fact that occasionally they'll do the stupid thing and keep on killing each other even when it doesn't make any sense. And there are some areas where you can stop it and some where you can't.

If you look at Africa, for example, and Brunei and Angola in the Sudan -- never mind Somalia, just those three countries -- hundreds of thousands of people have died in each of those countries just in the last couple of years because of civil war. That is what I said in my speech. There is still too much tribal and ethnic hatred in this world and we can't control it all, not and take care of our problems within our borders.

Q I'm a journalist. Mr. Clinton, what would you like the historians to say about you once you finish your tenure as President?

THE PRESIDENT: I would like them to say I restored a sense of hope and optimism to my country, that I strengthened the economy, and made it possible for my people to lead the world economically into the 21st century and that I restored the sense of community in America; that we came back together as a people, even though we are very diverse now. And I would like it to be said that I helped lead the world to more peaceful cooperation, into a future very different from the bloody and divided past of the 20th century.

Q I'm a journalist also. Mr. President, if at a dinner table, let's say, President Yeltsin would ask you to switch places with him, would you make such a risk? Would you risk doing that?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I like the job I have.
(Laughter) And I wouldn't do it because I'm just as proud to be an American as he is to be a Russian. But if I asked him to switch places with me, he wouldn't do it either.

You know, I'll tell you, the one thing I believe about President Yeltsin, he's just like me. We make mistakes and we're not perfect, and we don't have all the answers, but I'll tell you one thing about him, he at least gets up every day and tries to make a difference. He is trying to do something. The world is full of politicians who in times of change only worry about maintaining their popularity instead of making decisions. At least he is trying to make decisions and move generally in their right historical direction.

So if you disagree with him, you should get in here and contribute to this great democratic debate and try and help develop better policies. But it is a good thing, I think, that you have a President waded into the tides of history and make decisions. (Applause.)

Q You've been talking about the future of our nation, that that was -- that we must look into another future, but the nearest future is two years for the new presidential elections. And Mr. Yeltsin with whom you personally indicate** Russian democracy, will not run for reelection because he leaves. And we can see at the moment he leaves is the moment democracy leaves. So it means in two years we'll have a different President. He could be either a communist or a nationalist. Is America ready or getting ready to deal with this situation? And, gentlemen, in concern with this why are not you willing to give protections to the nations who seek it? For instance, the Baltic situation? Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Wait, stand up. First of all, one of things you learn now that you have these elections all the time is that two years is an eternity in democracy. Just because

there's nobody on the scene now doesn't mean there won't be somebody on the scene that none of you have ever heard of two years from now that a majority of the people will fall in love with and make president of the country. So you cannot assume that.

On the other hand, I would say this not only to the forces of reform, but to any other blocs. One of the most important responsibilities of political parties in a democracy is to always be grooming new leaders and to never treat anyone, no matter how great he or she may be, as totally indispensable. So this is something that all of these groups will have to learn. You have to always be grooming new people for leadership. But I wouldn't assume that there would be no future leaders besides out of the other two blocs you mentioned.

Now, on the Baltics, we have not denied them the right to protection. In fact, we have invited them to be part of this Partnership For Peace. And in order to be part of it -- and, keep in mind, Russia has agreed to be part of it. They will participate in joint military planning, joint military operations. And as we do the exercises, the only way you can be part of it is if you promise to respect the territorial boundaries of all of the other countries that are part of this. So we are giving them a great deal of protection. It just means that they're not members of NATO right away.

The other NATO members will tell you that, to be part of NATO, you have to be in a position to assume certain responsibilities as well as just ask for the security guarantee. But there are significant increases in security just for being part of the Partnership For Peace.

Before we go to the screen again, to St. Petersburg, I would like to introduce the most important person in this audience to me -- my wife, Hillary, who just came to Russia this morning. Stand up. (Applause.)

A very large number of the people I have met in the last two days, especially young women, have asked me about her, so I thought I would introduce her, and I thank you for that.

Is someone going to ask a -- St. Petersburg, do you have a question?

Q Very recently, the political and economic assistance was very closely linked to human rights. And why, at the present time, does America help the Baltic states in spite of the repression against Russians in that country?

THE PRESIDENT: Which country?

Q Baltics.

THE PRESIDENT: First of all --

Q I'm talking about all three Baltic countries -- Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first of all, in Lithuania, your government, the Russian government withdrew the troops because it was satisfied with the relationship between the two countries.

There are still outstanding questions with Estonia and Latvia. An international group from the Council on Security and Cooperation in Europe, CSCE, is now in Latvia studying the situation. And we have made it clear -- I have personally met with the leaders of all of the Baltic states, and I have said we were for the independence and the freedom of the Baltic nations, but we expect the Russian minorities to be protected. And if we

have evidence that they are being abused, it will affect our policies toward them.

So I assure you, sir, that -- I am waiting for the report right now on Latvia by the unbiased, sort of third-party source. And if there is evidence that they are abusing the rights of the Russian minorities, then I will act accordingly.

I don't think we can have a double standard. We can't have one standard for the United States and Russia and say if you're a smaller country you can do things that bigger countries shouldn't be permitted to do. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, will America give strong financial support to the businessman who would like to invest in the economy of Russia?

THE PRESIDENT: We have -- where is our support for them -- is that what you said? We have some institutions -- the Export-Import Bank and the office of private investment, which help private investors to invest in other countries. But the main thing we are trying to do now, we need much more -- there should be much more American investment in Russia.

Two of my Cabinet members met with the American business community here yesterday morning. And in March the Secretary of Commerce is coming here with a large group of American businessmen to encourage them to invest. We have also taken all the duties, all the extra taxes off of nearly 5,000 Russian products which can now be sold without handicap into the United States.

So we are trying to figure out not only how we can invest more here, but how we can buy more of your products. And in the end, that is much more important to your economic future than any direct government aid, because there -- in our economy, there is so much more money in the private sector than in the government sector. So we are working on that. And I hope in March when the American Investment and Trade Mission comes here, it gets a lot of publicity and that they get a chance to meet a lot of people and to learn a lot about how we can do that.

But let me -- if they need help for with the financing for investment, we actually have institutions to do that also to help them move --

Q In your speech you mentioned about your intention to support, to protect full Russian democracy. Is it the same for you, Russian democracy and the President Boris Yeltsin? That's the first part of the question. And the second one: How far the United States is going to go to protect Russian democracy?

THE PRESIDENT: The answer to your first question is that -- is Russian democracy the same thing as Boris Yeltsin? No. Not now, because you also have a democratic constitution

The answer to your first question is that, is Russian democracy the same thing as Boris Yeltsin? No. Not now, because you also have a democratic constitution that the people have voted for and a democratically elected Parliament that the people have voted for. But before the last election, you only had one person who had ever been voted on in a free election by all of the people of Russia -- the President.

Now, do I intend to work with President Yeltsin as long as he embodies Russian democracy and as long as he is the choice of the majority of the people of Russia to be the President? Of course, there is no other President. There may be some people in Russia who wish someone else were the President of the United States, but I'm the only U.S. president you have right

now. You see? That's not the same thing as saying that I'm all there is to American democracy, I'm not.

So what we wish to do -- yesterday evening, Ambassador Pickering, our American Ambassador, and Mrs. Pickering were both here, held a reception for me at the American Ambassador's Residence, Spaso House, and we had a lot of the leaders of Parliament, a lot of the leaders of the regional political groups, a lot of people from the private sector -- some of whom are from different political groups -- there to meet me. Because now, democracy is three things: It's the elected president, the Constitution, and the Parliament, plus people who have been elected in various ways throughout the country, plus people who are in free associations, like labour movements.

Now, one thing democracy is, beyond majority rule, is respect for minority rights, for individual freedoms, like the freedom of speech and the right to vote, even if you don't vote the way people like. So when you said, how far would I go to protect on Russian democracy, I want an equal partnership here. I don't want to have any dictatorial or control in Russia. I just want to be an equal partner with a strong partner. And I will be an equal partner as long as there is democracy, which is, majority rule under the constitution, and respect for minority rights and minority interests.

Q Mr. President, what do you think is the main difference between Russia and the United States?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the main difference between Russia and the United States today is that we are the oldest, now the longest-lasting continuous democracy on the face of the Earth, and you are one of the youngest. We have now been a free democracy for over 200 years. And that affects the way we are and the way we deal with things.

On the other hand, we have a lot of problems in common and we have a lot of good things in common. We are much more -- our people have deep roots in the soil, we're much more likely to be much more sort of open and friendly and gregarious in a certain way that many people in other countries -- we also, unfortunately, have a lot of the same problems that you are now dealing with a crime problem, and my country has one of the worst crime problems in the world.

So we have a lot in common, our two peoples do. And we have always pretty much gotten along, except for the tensions caused when we had different political systems before and after World War II. But I would say the biggest difference flows out of the fact that we have had the benefit of being a democracy for 200 years, and you are one of the youngest.

Q We welcome you here in the Kremlin. I would like to tell you briefly about the history of my city. This is one of the largest industrial cities, but unfortunately, there is a major military industry here and this is the place where academician Sakharov was exiled. At the same time we're one of the focal points of the reform. And I can judge about that just by looking at the people who are next to me. Around me are people who are helping along to reform.

This is the Mayor. He is welcoming you now. We have a twin city in the United States, which is Philadelphia. This is one of our businessmen who owns a joint venture with an American partners. This is an ordinary citizen of our city, who is now holding a famous festival. One of them has been attended by Rostropovich. And we have many many students who have studied in the United States.

We had just one question. Right next to me is a teacher. She is running student exchange programs.

Q I've been doing this for a long time. But usually these are one-sided exchanges. Does Mr. President think that American students would have something to learn from Russia, as well? (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Absolutely. Yes. First of all, I'm glad you have a sister city relationship with Philadelphia. It is a wonderful, wonderful city. They also voted for me for President. (Laughter.)

But the answer to your question is definitely. I came here in the first week of 1970 as a student, on my own when I was living in England because I wanted to learn about this country, and because I believed that we ought to be friends, and because I was so worried about what then seemed to be the differences between our two nations and the fact that we could blow up the world almost by accident. So, yes, I think we should send large numbers of American students here. I think we have a lot to learn.

Keep in mind, if we were having this -- if Boris Yeltsin came to the United States and did what I'm doing here, all -- very few of the students could stand up and speak to him in Russian as you are speaking to me in English. We have a lot to learn from you, and I would like more of our students to come here. (Applause.)

Yes. Yes. This is our youngest questioner so far. How old are you, young man?

Q I'm 13 years old.

THE PRESIDENT: Thirteen, not 30. (Laughter.)

Q I saw your picture shaking hands with President Kennedy and I'd like to ask you how old were you and when you got your idea to become a President of the United States. (Laughter and applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Come here. Come up here. Come shake hands with me and maybe you'll be President of Russia some day. (Applause.)

I was 16 when I shook hands with President Kennedy, and it was about that time that I knew I wanted to go into public service. But, of course, at that time I had no idea that I could ever be elected President, or that I would ever have a chance to. But sometime when I was a fairly young man, I decided that I would work hard and that if I ever got an opportunity that I would try to become President.

Probably our greatest President was Abraham Lincoln, who was the President of the United States during the Civil War in the mid-1800s. And when he was a young man, Abraham Lincoln wrote in his diary, "I will work and get ready and perhaps my chance will come." I say that to you.

And one thing we do have in common that I have always admired about your country is many of the leaders of your country, like me, have come from basically quite humble circumstances, have been working people. And that's a great thing for a nation -- to make it possible to cast the net for talent very wide so that anybody has a chance to rise to the top if he or she has the ability and the good fortune to do so.

So good luck to you.

Q Thank you.

Q Mr. President, I have two questions for you today. You stated that you have your idea of what democracy is and that is quite natural. It has three component parts, but

MORE

don't you feel that in England there is a completely different democracy as there is in France? When you do visits around the world and say this sort of democracy is the very best model -- in other words, okay, Russians, follow us. follow our model. I think this isn't quite correct. I have another question. If I can ask this one.

THE PRESIDENT: May I answer that one first? Let me answer this one first.

I perfectly agree with that. I think you could have a system, a democratic system like the British, like the French, like the Italians, like -- you name it, but they all have certain things in common. They all have opportunities for the people to vote and a system for them to have elected representatives who themselves get to vote on which laws govern the people, and some system for the protection of individual rights and the rights of minority groups. But how you do that is perfectly up to you. There are many different ways you can do it. Yes, the British system is different from the French system and both of them are different from our system.

Interestingly enough, your system is different from ours, too. You elect one president and then a parliament, but the upper chamber of your parliament has more control over the lower chamber than ours does; and your president, on paper at least, has more power than I do. I sort of like your system. (Laughter)

No, they should be different. I agree with that.

Q I have a second question then. During your election campaign you demonstrated how you can play the sax. I wonder if you demonstrate for us here today. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: No. I played for President Yeltsin last night. I have a quota, one saxophone play per country. (Laughter.) I didn't bring the horn today, but I thank you for asking.

Q Mr. President, just imagine the situation. You don't have an opportunity to speak to this pretty large audience. You don't have the opportunity to pop into the bakery, buy some bread and chat with some people on the street. You just have an opportunity to choose one person, one Russian person and talk only to him. From what social layer would you choose this person? Would it be -- I don't know -- an economist, interpreter, student, businessman, politician?

THE PRESIDENT: If I could only speak to one person, I would speak to the wisest person I could find in a medium-sized city in Russia that was having a difficult time with these economic changes. I would talk to someone, regardless of what economic strata they were from, he or she was from, had a lot of friends from all walks of life -- who could tell me how they were viewing what is going on now. I would pick someone from a sort of medium to small-sized town because they would be more likely to know all different kinds of people.

Red Square. We need to take one question from Red Square. Red Square can you hear me? I've gone over my time already 10 minutes.

Q You have a very educated auditorium here, and I was thinking, I wonder if you could gather as many people in the U.S. in one studio who would be as fluent in Russian as these people in Ostankino are fluent in English.

Anyway, I am here in Red Square. The people who are here would like to ask one question. Mr. President, we're getting an impression that you're supporting not so much the reforms in Russia but the personality of President Yeltsin. What's this connected to?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I already answered that question, or I tried to, but I will answer it again. Until you had your last election and you adopted a new constitution and you elected a new parliament from people with -- lots of people from different parties, President Yeltsin was the only person who had actually been elected by all the people of Russia in a full and free election. Now, you have three sources of democratic legitimacy, if you will. You have the parliament, the President and the constitution. We have no interest in picking favorites or defining Russian democracy in terms of anyone. So you have done that, and you must do that.

The second thing I would say, however, is that no country can have more than one President at a time. Every nation needs someone who's the leader, who then works with the leaders of other nations. And I'm the President of the United States. If I want to work with you and help you, I should be open to meeting with and listening to all the democratic voices in Russia. But in the end, I still have to work with your President. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, when you were a student you were in Moscow. And now you're the President of your nation. I'm a law student at the Moscow International University. And could you give me some advice how I can follow your career path?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I can tell you this. I came from a family that had no money, no influence and no particular interest in politics. My mother got interested in politics after I started running, but not before. My advice to you would be two things. One, get the best education you can; and two, involve yourself in politics and figure out what you believe; which party and group you want to be identified with; work in the elections; work on some problem that the people have.

And then the third thing I would say is this: Try to develop a genuine interest if you don't have it in the real problems and hopes of ordinary people, because in a democracy, the only way you can really keep going throughout all the things that will happen, all the ups and downs, is if you really care what happens to other people as well as what happens to you in your own career.

They say we have to stop. I've had a wonderful time. I'm sorry, but they're telling me I have to cut off.

I want to thank you again. Thank you very much for this. Thank you. I want to thank you again. I wish we had another hour. I'd like to take all the questions, but I have abused the network. We are now 18 minutes over time. And if you'll hang around here a little bit after, we'll shake hands and I'll try to answer your questions at least face to face. But I have to let the network cut off.

Thank you, all of you, from our remote sites. Thank all of you for being here. And Hillary and I are delighted to be with you. Good luck to you. We'll try to be good partners and good friends. (Applause.)

END

4:46 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Prague, Czech Republic)

For Immediate Release

January 12, 1994

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT
WITH VISEGRAD LEADERS

U.S. Ambassador's Residence
Prague, Czech Republic

1:55 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the very beautiful American Embassy.

I have just finished a very productive and enjoyable working lunch with the leaders of the Visegrad states -- President Vaclav Havel and Prime Minister Vaclav Klaus of the Czech Republic; President Arpad Goencz and Prime Minister Peter Boross of Hungary; President Lech Walesa and Prime Minister Waldemar Pawlak of Poland; and President Michal Kovac and Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar of Slovakia.

I want to, at the outset, stress my appreciation to President Havel, Premier Klaus and the Czech people for their hospitality and contributions to our meeting, and I thank again all the Visegrad leaders for joining here today.

This region, where the great democratic rebirth of Europe began five years ago, holds a special place in my own affections. I first came to this city 24 years ago this week, and two of my senior national security advisors were born in this region -- the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff General Shalikashvili, who spent most of his early years in Poland, was born there; and my U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright who was born here in Prague.

I told President Havel yesterday that the Czech Republic is the only nation in the world that has two ambassadors in the United Nations.

I have come to Europe to help build a new security for the transatlantic community for the 21st century. During the Cold War the security of the Western Alliance was defined by the division of Europe. Our new security must be defined by Europe's integration, the integration of a broader Europe based on military cooperation, robust democracies and market economies. That was my message in Brussels, where I met with our NATO and European Community allies. And it will be my message as I travel to Moscow.

I am mindful of an old Polish saying, which I have, I hope, learned to pronounce properly -- Nits o nas bez nas. Nothing about us without us. And so I have come to this region to share my thoughts directly with your leaders and your people. I believe the United States must make clear to all of you first that we are committed to helping you continue your work of reform and renewal in peace. That commitment derives from more than our shared values and our admiration for your efforts. It also derives from our own security concerns.

Let me be absolutely clear: The security of your state is important to the security of the United States.

At today's lunch I discussed three ways in which my nation is prepared to advance Europe's democratic integration by

MORE

- 2 -

supporting your region's continued renewal and security. First, we discussed the Partnership for Peace, the American proposal NATO has just adopted. The Partnership invites all former Warsaw Pact and former Soviet states, plus other non-NATO members in Europe, to join in military cooperation with NATO in training exercise and operations jointly.

While the Partnership is not NATO membership, neither is it a permanent holding room. It changes the entire NATO dialogue so that now the question is no longer whether NATO will take on new members, but when and how. It leaves the door open to the best possible outcome for our region, democracy, markets and security all across a broader Europe, while providing time and preparation to deal with a lesser outcome.

Second, we discussed ways in which the United States can help to solidify your democratic and market reforms. I stressed that I have ordered our programs to give greater emphasis to helping this region tend to reform's impacts on your workers and your communities.

I talked about the ways we are working to expand trade and investment between your region, the rest of Europe and the United States. I also discussed the steps we are taking to help the Visegrad region and other parts of Central and Eastern Europe bolster their new democracies.

We're supporting the development of a thriving civil society. And in our meeting I announced the creation of the democracy network, an initiative to bring new resources to grass roots and independent groups throughout the region. I stressed our interest in fostering regional cooperation among your countries, practical things that can advance your integration into a broader Europe.

Finally, I salute all those leaders here in Prague today who have worked to build practical regional cooperation and consensus in Central Europe at this pivotal moment in history. I congratulate them on having this regional meeting. And I suggested several ways we can help to support regional integration, including support for regional infrastructure projects, like highways and communications networks and air traffic systems.

I have greatly enjoyed my discussions today here. I assure you I will follow up on them. The United States will have a special conference this year on trade and investment in the countries represented here on what we can do to increase American investment and to increase the purchase of the products made by the people who are working hard in all of these thriving democracies.

I come away convinced that, together, we can place Central and Eastern Europe at the heart of a new Europe, an integrated Europe, democratic, prosperous, secure and free. That is my commitment; I believe it is our joint commitment.

Thank you very much, and I'd like now to turn the microphone over to President Havel.

PRESIDENT HAVEL: Distinguished President, ladies and gentlemen. We are living in a time of a dramatic searching for a new order. An order in which no one would be subjugated or endangered and which would make it possible for all European people and states to live in an atmosphere of peaceful cooperation.

Our today's meeting in Prague bears witness to the great importance which the United States and the North Atlantic Alliance attach to stability, security and peace in Central Europe, in relation to peace in all of Europe as well as to the security of the United States.

MORE

- 3 -

We welcome the Partnership For Peace project as a good point of departure in NATO's quest for a new identity of the Alliance as a true stabilizing core of European security. We appreciate that it allows individual approaches from the various countries. At the same time, however, it depends on how energetically and how quickly the different countries will move to instill in Partnership For Peace contents meeting their interests and their possibilities. For our part, we want to do everything in our power in order that our partnership results in our full membership in the Alliance. We do not regard Partnership For Peace as a substitute for that, but rather as a first step toward NATO.

The reason why we want to join the Alliance is that we share the values of civilization which it protects, and that we want to take part in protecting them. We realize that it is neither possible nor desirable to isolate Russia. However, we are independent states and we decide ourselves about our affiliations and our policies.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we agreed in our conversations with the representatives of the Central European nations that are represented at this meeting in Prague, our countries have very similar views on this subject. This is certainly a gratifying circumstance and it is to the benefit of us all.

Let me, therefore, conclude by expressing my firm conviction that this meeting has become an important landmark on the road toward a new democratic and truly peaceful Europe, sharing firm and natural ties with the North American continent. At one time, the city of Yalta went down in history as a symbol of the division of Europe. I would be happy if today the city of Prague emerged as a symbol of Europe's standing in alliance.

Thank you.

Q Mr. President, there are nationalists in Russia who look at these four countries and other nations that were under the grip of Moscow and they dream of rebuilding the Soviet Empire. What will you tell Russian President Boris Yeltsin about the security needs of these countries and how far it should go in guaranteeing their territorial integrity and their borders?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I would say that based on their past statements, he's right and they're wrong. That is, I think that the Russian position, the position of the present administration there that they will respect the territorial boundaries of their neighbors is the proper position.

You know, each nation at critical periods has to imagine again what its future is going to be. It has to define itself -- how it will define itself as a nation and how it will define a standard of greatness. The United States, in very different ways, is going through such a period today. And Russia must do that.

In the 21st century can anyone seriously believe that we will define greatness by whether one country can physically occupy another, since we all know that wealth and opportunity will be determined by things other than physical possession of land mass? I don't think so.

And my urgent task will be to try to continue to press the path of democracy and reform and America's support for it in Russia. They are a great people with a great history and a great future. But the future must be different from the past, and the way greatness is defined must be different. And that, I think, is a struggle plainly going on there now that will play itself out over the next few years. And I'm hoping and will be working for the best possible impact.

MORE

Helen?

Q Mr. President, it's obvious that the leaders have accepted something short of what they really wanted. And in a way they're being treated as second cousins. They really wanted security guarantees and you and all the NATO allies have told them that that's not in the package. In view of --

THE PRESIDENT: Let me just -- I disagree that they're being treated as second cousins. This is something NATO has never done before. We will have people out in the next few days talking about how we're going to begin all kinds of joint security operations. To say that 16 nations of NATO made a mistake not to immediately issue security guarantees to some nations of Europe and not others, without knowing in any way, shape or form whether the reciprocal obligations could be met by new members I think is an unfair characterization of the NATO Alliance.

Q My question is, in view of the lessons of World War II, is it conceivable if any of these nations were invaded or aggressed against that NATO would not come to their aid?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it is doubtful; that's right. I think your reading -- our reading of history is right. But, frankly, I think none of us believe that -- I can't speak for the other Presidents except based on our conversations -- that that is imminent. I think -- what I was impressed by from these leaders is that they very much want to be a part of Europe, of the Western Alliance, in an economic and social and political, as well as a military way, and that the broad definition of security is in that.

Of course, there are always concerns that in the future, the darker past might be recreated, that there could be an expansionism again. But what we need to do is, again -- what I'm trying to do is to reach out and enhance the security of these nations in ways that also permit other nations to enhance their security and partnership with us, and that does not now draw a new line of division across Europe. Maybe there will be a new line drawn some day, and if so, we want to do what we can to support the security of these nations. But we hope that we are giving Europe the possibility for the best possible future.

Mr. Blitzer I think had a question for President Walesa, and then I'd like a question from the foreign press next. But, Wolf, go ahead.

Q President Walesa, I'm sorry I can't ask you this question in Polish. But Poland seems to be the least enthusiastic among the Visegrad countries for the Partnership For Peace proposals. Is that accurate? And can you describe exactly how you feel about this proposal and whether Poland will seek membership in the Partnership For Peace proposal.

PRESIDENT WALESA: I can answer into words: Sometimes small is beautiful. And we do believe that this is a step in the right direction. It's been decided by the powers of the world and we shall try to make good use of this.

Q What about your next part of your unofficial program in Prague with President Havel? Did public radio give you a tape of your saxophone concert -- (laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: I think the best part of my unofficial time in Prague was becoming reacquainted with the city -- walking across the bridge again after 24 years and seeing the family I stayed with 24 years ago and just meeting the people. I was very pleased by the large number of people who came out yesterday to see me and to say hello. And seeing the changes

MORE

- 5 -

here, it was very rewarding and it stiffened my determination to continue to support these kinds of changes.

Now, I had a lot of fun playing the saxophone. The President gave me a saxophone with his name inscribed in it, so it's a gift I will always treasure. The nice thing about the little music we played last night was that the Czech musicians with whom I played were so good that they covered up all my shortcomings. (Laughter.)

Is there another question from the foreign press?

Q What is the next American step in the Bosnia war?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the next thing that we are doing now is what we are doing with NATO. NATO adopted a new resolution and our military commanders in Europe now are looking into the instruction they got from the NATO commanders, which is to examine what plans can be developed to ensure the rotation of the troops at Srebrenica and to ensure that the airstrip at Tuzla is open.

Now, in addition to that, I have been actively consulting with all the people with whom I have met. I have asked all the leaders here what further steps that they thought ought to be taken. Everyone recognizes that the peace prospects have been diminished now because, for the first time in a good while, all three parties seem to believe they have something to gain by fighting. And as long as that circumstance continues it's going to be difficult for us to convince them through a political process to stop. But there are some ideas floating around and I am going to solicit some more.

Q Mr. President, already there are voices in Ukraine's Parliament suggesting that President Kravchuk went beyond his authority in negotiating the agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. And even a Foreign Ministry spokesman there today said there may not be an agreement ready for you and President Yeltsin and President Kravchuk to sign in Moscow on Friday. Is that your understanding and is this causing concern about this agreement that you reached this week?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let's see what happens in Kiev. I think -- we have to let President Kravchuk make his own judgments about what he can and cannot do with his government. I expect that we will have an agreement and I expect that it will be honored. And I think, frankly, the more the people in the Ukrainian Parliament know about it, the better they will feel about it. I think as the details get out, they'll feel better about it.

Q There appears to be some difference of opinion even within your own staff about President Kravchuk's ability to order these changes, whether he can do it by executive order, whether the Rada or Parliament has to vote on it. What is your understanding of that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: We'll talk about it in Kiev and beyond. Let's watch it unfold and see.

Q Mr. President, I had planned to ask the question that Mark asked. But let me ask you -- the reformers in Russia seem to have had trouble building coalitions to offset the rise of the nationalist forces. What kind of advice will you be giving Mr. Yeltsin and other reform leaders about how to go about offsetting the threat of Mr. Zhirinovskiy?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think first of all, perhaps in the last election they learned a good lesson, which is that the forces of reform need to find ways to work together and to speak if not with one voice, at least with a common message.

MORE

- 6 -

And I expect there to be some rough spots along the way. I mean, after all, this is a rather new experience for them and they'll have to figure out exactly how the forces are going to be organized within the new Parliament, and then they'll have to work out their relationship with the President. But even those of us that have been at it for 200 years still have difficulties from time to time. But I'm looking forward to meeting with a number of those leaders in the reform effort and getting to know them and getting some feel for where they are and where they're going. But I'm still basically quite hopeful.

Thank you very much.

END

2:19 P.M> (L)

January 4, 1994

LUNCHEON WITH COLUMNISTS

DATE: January 5, 1994
LOCATION: Old Family Dining Room
TIME: 12:30-1:45p
FROM: Mark Gearan

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this luncheon is to accomplish two goals: First, to layout the themes for your speech in Milwaukee-- a speech intended to kick-off your trip to Europe; Second, to discuss your themes and objectives for each individual stop in Europe and explain how they blend together.

Before the G-7 Summit, you sat down with a similar group reporters in this same forum. You will recall that Jack Nelson who will be part of the group tomorrow, wrote you directly to let you know the effectiveness of these luncheons.

II. BACKGROUND

TO BE FORWARDED BY NSC

III. PARTICIPANTS

Jim Hoagland	Washington Post
Meg Greenfield	Washington Post/Newsweek
EJ Dionne	Washington Post
William Safire	New York Times
Abe Rosenthal	New York Times
Al Hunt	Wall Street Journal
Clarence Page	Chicago Tribune
Michael Elliot	Newsweek
Michael Kramer	Time
Jack Nelson	Los Angeles Times
Tom Oliphant	Boston Globe
Chris Mathews	San Francisco Examiner
Georgie Ann Geyer	Universal Press Syndicate
Mary McGrory	Washington Post
Margaret Warner	PBS
Walter Mears	AP
Richard Cohen	Washington Post
Gloria Borger	US News and World Report

IV. PRESS PLAN

On the record.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

The press will arrive in the Old Family Dining Room 12:25pm and take their seats around a horseshoe table. You will join them at 12:30pm and begin the discussion.

VI. REMARKS

None required.

Overview of Trip to Europe, Russia and Belarus

- The President's trip to Europe comes at an **historic moment of opportunity** in the post-Cold War period. He will reaffirm the importance of the transatlantic relationship to global stability and prosperity and renew the political, economic and security ties among the Western nations.
- There are several historic challenges interwoven in this trip, all of which will have a fundamental impact on our security and well-being at home:
 - o Encouraging continued reform in **Russia** and avoiding a return to authoritarianism, ultra-nationalism and aggressive foreign policy.
 - o Reasserting the centrality of the world's most successful alliance -- **NATO** -- to the security challenges of the post-Cold War world, largely through the Partnership for Peace.
 - o Deepening our **relations** with the European Union, building on our cooperation at the G-7 and GATT Uruguay Round and on the EU's desire for a stronger foreign and security policy role.
 - o Drawing the nations of **Central and Eastern Europe** into the community of Western democracies.
 - o Proceeding with measures to secure the **denuclearization** of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine.

Encouraging Democracy and Reform in Russia

- We must do all we can to ensure that Russia continues down the path toward **democracy and free markets**, and does not revert to authoritarian rule and aggressive foreign policy. We can avoid returning to the destructive Cold War competition that casts a shadow across Europe and the rest of the world for nearly half a century. In so doing, we will allow further cuts in our defense spending and open new markets for our workers and business.
- During his meetings in Moscow, the President will express his appreciation for the **remarkable changes** that have occurred in Russia over the past few years, including the elections of December 12. The Russian people held free and fair elections in which they approved a democratic constitution that wipes out the last vestiges of the Soviet system.

- The President will stress our support for the **reform process** in Russia and the benefits to be derived from continued progress. He will discuss new forms of cooperation in line with the work done by Prime Minister Chernomyrdin and me.
- Working with the Russian government, the President will consider how our bilateral and multilateral assistance programs can support the **long-term process of economic reform and privatization as well as the short-term alleviation of the pain of transition on the Russian people**. The strong showing of ultra-nationalists and other anti-reformers is a reminder that change is always difficult, and underscores the reasons we have worked so hard to support the process of democratic reform.
- Working with President Yeltsin, the reformers and the international community, we want to ensure that our assistance is implemented as effectively as possible. Over the past year, we have authorized \$4.5 billion in assistance, including a \$2.5 billion package two months ago.
- The President will stress the need for Russia to respect the autonomy and **territorial integrity of its neighbors**, including the need to withdraw troops from Latvia and Estonia. While recognizing the concerns over the treatment of ethnic Russians in the "near abroad," he will indicate the importance we attach to these issues.
- The President will also take advantage of this opportunity to **broaden our contacts** with other political groups in Russia, but in a way that does not undercut President Yeltsin.

(if asked)

- The President will not meet with Zhirinovskiy during his visit. Based on his past record and public statements, his policies and point of view are completely at odds with the principles that we support -- on human rights or foreign policy, for example. We reject these views, and believe that most Russians do, too.

NATO at the Center of Transatlantic Security

- For nearly half a century, NATO has ensured security for the transatlantic alliance. Now we have the opportunity to **use NATO to ensure post-Cold War security** by drawing the nations of Europe together to achieve their collective security. NATO must remain at the center of Europe's security.
- We have proposed that the NATO Summit launch a new initiative to transform NATO's relations with the militaries of Europe's east, including Russia, Ukraine and central Europe. The "**Partnership for Peace**" is an

important part of an **evolutionary process of NATO expansion.**

- The Partnership will provide a means for Eastern and Western militaries to plan, train, exercise and if necessary operate together. It will be open to all former members of the Warsaw Pact, and neutral and non-aligned nations. It is an inclusive approach to deepening NATO's engagement in the East and embracing Europe's new democracies in the West.
 - We have proposed that the Summit declare that **NATO wants and expects to expand to include new democracies in Europe's East.** Through participation in the Partnership, the new democracies will develop standard operating procedures, the habits of cooperation and the routines of consultation. This will help prepare them for membership down the road.
 - We will also discuss other means of adapting NATO to the new era of security. We have proposed a major new joint NATO effort on **non-proliferation and counter-proliferation.** This can help prevent nuclear, chemical and biological weapons from falling into the hands of rogue states or terrorists. We have also proposed important changes in NATO commands to enable the Alliance to take on new missions if its members choose.
- Q. Is the Partnership for Peace just a way to appease Russian concerns about the expansion of NATO to include central European nations?
- No. The Partnership reflects our best judgment about how to promote security and stability in Europe. It **avoids drawing new and hostile dividing lines in Europe.** Rather than face off across a new line, the Partnership is an evolutionary process that will build a community of democracies throughout Europe.
- Q. What good is NATO, either in its current form or under a new Partnership for Peace, if it cannot address fundamental European problems like Bosnia?
- First, NATO has acted to push ahead the process of a peaceful resolution of the tragedy in Bosnia. NATO has launched joint action to implement the "no-fly zone", to enforce the embargo on Serbia, to threaten air strikes if the strangulation of Sarajevo and other population centers resumes, and to prepare for implementation of a peace agreement if one can be reached. These actions have encouraged the parties to come to the negotiating table for serious discussions, which we hope will bear fruit.
 - Equally important, NATO and the Partnership for Peace can help prevent future crises like Bosnia from developing. It will help foster habits of cooperation and lines of communication that will, in time, help eliminate the causes of such disputes. The Partnership and the changes the President

has proposed in NATO command structures will put NATO in better shape to address new challenges that do arise in the future.

Enhanced Cooperation with the EU

- Our relationship with the European Union has been fundamentally changed by recent developments, allowing us a new opportunity to build a **productive relationship to work to enhanced international economic growth**. This will draw on cooperation we have built through our successful G-7 Summit in Tokyo and our joint work on the GATT Uruguay Round.
 - o Completion of the Uruguay Round -- which dominated our economic dialogue with Europe for much of the past seven years -- coupled with enhanced integration in post-Maastricht Europe and elimination of the overlay of the Cold War has opened new avenues for cooperation.
- The President will use the Summit with the EU to resolve some of the outstanding issues left over from the Uruguay Round. He will also express our **strong support for European integration** and explore means for deepening our relationship with the EU, including foreign policy cooperation.
- The President will also urge the EU to consider new means of providing market opportunities for the nations of Eastern and Central Europe as a means of drawing these nations into the community of Western market democracies.

Drawing Central/Eastern Europe into Community of Democracies

- The President will meet in Prague with the leaders of the so-called Visegrad nations -- the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia -- to **reaffirm our commitment to their independence** and sovereignty and their **inclusion in the Western community of democracies**.
- The people of these countries have taken courageous actions to throw off Communist rule and establish market democracies. We understand their concerns about their own security from external threats, especially if the process of democratic reform goes off-track in the former Soviet states (which we do not expect to happen).
- These concerns were clearly reinforced by the strong showing of ultra-nationalists and Communists in the December election in Russia. We need to persuade these countries to continue to **look to the West with confidence, and not to the East with fear**.

- The President will be discussing with them the importance of the **Partnership for Peace** as an evolutionary step in the expansion of NATO, explaining the ways in which this relationship will benefit their security and urging their active participation.
- He will work with the leaders of these countries to ensure that our **economic assistance and trade** programs are well targeted to provide the greatest possible support as these nations make the very difficult transitions to market economies.

Denuclearization of Former Soviet States

- We have the **historic opportunity to reduce the nuclear threat** by ensuring that all parties to the Lisbon Protocol -- US, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus -- agree to bring the START Treaty into effect and accede to NPT as soon as possible. It will be a safer world if there is only one nuclear successor state to the Soviet Union, rather than four.
- In Minsk, the President will **congratulate Belarus** for agreeing to dismantle their nuclear weapons and abide by the NPT. We are facilitating this process through the allocation of about \$70 million in Nunn-Lugar funds. Belarus officials have reiterated that withdrawal of all strategic missiles from their soil would be completed by 1996.
- **Kazakhstan** has ratified START-I, and we have agreed in principle with them on an umbrella accord for nuclear dismantlement. President Nazarbayev wanted to have this document signed at the Presidential level, and we anticipate that this will occur during a visit to Washington soon. President Nazarbayev has also said that Kazakhstan is ready to accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear state.
- With **Ukraine**, we are continuing the process of trilateral consultation and discussion begun last summer, including through discussions now taking place. We intend to work closely with Ukraine and Russia to help Ukraine meet its declared commitments under the Lisbon Protocol, and implement START I and accede to the NPT as a non-nuclear weapons state at the earliest possible time.
- We have for some time urged Ukraine to include SS-24s in the deactivation process. We welcome reports that the Ukrainian government is in the process of deactivating some of these missiles.

Meeting with President Asad of Syria

Points

- At the end of his trip, the President will meet with President Asad of Syria in Geneva. We consider this meeting critical to the goal of advancing the peace process between Israel and its Arab neighbors, especially with regard to progress on the Israeli-Syrian track. As you are aware, Presidents Nixon, Carter and Bush all met with Asad.
- The meeting will also be an opportunity to discuss bilateral issues and concerns. In every high-level meeting between US and Syrian officials, we have raised the issues of terrorism and human rights. This meeting will be no exception.
- Syria will remain on the list of state sponsors of terrorism as long as it continues to provide support and safehaven to terrorist groups.

Q: Are you concerned about the failure of Rabin and Arafat to reach agreement on the implementation of the Declaration of Principles?

- No. We are in constant touch with Israel and the PLO as well as with other parties who are facilitating the negotiations. Both sides are working hard to reach agreement and both sides seem to be committed to closing the gaps.
- We believe it is very important to reach prompt agreement and proceed with effective implementation so that Israelis and Palestinians can see the tangible benefits of the agreement.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Prague, Geneva)

For Immediate Release

January 16, 1994

PRESS CONFERENCE BY PRESIDENT CLINTON
AND PRESIDENT ASSAD

Intercontinental Hotel
Prague, Geneva

4:15 P.M. (L)

PRESIDENT ASSAD: At the conclusion of the important and constructive talks which were conducted today between President Clinton and myself, I wish to express my deep satisfaction for what these talks have effected in terms of the United States' determination to do all it can in order to bring the peace process to its desired objective, the objective of establishing the just and comprehensive peace in the region through the implementation of the U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242, 338, and 425 as well as the principle of land for peace.

In this respect, I appreciate the fact that not withstanding the great importance that President Clinton attaches to the internal affairs of his country, he has attached a special importance as a full partner and honest intermediary to helping the parties reach a comprehensive peace that is in the interest not only of the peoples of the region, but also the people of the world at large.

Today's meeting between President Clinton and myself came to crown a number of exchanges and telephone communications between us over the last year. I hope that our meeting today will contribute to the realization of the aspirations of the peoples in the region, mainly that this new year will be the year of achieving the just and comprehensive peace which puts an end to the tragedies of violence and wars endured by them for several decades.

During our meeting I had the opportunity to stress to President Clinton Syria's firm commitment to the principles and bases of the peace process, and our strong conviction that peace cannot be genuine and lasting unless it was comprehensive and based on the principles of international legitimacy and justice. This means endeavoring to reach a just solution on all tracks.

Historical evidence, both past and present, have proved that separate peace and partial solutions were not conducive to the establishment of real peace in the region. In this regard, I would like to express my satisfaction that President Clinton himself has committed to the objective of comprehensive peace.

On this basis, we have agreed to work together for the successful efforts aimed at putting an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict and at reaching a genuine and comprehensive peace that enables the peoples of the region to focus on the development, progress and prosperity.

This meeting has also provided us with the opportunity to exchange views over a number of issues including those related to bilateral relations between our countries. We have agreed that the noble objective toward which we are working requires a qualitative move in these relations. We have also discussed questions related to the regional situation as well as

MORE

- 2 -

all matters that might constructively contribute to the achievement of security and stability in the Middle East.

Syria seeks a just and comprehensive peace with Israel as a strategic choice that secures Arab rights, ends the Israeli occupation, and enables all peoples in the region to live in peace, security and dignity. In honor we fought; in honor we negotiate; and in honor we shall make peace. We want an honorable peace for our people and for the hundreds of thousands who paid their lives in defense of the countries and the rights.

There is hardly a home in Syria in which there is no martyr who had fallen in defense of his country, nation and of Arab pride. For the sake of all those, for our sons daughters and families, we want the peace of the brave a genuine peace which can survive and last, a peace which secures the interests of each side and renders to all the rights. If the leaders of Israel have sufficient courage to respond to this kind of peace, the new era of security and stability in which normal peaceful relations among all shall dawn anew. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I believe you could tell from that statement that I have just completed a constructive and encouraging meeting with President Assad.

From the first days of my administration, the achievement of a comprehensive peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principle of territory for peace has been one of my highest foreign policy objectives.

In pursuit of that priority, I have always viewed Syria's involvement as critical. That is why, from the outset of our administration, I have engaged President Assad in a regular correspondence by telephone and letter, and why I'm now pleased to have had this opportunity to hear personally President Assad's views about how best to make this a year of breakthroughs on all fronts.

During our meeting I told President Assad that I was personally committed to the objective of a comprehensive and secure peace that would produce genuine reconciliation among the peoples of the Middle East. I told him of my view that the agreement between Israel and the PLO constituted an important first step by establishing an agreed basis for resolving the Palestinian problem. I also told him that I believe Syria is the key to the achievement of an enduring and comprehensive peace that finally will put an end to the conflict between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

President Assad, as you have just heard, shares this objective: not just an end to war, but the establishment of real and comprehensive peace with Israel that will ensure normal, peaceful relations among good neighbors.

Crucial decisions will have to be made by Syria and Israel if this common objective is to be achieved. That is why President Assad has called for a peace of the brave. And it is why I join him now in endorsing that appeal. Accordingly, we pledged today to work together in order to bring the negotiations that started in Madrid over two years ago to a prompt and successful conclusion.

Critical issues remain to be resolved, especially the questions relating to withdrawal to peace and security -- excuse me -- the question of relating withdrawal to peace and security.

But as a result of our conversation today, I am confident that we laid the foundations for real progress in the negotiations between heads of delegation that will begin again next week in Washington.

MORE

- 3 -

President Assad and I also discussed the state of relations between the United States and Syria, and agreed on the desirability of improving them. This requires honestly addressing the problems in our relationship. Accordingly, we've instructed the Secretary of State and the Syrian Foreign Minister to establish a mechanism to address these issues in detail and openly.

For too long, the Middle East has been denied the benefits of peace. And yet, it is within our power to create the conditions that will enable Israeli and Arab, Muslim, Christian and Jew to live together in peace. Today's meeting was an important step toward fulfilling that vision. We have a lot of work to do, but we are closer to our goal.

Thank you. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, do you feel that you have a firm commitment from President Assad to normalize relations with Israel? And by that I mean open borders, free trade and diplomatic relations.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: The short answer is yes. I believe that President Assad has made a clear, forthright and very important statement on normal, peaceful relations.

Now, in order to achieve those relations, a peace agreement has to be negotiated in good faith and carried out. So -- but this is an important statement; the first time that there has been a clear expression that there will be a possibility of that sort of relationship.

Q Mr. President, it has proven that separate agreements were unsuccessful. And the proof is the Lebanese accords and the Jericho accords. Don't you think that we need a very clear commitment on a comprehensive peace? Then regarding the implementation of U.N. resolutions, regarding Iraq, U.N. resolutions were implemented. But as far as Lebanon and Resolution 425, until now the Security Council resolution is not implemented despite the American approval. So how can this situation be improved? How can we get the commitment to implement these resolutions?

Thank you, sir.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: First of all, as to the specifics of implementation, that will be part of the process of negotiation. But let me answer the first and more important question, I think.

I think all the parties in this process recognize that it cannot succeed unless all the tracks are brought to a successful conclusion. That is, I think even -- President Assad was very eloquent in our meeting today about the question of Lebanon -- and Jordan, for that matter -- in saying that even Syria, if it were fully satisfied with its differences with Israel, that they could be worked out, that there still would have to be a comprehensive peace in which the issues affecting Lebanon, issues affecting Jordan, and the issues relating to the PLO would, in addition to the Syrian issues, would all be resolved. We are all committed to that.

Q This is a question for President Assad. Mr. President, President Clinton is the fourth President that you're now meeting. Do you think you can afford to wait for a fifth one, or have you decided to sign peace now? (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I'm glad you got that question.

Could you repeat the question in Arabic, please?

- 4 -

Q No, I cannot repeat the question in -- (Laughter.) In English. Mr. Assad, President Clinton is the fifth -- fourth American President you're meeting now. Do you think you can afford to wait for a fifth one, or have you decided to sign peace now?

PRESIDENT ASSAD: Yes, we are ready to sign peace now. (Laughter.)

Q President Clinton, beyond the broad assurances that you and President Assad have spoken of here about the willingness to seek peace and to negotiate it, do you have, sir, as a result of these meetings, any of the kinds of specific, detailed concessions, or a sense of willingness to make concessions that might make a successful negotiation possible? And, if so, can you tell us in what areas they are?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, as you know, I have a very strong conviction that the specifics of this agreement will have to be negotiated by the parties themselves. And even though I have in my mind several things, I think that it is very important that those of us who are trying to facilitate these discussions not discuss the details of them. The parties are going to have to work that out.

Let me say that an indication has been given here by the very important statement that President Assad has already made, stating clearly that it is time to end the conflict with Israel, make peace with Israel, that the can peace be -- should lead to normal and peaceful relations. I would hope that this would provoke a positive response in Israel and that then the parties would get together and work these details out. That is not for the United States to dictate.

Q Mr. Clinton, despite the peace negotiations, ever since the Madrid Conference, Israel continues with its policy of settlements in the occupied Arab countries. Although Syria has signed the Nonproliferation Treaty and has been asking for years for the denuclearization of the Middle East as a region, Israel refuses, in fact, to sign and ratify this Nonproliferation Treaty and is still accumulating and amassing weapons. Don't you think, sir, that such practices go counter to the concept of peace for which you are striving? Thank you.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: First, sir, I believe the question of settlements in disputed areas is one of the things that clearly will have to be resolved in connection with this peace process, consistent with United Nations resolutions and the concept of territory for peace. I said that in my opening statement, I expect that to be worked through.

Secondly, on the question of weapons, I believe the best chance we have to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction that include not only nuclear, but also biological and chemical weapons, and, indeed, to slow the sophisticated conventional arms race in the Middle East is to finish this peace process successfully. I think, that is, as a practical matter, the only way to do it -- and the United States will work as hard as we can toward that objective.

Q President Assad, are you clearly stating unequivocally today that in exchange for a full Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights Syria would be prepared to establish normal diplomatic relations with Israel, including open borders, including tourism, the same kind of peace treaty that Israel established with Egypt?

PRESIDENT ASSAD: As we all know, especially the United States of America and President Clinton, we are endeavoring for a comprehensive peace in order for it to be lasting, in order for it to be just. In this context, we are for the achievement of true peace which guarantees the

- 5 -

rights of all, a stable life for all. Here lies the interests of the peoples in the region and the peoples of the world.

Myself and President Clinton completely agreed on these issues, the requirements for peace. We will respond to these requirements. And you know, of course, this will hinge on the discussions and the peace negotiations and not to be solved in a press conference.

Q The U.S.A. is a partner and an honest intermediary. Syria responded favorably in order to achieve this peace process in the interest of the world. Yet, the U.S.A. is still treating Syria in a different manner, different from the manner in which it treats Israel, especially in terms of financial and military aid. How would you explain this, sir?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, as we have made clear, we have had differences over the years with Syria over a number of issues, including our differences over questions relating to certain groups -- the PKK, the Hezbollah, the Jebril group and others -- other issues. We talked about these differences for about an hour today without any view toward trying to resolve them.

We agreed on two things, and I think this is very important. One is that if we can maintain one another's confidence working toward a peaceful solution in the Middle East, that that will do a great deal for our bilateral relations and for a better future. And the second is that we needed to have a process that had integrity, established by the Secretary of State and the Syrian Foreign Minister, that would go beyond public exchanges to a very specific delineation of the differences between us and an honest effort to resolve them or to make progress on them.

So, sir, I think the best answer to your question is that -- that we think that the progress perhaps can be made. We've set up a mechanism to deal honestly with the differences between us, and we believe maintaining each other's confidence by good faith and effort in the Middle East peace process is the most important thing we can do at this moment in our history.

MS. MYERS: We'll take one more.

Q Mr. President, the subject is so close to your heart, but you evaded answering whether you felt that Israel should sign the Nonproliferation Treaty. But my real question is, did you discuss and set a timetable for Israeli and Syrian troops to come out of Lebanon?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: We did not have any discussions today about the details of any phase of the Middle East peace process because the other parties are not here present, and it would not have been an appropriate thing to do.

Q (Inaudible) --

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Excuse me. I got one of those helpful little hints from one of my staff members down here. I apologize to interrupt you. I want to be perfectly forthright, because I don't want to leave a false impression that might be adversely interpreted against President Assad.

We did discuss the importance of having the Lebanese peace process go on parallel to the Israeli-Syrian process. I reaffirmed my support for the Taif Accords, and President Assad agreed that there should be a successful conclusion of the peace process which left Lebanon free and independent as a nation. So there was no difference between us on the objective. And I didn't want anything I said to be read unfairly against him on that score. We actually, I think, reached complete meeting of the minds. (Laughter.)

MORE

- 6 -

Q In my view, on the 15th of September at the White House, you called for a bigger Syrian role in the peace process and you -- on His Excellency President Assad to play a personal role in forging ahead a breakthrough in the peace process. Now that you've met President Assad face-to-face for the first time, what is your impression of President Assad and how do you view his personal role in achieving that breakthrough?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, first of all, I had heard a lot about President Assad's legendary stamina in these meetings. (Laughter.) And when we called a break four hours and 20 minutes into our meeting, I can tell you that his reputation does not exceed the reality; he deserves every bit of it.

Secondly, we had the opportunity -- because we did talk for so long, we had the opportunity to exchange not only our views about the issues in play at present, but also I had the opportunity to learn President Assad's perspective over a period exceeding 20 years now on some of these issues. And it reinforced my belief as expressed in September that there would be no comprehensive peace in the Middle East unless he were willing to take a leadership role; and that he has decided to take the risks that all these leaders, if they really want peace, are going to have to take.

And so I guess I would have to say that that is the most important thing to me, the thing that was most impressive. I believe that he is committed to trying to work through this as quickly as possible. And I think others will see that commitment and will respond in an appropriate way.

Q President Clinton, peace is an international issue, the U.S. administration is striving seriously to achieve peace. It is an international need, it's a need for the USA and Syria and Israel. One wonders why the peace process tumbles every now and then. And how will the U.S. administration, as the major sponsor of the peace process, tackle obstacles bound to face us in the future? Thank you.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: First of all, I think it tumbles every now and then because it's difficult to do. If it were easy to do it would have been done before. The parties have been at odds for a long time. There is a lot of mistrust to overcome. There are a lot of details to be worked out. And whenever there is any ambiguity at all or uncertainty, then that is likely to lead to other problems down the road. So there are lots of reasons why it happens.

What the United States is trying to do is to take advantage of what I think is an appropriate moment in history when you have leaders committed to getting this done -- leaders who understand that the interests of their people will be served over the long run by comprehensive peace -- and so what we can do, I think, is to try to keep the process going, keep the trust level up among the parties, try to be an honest broker and work through the problems. And when these difficulties do arise, as they have, as you implied, in the aftermath of the PLO-Israel Accord, to try to help work through them as quickly as possible and get things back on track.

Thank you very much.

END

4:44 P.M. (L)

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. draft	Correction to Pool Report from Jazz Club [partial] (1 page)	01/13/1994	b(7)(E)
------------	---	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Office of Press and Communication (Crowley, Philip J. (PJ))
OA/Box Number: 3460

FOLDER TITLE:

POTUS Trip to Brussels, Belgium; Prague, Czech Republic; Moscow, Russia; Kiev, Ukraine; Minsk, Belarus; and Geneva, Switzerland (January 8-16, 1994) [5]

2017-0413-F
sb2293

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

Correction to Pool Report from Jazz Club

(b)(7)e

001

Ann McFeatters

January 11, 1994
Pool Report #19
Prague/ Jazz Club

(b)(7)e

001

Meanwhile, back to the Golden Tiger pub. The Kopold family -- the Kopold are Jirina and Bedrich (the husband). Local AP reporter said they have been extensively written about because her mother, Maria Svernova, was a founder of the Czech Communist Party. She was the one who showed Clinton around 24 years ago today, according to her diary. Apparently, the Kopolds thought the Bush campaign was interested in this nugget in 1992.

The White House people would not let the pool into the Jazz Club and refused even VOA's David Borgida's request for a 30-second soundbite of the music. We later heard that Czech radio was allowed in and aired some of the sound. According to White House TV, which was allowed in, Clinton played "Summertime" and "My Funny Valentine."

Ted Koppel, who is doing Nightline on the trip all week, said after he interviewed Clinton in the Jazz Club that the president was given a saxophone. Or, in the parlance of the mayor of Brussels, an instrument of sax. Friendly showed it to the pool before putting it in the motorcade. Koppel said Clinton said that a new instrument is hard to play and tends to play sharp. But the White House steno inside for the Koppel interview said Clinton got a standing ovation after he performed onstage, with his eyes mostly closed, a true sign he was jamming..

For the curious and the thirsty, Clinton said he had two Pilsners and said that was his limit. The pool was curious about his allergies in the smoky club. Smokers who came out said it was not bad; non-smokers said visibility was about 30 percent. Secret Service Agent Dave had to come out for some fresh air, however, and everytime somebody left, the smell of smoke wafted by.

The club is on Narodni Street, where the Velvet revolution started Nov. 17, 1989. A student was supposedly shot and killed, but it turned out to be untrue. Havel invited about 75 well-known artistic types from around Prague to the Club. Earlier at the Tiger pub, at 17 Husova Street in Old Town. Dr. Bohumil Hrabal, a well-known writer born in 1914, was the most famous person in the pub when Clinton and Havel arrived.

Above the Reduta Club is a purple neon sign of Batman. In case you wondered, they serve beer and warm drinks and take Master Card and American Express. (The pool got very cold and very bored.)

Ann McFeatters

January 11, 1994

Pool Report #18

Walk On the Bridge and Pub Call-Prague

There was a US flag on top of the Castle--to correct an earlier pool report. Before Clinton and Havel went on their walk, they issued a joint statement which you heard in the press room. Havel said, "The Czech Republic is welcoming the Partnership For Peace. We are ready to implement immediately in concrete terms. We are eager to exhibit our goodwill and cooperate with our neighbors."

Asked if he is worried about the nationalist movement in Russia, he said, "We believe the development in the Russian Federation is extremely complex, very painful. We believe we will see even in the Russian Federation democratization and market economy." They walked along the famous Charles Bridge with an incredible entourage of about 80 photographers. Clinton and Havel walked with Madeleine Albright and a translator who talked about each statue. The name of the street they walked on, shaking hands with people along the way is Mostecka Street. It is a narrow cobblestone street and Secret Service agents walked ahead of them making sure that people hanging out their windows closed them before the President came by.

Clinton did 2 interviews with Brokaw and Rather on the Bridge. As he walked by a Dixie Land Band on a street below the bridge was playing "Can't Give You Anything But Love Baby". Havel and Clinton walked to a pub called "the Golden Tiger", one of Prague's best known pubs. He met an elderly couple whose last name is Kopold. Her mother Clinton said, showed him around Prague 24 years ago today. He said, "24 years ago today, you can't beat it!" Their son, Jan, played basketball with Clinton. But, Jan has since then been killed.

In the pub Clinton drank a Pilsner beer, next to Madeleine Albright. They were then fed breaded veal--huge hunks of breaded veal. Which Clinton said was wonderful. They were in the pub for about 45 minutes. The pubs' regular customers were invited to sit with him. Clinton said that President Havel had found the Kopolds for him and brought them to the pub so Clinton could meet with them.

There were pictures of tigers on the wall. Clinton said, "When I knew I was coming here I wanted to walk across the bridge and I wanted to see you." He kissed Mrs. Kopold on both cheeks.

Clinton was very animated at the pub and seemed to want to make sure that everyone had a good time. He also beckoned waiter to bring food for the Kopolds sitting across from him. He said "Get some food for these people". After leaving the pub Clinton went to a jazz club. More later.....

Ann McFeatters
Scripps Howard

Pool report #17

1/11/94.

Waiting for Clinton and Havel at Charles Bridge.

Pool held on historic Charles Bridge, closed off to normal pedestrian traffic, from 5 pm until Clinton and Havel's arrival shortly after 7:30. The 15th century bridge is notable for 30 baroque statues, each of them floodlit for tonight's walk-through. The most famous statue depicts St. Jan Nepomuk, a 16th century priest who was tortured and, according to local legend, tossed in the Vltava River from the very spot where his statue now stands. (Havel and Clinton stopped in front of statue on walk later.)

On the Mala Strana (lesser town) side of the bridge, beneath the Hradcany Castle where the walk began, a group of 25 American teenagers from the International School of Prague had been assembled to cheer the presidents. They were quite media-savvy -- the children of executives and international lawyers and, in one case, southern Baptist missionaries.

Typical quotes:

"I see he's running fashionably late."

"Yeah," said another, "It's Clinton time."

A girl who said she'd prefer to speak off the record.

At the other end of the bridge, on the Old Town side, ropes held back another crowd of several hundred at the bridge entrance. A young Czech man, standing near the front, said he was glad Clinton had come and that he "cares about our security." Asked to elaborate he declined. Asked for his name, he said "Pavel." Asked for a surname, he said, "Just put down Pavel F -- full stop."

Bridge itself deserted except for handful of Czech police, White House advance, Dan Rather and crew, Tom Brokaw and crew, Ted Koppel and crew. On the Old Town side of bridge, a large vertical banner suspended from a derrick, says "Coca Cola Vitejte! President Clinton Praze."

Jon Sawyer

St. Louis Post-Dispatch

POOL REPORT #22
January 12, 1994

A Polish President Lech Walesa was next to see the president in the wood paneled Embassy study.

"Has he convinced you yet to join the Partnership for Progress?" Walesa was asked.

"The president has many ways of convincing me," Walesa replied.

Helen Thomas then broke in to say that the pool had heard that President Walesa was being a "reluctant dragon," a phrase that seemed to bemuse him and his interpreter.

"We're going to talk about that later," the president replied. "but a dragon nonetheless."
Wilbur Landrey, St. Petersburg Times.

An addendum: An NSC background briefing on some of the substance of the bilaterals with Hungary and Poland was taking place during the changeover between your poolers. The following is the substance of the first part of the briefing. It is to be fervently hoped that any gaps in the briefing will be filled by the next round of poolers.

According to the briefers, the President's goal during the meetings was designed to make three key points:

- 1). Making very clear to the Visegrad countries that the U.S. has a vital interest in their future;
- 2). Stressing to them that participation in Partnership for Peace is a step towards full NATO membership. But as the White House official put it, "There was no hint of an explicit security guarantee." He went on to say, "There were no promises, no criteria and no timetable [for NATO membership]. But we are stressing a clear link to membership down the road.
- 3). There was also a discussion of new U.S. initiatives in the economic and social area toward these countries. One example given is to restructure some of the current assistance programs to point them less towards aiding privatization and instead putting more emphasis on fostering the creation of "a social safety net." Sounding a bit like a Clinton primer on how to grow the American economy, the official said that the U.S. would be helping these nations create programs for worker retraining, etc. Don't get too excited, though. The official stressed that the U.S. would be providing "more know-how than money."

At this exciting juncture, the changeover between pools occurred.

Walter Shapiro, Esquire

January 12, 1994

Prague Pool Report #21

President left the hotel at 8:13 AM for the old Jewish cemetery where the motorcade arrived at 8:20 AM. He first visited the Pinkas Synagogue where a memorial to the victims of the Holocaust was opened after World War II. Their names are inscribed on the wall. Afterwards he walked through the cemetery itself, guided by Jaroslav Safranek who explained that the 12,000 graves there are in 14 layers dating back to the 15th century.

In 40 degree weather the President was without a top coat, wearing only his dark suit and for the occasion a gray yarmulka. The walk took about 10 minutes, and afterwards the motorcade left for the US Embassy.

Richard Schifter, the special assistant to the President and counselor on National Security Council accompanied the President on the visit to the cemetery. Schifter's parents died in Poland during the holocaust.

"On the way over we talked about the holocaust," Schifter said. "The relevance is that there are no burial places of the holocaust and the cemetery stands for the remembrance of the culture that existed in this part of the world for half a millenium and was wiped out in 2 or 3 years, between 1941 and 1944." "There was no question that the President was moved. He put this on his schedule himself and that is significant."

At the embassy the President's first appointment was at 9 AM with Hungarian President Arpad Gones. During the photo op the President was asked if Gones was going to sign on to the Partnership For Peace.

"I hope so," the President said. We haven't talked yet. Asked about aid to Hungary, the President added "We are going to talk about that."

Wilbur Landrey
St. Petersburg Times

Pool Report No. 20, Jan. 12

Visit to the Jewish Cemetery in Prague.

President arrived about 8:15. Went first to the Pinkas Synagogue, the second-oldest at the edge of the cemetery, which is now a Holocaust museum. He was given a book, which he passed on to aides. Wearing a grey yarmulke with black fringe, he went inside the sanctuary with Rabbi Karel Sidon, who was wearing a black hat. Through guide and translator Jaroslav Safranek the rabbi explained the history of the building and the ongoing project of inscribing on the walls the names of the 77,297 Jews from Bohemia and Moravia (Czech Republic, not including Slovakia as the White House fact sheet would lead you to believe) who were killed by the Nazis. The names had been inscribed once before, in the 1950s, but after the Six Day War, Czechoslovakia broke relations with Israel, closed the synagogue and plastered over the names.

Safranek said there are now 1,320 'registered' members of the Jewish community in Prague. That compares to 30,000 in the city before World War II.

Clinton, who was wearing a gray suit and no overcoat, nodded, said almost nothing except to ask about the bima, the stand in the middle of the sanctuary where rabbis once conducted services. The president repeatedly checked that his yarmulke was still on his head. Most of the conversation was inaudible, as the synagogue, with its arched ceilings, had the acoustics of a cave.

In the photo op was the artist doing the inscriptions, Michaela Pokova. She showed Clinton the list of names she was working from. Also accompanying Clinton was Dick Schifter of the NSC staff, whose parents were killed by the Nazis, and another man.

After 10 minutes, the group headed outside to the cemetery.

Clinton spent another 12 minutes being guided along a twisting path through the cemetery by Safranek. The cemetery is a jumble of headstones that were erected between 1389 and 1787. Many are leaning, almost on top of each other, many with chipped corners. The handouts have more material on the cemetery. Bare-limbed trees and the brooding shapes of neighboring buildings added to the somber mood. "More than 90,000 people were buried here," Safranek told Clinton, pointing as he described various headstones. There are 12,000 headstones and pieces of headstones in the cemetery; in some places, the dead are buried 12 deep.

Safranek pointed out the sarcophagus of Lady Hindel Bashevi, a rich woman of the 17th century who cared for the poor of the ghetto. Another important sarcophagus was that of Rabbi Jehuda Levi Ben Bezalel.

They also discussed the legend of the Golem, which was created by one of the Prague rabbis buried in the cemetery.

Clinton was out by 8:42.

Steve Komarow, USA Today
Paul Richter, LA Times

January 12, 1994

Prague

ADDENDUM TO POOL REPORT #23A

At lunch with Visograd leaders, Clinton sat with Albright on his left and Christopher on his right. Christopher was awake. Asked how things were going, Clinton replied "So far, so good."

Asked what was on the menu, Clinton looked down at the menu and said, "Tuna and shitake mushrooms." then he laughed and added, "part of our global outreach to the Japanese."

Helen asked why there was no Eastern European food such as kielbasa. Your pool thought the President looked rueful: "No kielbasa."

Ken "Kielbasa" Walsh
US News and World Report

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Kiev, Ukraine)

For Immediate Release

January 12, 1994

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT CLINTON
AND PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK

Kiev Airport
Kiev, Ukraine

9:50 P.M. (L)

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: Ladies and gentlemen, let me open this news conference and give the word to the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Thank you very much. I have just completed my first meeting with President Kravchuk, and I am delighted that we have met under such promising and historic circumstances. I was also delighted to be able to wish the President a happy 60th birthday on this auspicious occasion.

President Kravchuk, President Yeltsin and I are ready to sign on Friday an agreement committing Ukraine to eliminate 176 intercontinental ballistic missiles and some 1,500 nuclear warheads targeted at the United States. This breakthrough will enhance the security of Ukraine, the United States, Russia, and the entire world.

Ukraine is a nation with a rich heritage, enormous economic potential and a very important position in European security. The ties between our two nations have deep roots. From America's birth to the present day, Ukrainian immigrants have helped to shape my nation's history.

Our meeting this evening begins a new era in our relations. The agreement President Kravchuk and I will sign with President Yeltsin opens the door to new forms of economic, political and security cooperation. Our meeting tonight centered on three important issues. First, we discussed the strategic importance

First, we discussed the strategic importance for this region and the world of the nuclear agreement. I commend President Kravchuk for his courage and his vision in negotiating this agreement.

Second, I was able to issue a personal invitation to Ukraine to participate fully in the Partnership For Peace launched at this week's NATO Summit. By providing for specific and practical cooperation between NATO and Ukrainian states and their forces, this Partnership can foster an integration of a broader Europe and increase the security of all nations. I'm very pleased by the expression of interest in participating that came from President Kravchuk and his government today.

Third, President Kravchuk and I agreed today to expand and enhance the economic ties between our nations. This is a difficult time of transition for Ukraine, but Ukraine is blessed with abundant natural resources and human talent. Because so many of its neighbors are moving toward market economies and democracy as well, I believe Ukraine's most promising future lies with reform and with integration with those burgeoning economies.

MORE

To assist in the reform effort, I am today announcing the establishment of an enterprise fund for Ukraine, as well as Belarus and Moldova, a fund which will help to capitalize new small businesses and provide assistance to existing firms that seek to privatize.

Over the last year the United States has also provided \$155 million in assistance to Ukraine. We are prepared to increase our support substantially as Ukraine moves toward economic reform. Under such circumstances, I also believe the international community would be able to provide significant support and investment to Ukraine, and I am prepared to work hard to see that that support and investment comes to pass.

To begin this work, we will be pleased to welcome to Washington later this month a senior Ukrainian economic delegation. I believe that Ukraine can play a major role in the future of Europe, a Europe whose security is not based on divisions, but on the possibility of integration based on democracy, market economics and mutual respect for the existing borders of nations.

I'm looking forward to seeing President Kravchuk in Moscow on Friday and to welcoming him to Washington for an official visit in March. I want to thank the people of Ukraine for having me here and treating me so warmly, if only briefly. And I would like to close by asking the President permission to come back and actually see the beautiful city of Kiev at some other time. I have sampled its wonderful food and I'm now ready for the sights.

Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to greet the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton, and his accompanying persons in Ukraine. I'm sorry that this visit is quite short, but I hope and I'm confident that Mr. President will be able to visit Ukraine once again, so to say, in a full-scale and will be able to show him the Ukraine as it is. And I invite you, Mr. President, to visit Ukraine whenever it is convenient for you.

This is a short visit, a few hours only, but to my mind it is worth several days of negotiations if it's taken into consideration the wide range of issues which have been discussed. And we would be glad to inform the world that those problems were worth its attention.

I think the most urgent problem and the most important problem for the whole world now is the problem of nuclear weapons. And we have approached its solution. And I'm sure that this day and the forthcoming days open the way for the world for disarmament and for the elimination of nuclear weapons. And Ukraine will be committed to its obligations and Ukraine will be the state which will not stand in the way to disarmament.

A lot of time was devoted to discussing the bilateral relations between the Ukraine and the United States. And I'm glad that the President of the United States and the United States support our country in this time of our hardships. And I'm sure that this sort of cooperation and support is real support of all independent states which have emerged on the basis of the former Soviet Union.

I'm sure that the charter for cooperation and friendship between our states, which is now being finished up by our experts, will be a new stage in the development of our relations. For us, it is very important that there is an understanding from the part of the President of the United States of urgency of the support to Ukraine in carrying out its economic reform and support its reforming processes. I am happy that the President of the United States will support our country in such

MORE

- 3 -

international financial structures as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, European Bank for the Reconstruction and Development.

We understand that we have to be decisive in carrying out reforms, and we are ready for that. And we are happy with the development of our trade relations and that new prospects are opening up.

We support the initiative of the United States, its program which is called the Partnership For Peace, which we consider to be the universal formula which enables the participation of all countries. We understand that this program does not solve all the problems of security, but anyhow, it gives the possibility of all states to participate.

I'd like to greet once again Mr. President here in the Ukraine, and I would like to point out that in all issues we have discussed we have found joint, common viewpoints. This meeting was short, but it was very important and fruitful and it opened a new stage in the development of Ukrainian-American relations, which I am confident will be long-term and reliable.

Thank you for your attention.

If you don't mind, Mr. President, I'll have the office now of the Press Secretary. (Laughter.) I give the possibility to ask questions of our guests, American journalists.

Q What exactly must your Parliament now do to ratify this agreement? And exactly how long will it take for Ukraine to become a nonnuclear nation?

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: You know, the philosophers say that everything changes in the world, even you cannot step in the same river twice. So I hope that our Parliament becomes cleverer in the course of its life and it sees the reality of the present days, and it will understand the essence of these relations and the wish of the three states. And when they will understand it, they will support the implementation of these agreements.

Q Ukraine sympathizes with you and your wife, Hillary, but anyhow, there's a question here. There is a decision of the Parliament, the Ukrainian Parliament on disarmament. According to mass media, you told that there will be a financial technological assistance. But your words were that you will render technical assistance. Is that true?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, I will attempt to answer the question as I understand it. First of all, Ukraine is already due some compensation for the tactical nuclear weapons it has already dismantled. And I have discussed with the President the quickest way of reaching an agreement on how much is due and how it can be delivered.

Secondly, under the so-called Nunn-Lugar bill, Ukraine is entitled to a substantial amount of money to help to dismantle the offensive strategic nuclear weapons, which can be used for not only dismantling the weapons, but for some of the defense conversion needs of Ukraine as well.

But over and above that, the United States is committed to rendering economic assistance to Ukraine to help start new enterprises, to help fund privatization, and to help make this painful transition to a new economy. And we are further committed to helping convince other nations and the international financial institutions to help as well.

Finally, as part of our agreement, of course, Ukraine will be compensated for the highly enriched uranium that is a part of nuclear weapons. And that is a strictly commercial

MORE

- 4 -

arrangement because that uranium can be turned into fuel rods for commercial purposes and electric power plants.

Q Thank you, and happy birthday, President Kravchuk. President Clinton, as President of the United States you do not have the luxury at home to ignore events overseas, and perhaps the reverse is true. Former President Carter was one today who came out and suggested the time had come for an independent counsel to take a look at the Morgan Guaranty Savings and Loan situation. He and many other Democrats are looking to you for an indication of whether that's appropriate. Is it?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: I have nothing to say about that on this trip, except that they have been -- most of them have been denied the facts that are already in the public record before they made their comment, largely as a result of the way this thing has been discussed. But I have nothing else to say about that.

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: Thank you for your greetings, and I'd like to note that there is a gentleman sitting over here who mentioned the wife of Mr. President, Hillary. So, once again, I would like to give a word to a woman. And I hope I'll receive another portion of greetings.

Q Sometimes financial programs, but they elect implementors. Where's the guarantee that these programs will be implemented?

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: If this is a question to me, I would answer that the guarantees are inside the Ukraine. The way we work, the way they will have the attitude to us. So these are the guarantees.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: If I might add just one point. Sometimes in discussions with nations, financial guarantees do not materialize because they are dependent on decisions made by other parties, usually the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund. In this case, every part of our agreement depends only upon the three Presidents and their governments to keep their word. And I told -- the first thing I said to President Kravchuk tonight is that I would do everything I could to make sure that all three of us did exactly what was in the agreement. And I am confident that we will.

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: I'm sorry, as a Press Secretary I would ask for some more questions, but here is a protocol, so the last question, please.

Q Mr. President, Mr. President Clinton, you mentioned the PFP, the Partnership For Peace. And there are some people who say that Russia has been using a type of passive imperialism in order to keep countries of Eastern Europe and Central Europe out of NATO for the time being. Do you -- by threatening destabilization. Do you agree with that? And I would be very interested in what President Kravchuk has to say.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: No, I don't. The short answer to the question is, I do not agree with that, although President Yeltsin himself has expressed reservations about NATO membership for other countries if Russia is excluded. You know, he has expressed an interest in being a member himself.

The leaders of NATO concluded that they should not offer membership at this time to any country because they weren't sure any country was ready to assume the responsibilities of membership and because they didn't want to exclude anyone else.

The Partnership For Peace offers a genuine concrete military security cooperation -- joint planning, joint training, joint operations -- to all the former states -- all the state of the former Soviet Union and to all of the members of what was the

MORE

- 5 -

Warsaw Pact. And we are genuinely interested in reaching out to all these nations.

I can assure you that no one has a veto over NATO membership. It is anticipated that the Partnership For Peace will lead to NATO membership for many of those who participate in the Partnership who want to go through and assume the responsibilities of membership, ultimately.

That's how I see it. President Yeltsin only said that he didn't, at this time, want another line drawn across Europe, he wanted to have a chance to be part of an integrated European security network in which every nation would have to respect the territorial boundaries of every other state.

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: Mr. President Clinton, and I'll give one more question to the Ukrainian side.

Q The question to President Clinton: What assurances of security will the United States give and Russia give to Ukraine after it will have the nonnuclear status?

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Well, first of all, what goes with the Nonproliferation Treaty adherence is the absolute security that no one who has nuclear weapons will ever use them against any nation that is part of the NPT. That is the first security.

But let me make two other points, which I think are more important at least as a practical matter to Ukraine's security. Number one, the Partnership For Peace gives Ukraine the opportunity to work with the military forces of the United States and all of NATO in planning and working together and in establishing patterns of conduct which clearly will increase the security of this nation.

Second, and perhaps even more important, Ukraine's decision to become a nonnuclear state opens the possibility of receiving significant economic assistance not just from the United States, but from the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the G-7 nations and other nations who understand the greatness of this nation, its strategic importance and its economic potential. And I believe that in the 21st century, it will be difficult for any nation to be secure unless it is economically strong.

So perhaps that is the most important thing of all -- the whole range of possibilities that are now open to Ukraine because of this courageous decision by the President.

PRESIDENT KRAVCHUK: Ladies and gentlemen, we would compensate what we haven't time to do, when we'll be implementing our program. And you will be compensated with an objective description of the role and the processes in Ukraine. And now the best thing for us to do is to wish Mr. President Clinton bon voyage.

PRESIDENT CLINTON: Let me say this in closing: If he did not have such a very important job, I would invite President Kravchuk to the United States to run my press conferences. (Laughter and applause.)

END

10:30 P.M. (L)

TOTAL P.005

The White House
Office of the Press Secretary

January 13, 1994
For Immediate Release

Contact: Jeff Eller
202-456-2566

*** MEDIA ADVISORY ***

The President's Health Security Act will be the focus as Clinton administration officials participate in a variety of activities in January. Those activities will include town hall meetings, hearings, forums and conferences. A schedule of these events follows for January. This schedule can and will be updated. Please check with contacts listed below for confirmation.

JANUARY PUBLIC EVENTS

January 13

VA Institute of Management Accountants, Northern Virginia
Chapter Meeting
7:00pm
Tysons Corner Marriott
contact: Shirley Bass 703 819-9179
Administration Representative: Glenn Hutchins, Senior Policy
Analyst, Small Business Administration

January 14

VA Smart Card Forum's Health Care Access Card Symposium
Ritz-Carlton Hotel, Tysons Corner
9:15am
contact: Joe Krysztoforski 410 527-5517
Administration Representative: Jon Silva, Agency for
Research and Policy Analysis, DOD

January 15

TX National Medical Association Health Coalition Regional
Meeting
Houston
contact: Rosemary Davis 202 347-1895
Administration Representative: Dr. Risa Lavisso-Mourey,
Deputy Administrator for the Agency of Health Care Planning
and Research, HHS

NY Rep. Louise Slaughter
10:00am Greece Town Hall Meeting
1:30pm Rochester Town Hall Meeting, Douglas Middle School
3:00pm Perinton Town Hall Meeting
contact: Tom Bantle 202 225-3615
Administration Representative: Judy Feder, Deputy Assistant
Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS

January 17

DC Washington Employee Benefits Forum Luncheon Meeting
12:30 pm, The Capitol Hilton
contact: Brian O'Hare 212-698-2500
Administration Representative: Gary Claxton, Senior Policy
Analyst, HHS

January 19

WA Rep. Jolene Unsoeld Town Hall Meetings in Vancouver and
Olympia
contact: Paul Elliot 202 225-3536
Administration Representative: Dena Puskin, Deputy Director,
Office of Rural Health, HHS

January 20

VT Senators Patrick Leahy and James Jeffords .
Town Hall Meeting
contact: Mark Powden 202 224-5141
Administration Representative: Leon Panetta, Director,
Office of Management and Budget (tentative)

DC Executive Enterprises, Inc.
Conference on "Health Care Alliances: Creating and Managing
Integrated Delivery Systems"
Sheraton Carlton Hotel
contact: Amy Zagin 212 645-7880
Administration Representative: Walter Zelman, Senior Policy
Analyst, HHS

DC Women's Bar Association of Washington, D.C.
contact: Sandra Smith Bjork 703 648-8987
Administration Representative: Kathleen Hastings, Legal
Medicine Program Director, Agency for Health Care Policy
Research, HHS

January 21

PA Reps. George Gekas, William Goodling, Robert Walker
Columbia Institute Pennsylvania Conference on Health Care
8:30am
Wildwood Conference Center in Harrisburg
contact: Alan Gagnoli 202 225-4315

Administrative Representative: Ira Magaziner, Senior Advisor
to the President for Policy Development

January 22

FL Rep. Carrie Meek
Town Hall Meeting in Dade County
10-12pm
Opalaca Neighborhood Senior Center in Miami
16405 NW 25th Avenue
contact: Marsha Runnigen 205 225-4506
Administration Representative: Robyn Stone, Senior Policy
Analyst, HHS

January 25

DC The National Association of Manufacturers and the
Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans
Conference on "Business Health Solutions"
1:15-1:45pm
Mayflower Hotel
contact: Sharon Canner 202 637-3124
Administration Representative: Lloyd Bentsen, Secretary of
the Treasury (tentative)

January 27

VA Virginia Aerospace Business Roundtable Forum on Health
Reform
12:00-2:00pm
Holiday Inn in Hampton, Virginia
contact: Mary Jane Ledford 804 865-0900
Administration Representative: Jonathan Silver, Assistant
Deputy Secretary, Department of Commerce

CA Queen's Bench Annual Judges Dinner
San Francisco
contact: Janice Sperrow 415 677-7653
Administration Representative: Kathleen Hastings, Legal
Medicine Program Director, Agency for Health Care Policy
Research, HHS

CA California Women Lawyers Health Care Task Force
San Francisco
contact: Janice Sperrow 415 677-7653
Administration Representative: Kathleen Hastings, Legal
Medicine Program Director, Agency for Health Care Policy
Research, HHS

January 29

VA Congressman L.F. Payne Annual Meeting of the Advisory
Committee of the University of Virginia Medical Alumni
morning Ritz-Carlton Hotel at Pentagon City in Arlington
contact: Ellis Woodward 202 225-4711
Administration Representative: Judy Feder, Deputy Assistant
Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS

-30-30-30-

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 13, 1993

**PRESIDENT CLINTON NAMES WILLIAM GINSBERG AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AT DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

President Clinton today announced his intention to nominate William W. Ginsberg as Assistant Secretary for Economic Development at the Department of Commerce.

"William Ginsberg's experience and commitment to economic development will serve him well in this new post. I am pleased to name him to our team," the President said.

Since 1990, Ginsberg has served as president of Science Park Development Corporation, a private, independent, not-for-profit corporation co-sponsored by business, Yale University and the State of Connecticut. As part of its efforts to promote development-stage technology businesses, the corporation is currently working to develop a high-technology research and business park in an abandoned inner-city site in Connecticut.

Ginsberg, a resident of New Haven, is also president of the Board of Directors of the Association of University Related Research Parks, an international organization.

Prior to his work with Science Park, Ginsberg served as Development Administrator for the City of New Haven, Connecticut (1984-88) and as Executive Director of the New Haven Redevelopment Agency (1987 - 88). Ginsberg served as an attorney with Webster & Sheffield in New York City from 1980 - 84.

Ginsberg earned a B.A. from Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut in 1976 and a J.D. from Columbia University School of Law in 1980. He is married to Ellen Kelly Ginsberg and the couple have two children.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S TRIP TO BRUSSELS, PRAGUE, MOSCOW, MINSK AND GENEVA

— REPORT by Tom Raum, AP, based on pre-advance trip Dec. 12-19, 1993 —

FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

OVERVIEW: President Clinton attends a NATO summit and meets with European Union officials in Brussels (Jan. 9-11); visits the Czech Republic and while in Prague also meets with the heads of state of Hungary, Poland and Slovakia (Jan. 11-12); visits Moscow for a summit with President Boris Yeltsin (Jan. 12-15); goes to Minsk in Belarus (Jan. 15); and meets in Geneva with President Hafez al-Assad of Syria. Hillary Rodham Clinton and possibly Chelsea join him in Russia on Friday Jan. 14 and are with him for the rest of the trip.

GENERAL NOTES. The bulk of the trip is taking place north of the 50th parallel (Newfoundland) in the dead of winter, so expect it to be cold and dark. (Night comes at about 4 p.m. in Brussels, Prague, Minsk and Moscow.) Temperatures in Brussels will probably be about 10 degrees colder than average for Washington in January; Prague about 12 degrees colder; Moscow and Minsk colder still. Wear warm clothes. For Moscow and Minsk, especially, you should consider parkas, duck boots or the equivalent. Expect snow and slush.

PHONES. By now you will have signed up the credential forms and indicated how many phones you would like at each stop. There will be usual AT&T phones available in most filing centers. Good existing ground lines will be used in Brussels and Geneva. A satellite dish will be brought in for Prague and Moscow. Filing from Minsk will be difficult - with only a few direct-to-U.S.-satellite phones - to be used on priority basis by those who need them most. There will be some voice phones connecting Minsk to the United States via Moscow Filing Center - to be used on a priority basis by those who need them the most (wires, etc). The good news is that the Minsk stop occurs early in the morning Saturday EST, so there will be more filing time in Geneva.

All White House filing center phones throughout the trip can accept incoming calls. Most of the press hotels (except Prague and Geneva) have modular jacks that can be used with computers. (You may need to use a splitter, and set the computer to manual). AT&T Direct is available in most press hotels. However, the Metropal in Moscow has a separate deal with Sprint.

Here, from AT&T's Ellis Kitchen, is a rough breakdown of filing-center phone costs:

BRUSSELS - \$100 per phone

PRAGUE - \$800-\$1,000 per phone

MOSCOW - \$800-\$1,000 per phone

GENEVA - \$300 per phone

In the cities with satellite dishes (Prague, Moscow), the high cost per phone is offset by the fact that the phones then become local numbers (probably with a 703 area code). So calls to bureaus or families in the Washington area, in essence, are local calls.

AT&T USA Direct - a local call puts you in touch with a U.S. operator in the states - at a fraction of the cost of calling from your hotel. Works for both voice and data calls.

BRUSSELS: 078-11-0010

PRAGUE: 00-420-00101

MOSCOW: 155-5042

GENEVA: 155-00-11

ELECTRICAL CURRENT: The same converter throughout our trip - one with two prongs. It's the basic European plug. The power in most places is 220 volts. Most computers can handle that. But you may require a transformer (usually part of converter kits) to step that down to the U.S.-familiar 110 volts for other devices. Hotel rooms in the beginning of the trip (Brussels, Prague) have built-in hair dryers. Not so in Prague and Moscow.

DRINKING THE WATER: Probably OK in Brussels and Geneva; be wary anywhere else.

SUMMARY SCHEDULE The White House was nearing release of a preliminary schedule. Thus, this, based on earlier information that may no longer be accurate, just hits the high points. *FYI: Brussels, Prague and Geneva are EST +6, Minsk is EST +7, Moscow is EST +8*

SATURDAY, Jan 8

9 a.m. EST (approx) Press charter leaves. getting to Brussels about 10 p.m. (local)

11 p.m. (approx) Clinton leaves Andrews on Air Force One.

SUNDAY, Jan 9

Noon (approx) (6 a.m. EST) Air Force One arrives Brussels. King Albert II greets Clinton at an airport arrival ceremony. Clinton and the king will then go to Laeken Palace. Soon thereafter, Clinton will have a bilateral with Belgian prime minister Jean-Luc Dehaene.

6 p.m. rough (noon EST) Clinton scene-setter speech to several hundred young Europeans at Hotel de Ville (Town Hall).

7:30 p.m. (1:30 p.m. EST) American Community event, likely at Conrad Hotel

RON Conrad Hotel

MONDAY, Jan 10

9 a.m.- 12:15 a.m. (3 a.m. - 6:15 a.m. EST) NATO activities: Meeting with Woerner, opening session, class photo, working session.

12:15 p.m. (6:15 a.m. EST) Break for lunch. Lunch is at Laeken Palace.

3:30 p.m.-6 p.m. (9:30 EST to noon EST). Second working NATO session.

8 p.m. (2 p.m. EST). Working Dinner at Chateau Val Duchesse.

TUESDAY, Jan 11

9 a.m. (3 a.m. EST). Final NATO session begins.

10 a.m. (4 a.m. EST). Woerner remarks, followed by Clinton Q&A. At NATO Luns Theater.

11:30 a.m. - 2 p.m. (5:30 a.m. - 8 a.m. EST) European Union event, including lunch and brief joint press conference

4 p.m. (10 a.m. EST) wheels up from Brussels.

(Flight: 1 hour, 20 minutes, no time change)

5:45 p.m. (11:45 a.m. EST) arrives Prague. Met at airport by Havel. No ceremony.

6:25 p.m. (12:25 p.m. EST) formal welcoming ceremony at Prague Castle

(Reviewing troops, etc). Meeting Havel in castle, followed by meeting with Prime Minister Klaus. Evening events still being worked out.

WEDNESDAY, Jan. 12

8 a.m. (2 a.m. EST). Clinton goes to Old Jewish Cemetery, where as many as 90,000 Czech jews are buried. Tours synagogue where names of Holocaust victims are inscribed.

9 a.m. - 2 p.m. (3 a.m. - 6 a.m. EST) Meetings at U.S. ambassador's residence with leaders of Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. Havel joins for working lunch. Class photo with Clinton statement.

3 p.m. (9 a.m. EST). Clinton visits K-Mart store for meeting w/ Czech business leaders.

4:30 p.m. (10:30 a.m. EST) U.S. embassy community speech

5:30 p.m. (11:30 a.m. EST) leave for Moscow

(2 hour, 25 minute flight + 2 hour time change)

10 p.m. (2 p.m. EST) arrival in Moscow.

Some White House aides are suggesting an evening stroll through Red Square).

THURSDAY, Jan. 13

9 a.m. (1 a.m. EST) Arrival ceremony at the Kremlin - St. Georges Hall. Meetings with Yeltsin and his advisers. At some point, Clinton and Yeltsin may take a stroll through Kremlin grounds.

1 p.m. - 2 p.m. (5 a.m. - 6 a.m. EST) - Danilovskiy Monastery for meeting with patriarch of Russia.

5 p.m. to 7 p.m. (9 a.m. to 11 a.m. EST) - Reception at Spaso House for Russian "opinion leaders" (artists, writers, thinkers, some politicians, NOT Vladimir Zhirinovskiy).

7:30 p.m. (11:30 a.m. EST). Private dinner with Yeltsin in dacha.

FRIDAY, Jan. 14

8:30 a.m. (12:30 a.m. EST). Visits Tomb of the Unknown Soldier; wreath-laying ceremony.

9 a.m. - 10 a.m. (1 a.m. - 2 a.m. EST). Another meeting at the Kremlin (expanded group).

10 a.m. (2 a.m.) Signing of any documents. Kremlin

10:45 a.m. (2:45 a.m. EST). Joint News Conference at Kremlin.

3:30 p.m. (7:30 a.m. EST). Speech at Russian TV center, Ostankino.

7 p.m. (11 a.m. EST) "Official" dinner at Kremlin. Hall of Facets.

SATURDAY, Jan. 15

8:15 embassy community greeting at embassy

9 a.m. (1 a.m. EST). Departure Remarks by both Clinton and Yeltsin at Kremlin.

10:15 a.m. (2:15 a.m. EST). Departure from Vnukovo II airport for Minsk.

(Time change - 1 hour. Minsk is +7 hours from EST)

10:30 a.m. (3:30 a.m. EST) Arrival in Minsk. Clinton may visit crosses alongside the road on the in Kuropaty that mark burial grounds for some 30,000 Belarussians killed by Stalin between 1937-41.

11:45 a.m - 2 p.m. (4:45 a.m - 7 a.m. EST) Meeting with Belarussian officials.

(Mrs. Clinton may visit a hospital where children who were victims of Chernobyl are being treated.)

2 p.m. (7 a.m. EST) War Memorial at Victory square.

3 p.m. (rough) (8 a.m. EST) May visit a factory in town that was privatized in 1990 and makes women's wear, knitted goods, tableclothes and crafts.

4 p.m. (9 a.m. EST) Wheels up for Geneva.

The press filing center will be the Planeta Hotel. There will only a few satellite lines out.

6 p.m. approx (noon EST). Arrival Geneva

Holds meetings with Swiss prime minister at Intercon.

Possible family dinner at a Swiss restaurant.

Clinton and family spend night at the InterContinental. Press divided between the President and the Warwick hotels.

SUNDAY, Jan. 16

9 a.m. to noon, rough (3 a.m. EST to 6 a.m. EST) Meets with President Hafez al-Assad. Filing center will be in ballroom of Intercontinental Hotel.

2:30 - 3 p.m. (8:30 a.m. - 9 a.m. EST) Wheels up for Andrews AFB.

Clinton returns late afternoon.

Tentative 6:00 pm - (which is 12 noon EST) - press charter departs

5:15 p.m. EST Clinton back at Andrews

BRUSSELS

The centerpiece of the visit to Brussels is the NATO summit, on Monday Jan. 10 - Tuesday Jan. 11. Clinton will give a kickoff speech on Sunday, Jan. 9, at the Brussel's Town Hall setting the stage for the whole trip. The general theme will be: the new Europe, overtures to Eastern Europe and a press for more aid from the West for Yeltsin's Russia. Issues before the 16-nation North Atlantic Treaty Organization include whether to expand NATO membership to include some former Warsaw Pact nations and new rules of military engagement (for instance: can NATO move in local disputes without involving U.S. troops?). NATO membership is not expected to be expanded at this time. The West is papering this over with its "Partnership in Peace" program - offering eastern European nations like Poland and Hungary what amounts to observer status for now. As of late December, there was a chance defense ministers might be invited to the session. It comes as France seems to be easing in its decades-old reluctance to join NATO in military discussions. While in Brussels, Clinton will also pay a courtesy call on the king of Belgium and visit European Union/Community officials.

CURIOUS NOTE NO. 1: Many Belgians feel that the United States slighted the country last August by sending a low-level delegation to the funeral of the country's beloved King, Baudouin I, that contained no high-ranking Clinton administration officials and was led by Gerald Ford. The administration is aware of this sensitivity and may bend over backwards to reach out to the new king, Albert II, brother of Baudouin. Albert II likes motorcycles, by the way. The monarch's proper title is king of the Belgians, not king of Belgium.

CURIOUS NOTE No. 2: Oh, no, not another saxophone event! Yes, believe it or not, the inventor of the saxophone was a Belgian - Adolphe Sax - and he was born in a small village not far from Brussels. The 100th anniversary of his death is being celebrated. There may be some kind of saxophone presentation event.

CURRENCY: The currency is the Belgian Franc, which is a strong currency (vs. the dollar). Thus, don't expect any bargains. The rate is 36.1 francs to the dollar. Something with a \$1,000 BF pricetag will cost you \$27.70.

HOTELS. There are two that concern us: the Hilton and the Conrad. The president, most White House staffers, and the pool will stay in the Conrad. The filing center is there also, in a large lobby-floor ballroom. Most of the press will stay in the Hilton, about a half mile away (an easy 15-minute walk). There will be shuttles. And cabs are easy. Both places have rooms with phones with modular jacks. The Hilton has a Godiva chocolate outlet on the lobby level. **PRICE REALITY CHECK:** Buffet breakfast at the Conrad is about \$30. By contrast, a hearty lunch (subsidized) at the NATO cafeteria is about \$3.

LANGUAGES. Brussels is officially bilingual - French and Dutch - although you hear French the most. Many store merchants speak English.

SHOPPING. Some of the best shopping in Europe. There are stores all over the place. Dozens within a half mile of both hotels. Some of the specialties: handmade lace, embroidered items, chocolates.

DINING: There are fine restaurants EVERYWHERE. Make reservations and don't expect to spend less than two hours in any restaurant. Enjoy!

GRAND-PLACE. This is one of the best of Europe's medieval squares. It is beautiful, especially at night (it is floodlit). Clinton may walk here on his first evening in Brussels, although this is not being announced.

HOTEL De VILLE (Town HALL). The site of Clinton's Sunday night address. It has a gothic facade and an imposing tower. Parts of the building date back to 1402. It faces the Grand-Place. A lot of dark rooms, with old paintings on the walls. His Sunday speech, setting the stage for the entire trip, will be to about 200 young adults gathered from around Europe. They are from all walks of life. The site for the speech is the aptly named "Gothic Room."

NATO HEADQUARTERS. BORING. The boxy buildings were built to be temporary after NATO was founded in 1949 - and still are standing. The head of NATO is Secretary General Manfred Woerner. Clinton is expected to have a short meeting with Woerner on the opening day. Woerner also opens the NATO session on Monday in Room 16 - the large ceremonial meeting room. Later working sessions will take place in the smaller, but more businesslike, Room 1. There is a press filing center already in existence at NATO. Also, a cafeteria and gift shops - where you can get good buys on chocolates and other items. There will be about 10 White House phones installed in a private room nearby.

LAEKAN PALACE. This is the home of the royal family. It is the site of a working NATO lunch on Monday, Jan. 9, hosted by King Albert II. We weren't permitted to look at it. There might be a photo session inside but with a very small pool. The Belgian government emphasizes that it is considered unacceptable to speak in the presence of the King much less ask questions. The castle was built in 1784 and is set in a 400 acre park. Clinton also is expected to go here on Sunday after his arrival, meeting with the king then spending some time in the Stuyvenberg guest house - where Reagan spent the night on a trip to Brussels. Clinton meets with the Belgian Prime Minister at the guest house.

CHATEAU VAL DUCHESSE. This is where the working dinner will be held on Monday, Jan. 10. It is not quite a castle, but a very fancy huge home, that is owned by the Belgian government and often used both by the European Union and NATO, both whose headquarters are in Brussels. There are flags of the member nations outside. There is a charming smaller house on the grounds - a former convent called "The Priory" - where the communique will be hammered out.

PRAGUE

GENERAL: Same time zone as Brussels, 6 hours ahead of EST. Power outlets are the basic European ones _ requiring two-prong plugs. The same adapter that worked in Brussels works here. Prague's mostly narrow streets for the most part are clogged with traffic in the best of times. With four foreign heads of state in town, there can be times when traffic can be expected to come to a near halt. Plan lots of time for getting around. There are two parts of the Prague trip: Clinton's official visit on Tuesday to the Czech Republic and meetings with President Vaclav Havel and Prime Minister Klaus; and his meetings the next day in the U.S. ambassador's residence (Wednesday, Jan. 12) with leaders from Poland, Hungary and Slovakia. The administration views the Prague stop as a bridge between the NATO meeting and the Moscow summit: a further reaching out to the nations that used to border and be captives of the Soviet Union. The Czech Republic is barely a year old - established Jan. 1, 1993. It was formerly part of Czechoslovakia. The president (Vaclav Havel) is the head of state while the prime minister (Vaclav Klaus) is head of government.

HOTEL ATRIUM. The White House has blocked out 650 rooms, so everyone including the president is staying here. Rooms have phones that are hard-wired and completely computer unfriendly. However, AT&T direct works fine from the room phones. Dial 0 and 00-420-00101. Bathrooms have built-in hair dryers. Breakfasts are included in the room charge. There is a casino on the lobby level of the hotel.

FILING CENTER is a large ballroom on the ground floor. Your basic ballroom filing center.

PRAGUE CASTLE. Was founded in the 9th century and is the seat of the head of state. The hilltop walled complex includes the imposing Gothic Cathedral of St. Vitus, a restaurant, a group of shops, and a group of small houses.

BOYS NIGHT OUT. Clinton and Havel are supposed to spend at least part of Tuesday night out on the town. This could mean a walk on historic Charles Bridge, then perhaps a visit to a pub like Havel did with Yeltsin during the Russian president's visit. Another possibility: a visit to the tiny theater where Havel got his start in drama, first as a stagehand and later as a playwright. The theater is Divadlo Na Zbradli, which means "Theater on the Balustrade" and it is truly tiny. The stage is postage-stamp size. The informal and intimate theater has a tiny balcony up a steep flight of steps.

CHARLES BRIDGE. Was built in the early 15th century and is a popular promenade and the site of much sidewalk trade activity. The bridge crosses the Vltava River (sometimes called Moldau, its German name) and offers great views of Prague and the castle. Some advisers are suggesting Clinton and Havel walk across the bridge as part of their evening stroll. However, such a walk would not be publicized in advance.

OLD JEWISH CEMETERY. Clinton is expected to visit this historic cemetery - the oldest undamaged Jewish cemetery to survive the period of the Nazi occupation. Some 12,000 gravestones are crowded together on a small piece of land, some from the early 15th century. As many as 90,000 may be buried here in different strata. Clinton will also visit the Pinkas Synagogue a synagogue where a restoration project is under way to re-inscribe on the walls the names of 77,297 Czech holocaust victims.

U.S. AMBASSADOR'S RESIDENCE. The site of the meetings with the leaders of the four eastern European democracies. Clinton will meet separately with the Presidents of Hungary, Poland and Slovak Republic and then will meet with all four, including Havel, for a group session at lunch. The residence is an opulent old building built to near-palace dimensions - complete with a huge underground swimming pool that is in disrepair. The back steps, where the "class photo" might be made, opens onto a huge back yard.

ATTENTION SHOPPERS: K-MART VISIT. Clinton is expected to meet with a group of about 50 Czech business people in a K-Mart in downtown Prague. The message is two-way trade: Not only does K-Mart benefit directly from the investment, but the store also provides an outlet for other U.S.-made products. Conversely, K-Mart has agreed to sell more Czech-made products in its U.S. stores.

The store is one of 13 former state-owned department stores that K-Mart has purchased in the Czech Republic (six) and Slovakia (seven), according to manager Don MacNeill. It is a part of the privatization program by the former Communist states.

K-Mart bought the store about two years ago, but the grand opening was last October. MacNeill said there was a major facelifting to turn the store into a U.S.-style department store. It is not a discount outlet here, by the way, although the store does have sales with its trademark flashing blue light.

Yes, MacNeill said, the westernization brought something to the store that wasn't present when it was run by the state: shoplifting. But, he said, the level of shoplifting in its stores here is the same percentage as shoplifting in the U.S. stores.

Clinton will hold the meeting on one of the shopping floors, with merchandise behind him.

In case you're interested, the "blue light special" is announced in Czech as "Majak" which literally translates into "lighthouse" or beacon."

There is also a Little Caesar's Pizza on the street level of the store.

CURRENCY: 100 Czech Korunas are equal to \$3.38. Most stores require cash. Hotels and larger stores and restaurants take credit cards.

WARNING: There has been a rise in street crime lately, especially by pickpockets.

SHOPPING: Prague is known for crystal, ceramics and garnet jewelry. According to folks at the embassy, good shopping areas include National Avenue (Narodni Trida), Wenceslas Square, Old Town Square and the roads leading to the Charles Bridge. Charles Bridge itself cluttered with merchants selling souvenirs and artwork.

RESTAURANTS. Reservations are generally needed.

Here are a few good ones:

- U Kalicha (At the Chalice) Na Bojisti 12. Phone 290-701. Just off Wenceslas Square. Czech food. Strolling musicians. On the site of the original pub frequented by Czech writers, including Jaroslav Hasaek (Good Soldier Svejk).

- U Sixtu. Celetna Street, Just off Old Town Square. Czech food. Downstairs vaulted dining room. phone 2422-5724.

- There is a U.S.-owned bookstore, The Globe, that serves soups, sandwiches, salads and espresso until midnight each night.

- There is a restaurant on the first floor of the Atrium which is open fairly late. Also serves breakfast, which is included in the room charge.

MOSCOW

GENERAL. Moscow is a bleak, cold and intimidating place in mid-winter. After all, the Russian winter defeated Napoleon and Hitler. One can only wonder how the White House press corps will fare. The recent political turmoil only adds to this sense of bleakness. The Russian parliament ("White House,") which Yeltsin had shelled on Oct. 4, was still being repaired when the advance team was there in mid-December _ the high rise part completely draped in a white shroud that covered the extent of the damage. The huge television station outside town, visited as a possible site for a Clinton appearance, still bore the signs of the Oct. 3 unsuccessful coup attempt _ fragmented glass in the lobby of the building housing the news operation and many bullet holes in the walls and windows. Clinton will meet with Yeltsin in the Kremlin, will pay a call on the patriarch of Russia, may do one or two "street events," and will give a foreign policy speech - either at the TV station or at Moscow State _ where Reagan spoke in 1988. Hillary (possibly with Chelsea) will come on Friday, maintaining a separate schedule but joining her husband for Friday night's State Dinner. Present plans call for Clinton to stay at the Slavanskaya-Radisson. The filing center is at, and a large number of U.S. press will stay at, the Radisson. The rest of the press will stay at the Metropol (a nicer hotel). A word of warning: street crime is on the rise in Moscow, much worse than it was even a year ago when Bush visited. With Russia's strained economic situation, foreign tourists are crime targets. Gangs of children roam the streets looking for foreigners. A member of our pre-advance team in fact was mugged (escaping without injury) a block from the Radisson Hotel in early afternoon. Travel in groups, dress and behave conservatively. Be low-key.

PRESS HOTELS AND FILING CENTER. The main hotel where press will be is the Slavanskaya-Radisson. So will most of the traveling staff and much of the U.S. press. The filing center is in a ballroom. There is a lobby bar and a hall filled with shops. The hotel has several restaurants, including one with a \$30-per-person dinner buffet. Room phones have modular jacks. Nice hotel but bad neighborhood. The old train station right next door is a prime spot for pickpockets and would-be muggers. The other press hotel is the Metropol - an opulent hotel in the heart of Moscow, near both the Bolshoi Ballet and Red Square. The rooms are posh. The lavish glass-ceilinged dining room was used for the filming of a party scene in the movie "Dr. Zhivago." And both Lenin and Stalin gave speeches in the hotel. Rooms have floor phone jacks and phones with modular jacks.

CURRENCY: \$1 will get you about 1,200 rubles. Dollars are accepted everywhere, however, and you can get by with just a few rubles. The hotels where we'll be staying - and some restaurants - will only take hard currencies like dollars, or credit cards.

SHOPPING. Some good bargains can be had, partly because of the value of the dollar and low wages of the average Russian worker. There are street vendors in many public places _ including around Red Square and in the overlook across from Moscow State University - hawking souvenirs like nesting wooden dolls, painted eggs and lacquer boxes. Nicer items can be found - at good prices - in some of the stores. The GUM Department Store on Red Square has many shops. Also: "The New Arbat," a pedestrian street lined with shops and Tverskaya Street, another big shopping street with many shops and vendors.

TRANSPORTATION. There will be shuttles back and forth between the two hotels. Cabs are available at the hotels and may be hailed at most busy locations. Authorized taxis have a checkerboard stamp on the side, and usually a green light in the window showing they are available. AVOID GYPSY CABS!. The embassy warns that you can get mugged inside a cab as easily as on the street. Do not get into cabs if other individuals are in the vehicles or into "independent" cabs. Driver might not speak English, so you may want to have something that shows the destination written in Russian if possible. Moscow's Metro system is advanced and pretty well covers the city. **ON FOOT:** Watch out, pedestrians don't have the right of way. Moscow has one of the highest pedestrian fatality rates in the world. **NOTE:** The penalty for running a red light is higher than for killing a pedestrian.

THE KREMLIN. The walled fortress is situated on the bank of the Moscow river. In addition to government buildings, it also contains cathedrals, museums, many towers and historical buildings. The former high-ceilinged Supreme Soviet chambers will be used for the Clinton-Yeltsin news conference on Friday. The showpiece is the Grand Kremlin Palace, once the home of czars but now housing offices of the government and used to receive visiting foreign heads of state. The State Dinner will be in the extremely ornate Hall of Facets, with a low vaulted ceiling and brightly colored murals on the walls. Working sessions will be in the large St. Catherines Hall, with gilded walls, large chandeliers and a huge wooden door with embedded diamonds. The ceremonial welcome and departure ceremonies will be in St. George's Hall, at the top of a sweeping staircase. The hall contains six immense gilt chandeliers and parquet flooring.

RED SQUARE. Still looks the same as always, with St. Basil's onion-domed cathedral on one end and the Lenin Museum (closed) on the other, flanked by the huge GUM Department Store to the left (looking toward St. Basil's) and the walls of the Kremlin and Lenin's Tomb (which Mrs. Clinton, but not the president, may visit). Clinton may stroll through Red Square the evening of his arrival. This is still under discussion. Such a walk would not be announced ahead of time. If he takes in Red Square, he may visit Kazan Cathedral - a small cathedral that Stalin destroyed which has recently been reconstructed to the original specifications.

OSTANKINO TELEVISION CENTER. There are two huge buildings, facing each other across a highway, and joined by an underground tunnel. This is the site of the Oct. 3 showdown when anti-reformist forces sought to take over the central broadcasting facility. Although broadcasts went off the air briefly, Yeltsin forces never lost control. Clinton is likely to use a studio for an address to the Russian people, perhaps with a live audience.

MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY. A potential back-up site. Located in one of Moscow's look-alike, massive, high-towered "Seven Sisters" buildings, the university's auditorium - with its 1200 seats - was the site of Reagan's speech in 1988. Then, as you may remember, Reagan shared the stage with a huge bust of Lenin. All that's left of the bust now is a rectangle of lighter wood on the floor behind the podium. However, quotes from Marx and Lenin remain on the walls. Clinton may use the same auditorium for a speech.

DANILOVSKIY MONASTERY AND MEETING WITH THE PATRIARCH. A very picturesque walled cluster of buildings. This is the site of Clinton's meeting with the patriarch of Russia, Alexey II. He is expected to take Clinton briefly to the private chapel, then to the Throne Room for a meeting. It is in this room that the patriarch, head of the Orthodox Church in Russia, met with opposing sides in early October in an unsuccessful effort to strike a compromise between Yeltsin and his opponents in Parliament. The patriarch will give Clinton some kind of present. The 2nd floor room is where the patriarch takes secular visitors. There is a similar room on the other side of the building where he takes religious leaders.

SPASO HOUSE AND MEETING WITH "OPINION LEADERS." This large mansion is the home of the U.S. ambassador and the site for Thursday evening's reception with artists, writers, other cultural figures and some politicians (but definitely not ultra-nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovsky). There will be pool coverage of the President's brief remarks to the guests.

ZIL FACTORY, Avtozavodskaya 23. This possible - although diminishing in likelihood - Clinton site is a joint venture between Zil (of the long heavy black Russian limo fame) and U.S.'s caterpillar. There is a long assembly line of pickup trucks that have Zil bodies and Caterpillar engines. The plant has been privatized and now is partially employee-owned. But times are hard. Few of the pickup trucks have been sold since the venture began early last year, and the plant has downsized to a four-day work week. The White House is exploring other sites for the business-entrepreneurship event.

DACHA. On Thursday night, Clinton will have a private dinner with Yeltsin at the Russian President's dacha on the outskirts of Moscow. It will be a small dinner with only a few guests. The meeting is totally private. Only planned coverage is protective travel pool.

RESTAURANTS. Make reservations and ask if the establishment wants payments in rubles or hard currency. Find out if they serve alcohol or if you have to bring your own beverages. There is a list of suggestions that the embassy puts out that will be included in the trip book. There is also a McDonald's near Pushkin Square.

ADDITIONAL NOTES FOR MOSCOW TRIP:

- We also checked out these sites, all potential Clinton spontaneous stops: Pyatnitskaya Street, Tretyakov Museum, Danilovskiy Market, Novodeivichiy Cemetery and Museums, metros and markets.
 - Travel pools will be formed each morning at 6:30 a.m. in case Clinton jogs.
 - White House filing center is in the Radisson. Press is divided between the Radisson and the Metropol.
- There will be shuttle buses back and forth between the two hotels 24 hours a day.

MRS. CLINTON'S SCHEDULE:

She, and possibly Chelsea, arrive on Friday and maintain a separate schedule. This may include a visit with Mrs. Yeltsin to a hospital and a lunch at Spaso House hosted by Mrs. Pickering.

MINSK

GENERAL INFORMATION. The president is only expected to spend about four hours in Belarus. One purpose of the trip is to "reward" the former Soviet republic for agreeing to give up its nuclear missiles. Belarus (once called White Russia) is landlocked, bordered by Russia on the east, Ukraine on the south, Lithuania and Latvia to the north and Poland to the west. The country has been a battleground throughout history, and Minsk has been levelled several times - including in World War II. Thus, most of the buildings are post-war, and are in the blocky, utilitarian, graceless, Stalinist style of architecture. As if Belarus hadn't suffered enough, it took the brunt of radiation from the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident in 1986. As part of the visit, Mrs. Clinton may go to a hospital where children are being treated for radiation-related illnesses, like leukemia. Although Belarus was quick to ratify the START treaty and agree to adhere to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, political reforms have been slow in coming. Popular elections have not been held nor has a new constitution been adopted. And, for the most part, the same communist bosses who ran things when the republic was part of the Soviet Union are still in charge.

KUROPATY. Clinton will visit this site on his way in from the airport. Just off a ring road that encircles Minsk, this is the burial ground for up to 30,000 Belarussians killed by Stalin between 1937-41. The bodies were discovered by construction crews building the ring road in the early 1960s. The Soviets initially blamed the deaths on the Germans, but it later became clear that they predated the failed German offensive across Belarus. A large cross and several smaller ones marks the burial grounds. Clinton is expected to meet with the Belarussian who discovered the site.

VOSGOVIY FOUR. This is the guest house where Clinton's meetings with leaders, and possibly others, will take place. It is a large boxy building typical of many in Minsk.

PLANETA HOTEL. A second-floor restaurant will be the site of the press filing center. Senior White House staff and officials will also use the hotel as working space. The hotel smells like stale cigarette smoke throughout - and there will be few phones available. There should be (if you pardon the expression) food, however.

CRAFT FACTORY. One potential site is a former state-run factory that used to make toys but which was privatized in 1990 and now makes women's clothing in addition to toys and craft items.

VICTORY SQUARE. This square is in the center of Minsk and has an obelisk and an eternal flame commemorating World War II dead. Clinton may visit it briefly. As a backdrop, there are buildings topped by large cryllic letters that say: "Victory of the People...Is Eternal." The square is two blocks from the apartment where Lee Harvey Oswald rented a room.

SPECIAL NOTE: Winter weather remains a major variable. There is a chance that, in the event of a snowstorm, the Minsk leg could be seriously truncated.

The press charter will be brought to Minsk a few hours early. Tours of the sites that Clinton will visit will be conducted for interested press.

- 12 -
GENEVA

Details are still being worked out. Clinton will most likely stay in the InterContinental. Some press (pool) will stay there, with the rest of the press staying in the President and Warwick hotels. Clinton will meet with the Swiss Prime Minister Saturday night, but nothing else is planned. Perhaps a private dinner with his family. On Sunday, 9 a.m. to noon is basically blocked out. Location of the site for the meeting between Clinton and Assad is still being decided. The last time a President was in Geneva, was November 1990, when President Bush met with Assad at the International Conference Center. In any event, the filing center will be at the Intercontinental Hotel. Phones in press hotel rooms (President & Warwick) reportedly do not have U.S. computer-friendly modular jacks. There will be 24 hour transportation between the press hotels and the Filing Center. Swiss security is expected to be extremely tight at the Intercontinental, so allow for extra time to get in. Clinton expected to leave town early afternoon, getting back to Andrews in early evening. Press charter to follow by several hours.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S TRIP TO BRUSSELS, PRAGUE, MOSCOW, MINSK AND GENEVA

— REPORT by Tom Raum, AP, based on pre-advance trip Dec. 12-19, 1993 —

FOR PLANNING PURPOSES ONLY - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

OVERVIEW: President Clinton attends a NATO summit and meets with European Union officials in Brussels (Jan. 9-11); visits the Czech Republic and while in Prague also meets with the heads of state of Hungary, Poland and Slovakia (Jan. 11-12); visits Moscow for a summit with President Boris Yeltsin (Jan. 12-15); goes to Minsk in Belarus (Jan. 15); and meets in Geneva with President Hafez al-Assad of Syria. Hillary Rodham Clinton and possibly Chelsea join him in Russia on Friday Jan. 14 and are with him for the rest of the trip.

GENERAL NOTES. The bulk of the trip is taking place north of the 50th parallel (Newfoundland) in the dead of winter, so expect it to be cold and dark. (Night comes at about 4 p.m. in Brussels, Prague, Minsk and Moscow.) Temperatures in Brussels will probably be about 10 degrees colder than average for Washington in January; Prague about 12 degrees colder; Moscow and Minsk colder still. Wear warm clothes. For Moscow and Minsk, especially, you should consider parkas, duck boots or the equivalent. Expect snow and slush.

PHONES. By now you will have signed up the credential forms and indicated how many phones you would like at each stop. There will be usual AT&T phones available in most filing centers. Good existing ground lines will be used in Brussels and Geneva. A satellite dish will be brought in for Prague and Moscow. Filing from Minsk will be difficult - with only a few direct-to-U.S.-satellite phones - to be used on priority basis by those who need them most. There will be some voice phones connecting Minsk to the United States via Moscow Filing Center - to be used on a priority basis by those who need them the most (wires, etc). The good news is that the Minsk stop occurs early in the morning Saturday EST, so there will be more filing time in Geneva.

All White House filing center phones throughout the trip can accept incoming calls. Most of the press hotels (except Prague and Geneva) have modular jacks that can be used with computers. (You may need to use a splitter, and set the computer to manual). AT&T Direct is available in most press hotels. However, the Metropal in Moscow has a separate deal with Sprint.

Here, from AT&T's Ellis Kitchen, is a rough breakdown of filing-center phone costs:

BRUSSELS - \$100 per phone
PRAGUE - \$800-\$1,000 per phone
MOSCOW - \$800-\$1,000 per phone
GENEVA - \$300 per phone

In the cities with satellite dishes (Prague, Moscow), the high cost per phone is offset by the fact that the phones then become local numbers (probably with a 703 area code). So calls to bureaus or families in the Washington area, in essence, are local calls.

AT&T USA Direct - a local call puts you in touch with a U.S. operator in the states - at a fraction of the cost of calling from your hotel. Works for both voice and data calls.

BRUSSELS: 078-11-0010 PRAGUE: 00-420-00101
MOSCOW: 155-5042 GENEVA: 155-00-11

ELECTRICAL CURRENT: The same converter throughout our trip - one with two prongs. It's the basic European plug. The power in most places is 220 volts. Most computers can handle that. But you may require a transformer (usually part of converter kits) to step that down to the U.S.-familiar 110 volts for other devices. Hotel rooms in the beginning of the trip (Brussels, Prague) have built-in hair dryers. Not so in Prague and Moscow.

DRINKING THE WATER: Probably OK in Brussels and Geneva; be wary anywhere else.

SUMMARY SCHEDULE The White House was nearing release of a preliminary schedule. Thus, this, based on earlier information that may no longer be accurate, just hits the high points. *FYI: Brussels, Prague and Geneva are EST +6, Minsk is EST +7, Moscow is EST +8*

SATURDAY, Jan 8

9 a.m. EST (approx) Press charter leaves. getting to Brussels about 10 p.m. (local)
11 p.m. (approx) Clinton leaves Andrews on Air Force One.

SUNDAY, Jan 9

Noon (approx) (6 a.m. EST) Air Force One arrives Brussels. King Albert II greets Clinton at an airport arrival ceremony. Clinton and the king will then go to Laeken Palace. Soon thereafter, Clinton will have a bilateral with Belgian prime minister Jean-Luc Dehaene.

6 p.m. rough (noon EST) Clinton scene-setter speech to several hundred young Europeans at Hotel de Ville (Town Hall).

7:30 p.m. (1:30 p.m. EST) American Community event, likely at Conrad Hotel
RON Conrad Hotel

MONDAY, Jan 10

9 a.m.- 12:15 a.m. (3 a.m. - 6:15 a.m. EST) NATO activities: Meeting with Woerner, opening session, class photo, working session.

12:15 p.m. (6:15 a.m. EST) Break for lunch. Lunch is at Laeken Palace.

3:30 p.m.-6 p.m. (9:30 EST to noon EST). Second working NATO session.

8 p.m. (2 p.m. EST). Working Dinner at Chateau Val Duchesse.

TUESDAY, Jan 11

9 a.m. (3 a.m. EST). Final NATO session begins.

10 a.m. (4 a.m. EST). Woerner remarks, followed by Clinton Q&A. At NATO Luns Theater.

11:30 a.m. - 2 p.m. (5:30 a.m. - 8 a.m. EST) European Union event, including lunch and brief joint press conference

4 p.m. (10 a.m. EST) wheels up from Brussels.

(Flight: 1 hour, 20 minutes, no time change)

5:45 p.m. (11:45 a.m. EST) arrives Prague. Met at airport by Havel. No ceremony.

6:25 p.m. (12:25 p.m. EST) formal welcoming ceremony at Prague Castle

(Reviewing troops, etc). Meeting Havel in castle, followed by meeting with Prime Minister Klaus. Evening events still being worked out.

WEDNESDAY, Jan. 12

8 a.m. (2 a.m. EST). Clinton goes to Old Jewish Cemetery, where as many as 90,000 Czech jews are buried. Tours synagogue where names of Holocaust victims are inscribed.

9 a.m. - 2 p.m. (3 a.m. - 6 a.m. EST) Meetings at U.S. ambassador's residence with leaders of Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. Havel joins for working lunch. Class photo with Clinton statement.

3 p.m. (9 a.m. EST). Clinton visits K-Mart store for meeting w/ Czech business leaders.

4:30 p.m. (10:30 a.m. EST) U.S. embassy community speech

5:30 p.m. (11:30 a.m. EST) leave for Moscow

(2 hour, 25 minute flight + 2 hour time change)

10 p.m. (2 p.m. EST) arrival in Moscow.

Some White House aides are suggesting an evening stroll through Red Square).

THURSDAY, Jan. 13

9 a.m. (1 a.m. EST) Arrival ceremony at the Kremlin - St. Georges Hall. Meetings with Yeltsin and his advisers. At some point, Clinton and Yeltsin may take a stroll through Kremlin grounds.

1 p.m. - 2 p.m. (5 a.m. - 6 a.m. EST) - Danilovskiy Monastery for meeting with patriarch of Russia.

5 p.m. to 7 p.m. (9 a.m. to 11 a.m. EST) - Reception at Spaso House for Russian "opinion leaders" (artists, writers, thinkers, some politicians, NOT Vladimir Zhirinovskiy).

7:30 p.m. (11:30 a.m. EST). Private dinner with Yeltsin in dacha.

FRIDAY, Jan. 14

8:30 a.m. (12:30 a.m. EST). Visits Tomb of the Unknown Soldier; wreath-laying ceremony.

9 a.m. - 10 a.m. (1 a.m. - 2 a.m. EST). Another meeting at the Kremlin (expanded group).

10 a.m. (2 a.m.) Signing of any documents. Kremlin

10:45 a.m. (2:45 a.m. EST). Joint News Conference at Kremlin.

3:30 p.m. (7:30 a.m. EST). Speech at Russian TV center, Ostankino.

7 p.m. (11 a.m. EST) "Official" dinner at Kremlin. Hall of Facets.

SATURDAY, Jan. 15

8:15 embassy community greeting at embassy

9 a.m. (1 a.m. EST). Departure Remarks by both Clinton and Yeltsin at Kremlin.

10:15 a.m. (2:15 a.m. EST). Departure from Vnukovo II airport for Minsk.

(Time change - 1 hour. Minsk is +7 hours from EST)

10:30 a.m. (3:30 a.m. EST) Arrival in Minsk. Clinton may visit crosses alongside the road on the in Kuropaty that mark burial grounds for some 30,000 Belarussians killed by Stalin between 1937-41.

11:45 a.m. - 2 p.m. (4:45 a.m. - 7 a.m. EST) Meeting with Belarussian officials.

(Mrs. Clinton may visit a hospital where children who were victims of Chernobyl are being treated.)

2 p.m. (7 a.m. EST) War Memorial at Victory square.

3 p.m. (rough) (8 a.m. EST) May visit a factory in town that was privatized in 1990 and makes women's wear, knitted goods, tableclothes and crafts.

4 p.m. (9 a.m. EST) Wheels up for Geneva.

The press filing center will be the Planeta Hotel. There will only a few satellite lines out.

6 p.m. approx (noon EST). Arrival Geneva

Holds meetings with Swiss prime minister at Intercon.

Possible family dinner at a Swiss restaurant.

Clinton and family spend night at the InterContinental. Press divided between the President and the Warwick hotels.

SUNDAY, Jan. 16

9 a.m. to noon, rough (3 a.m. EST to 6 a.m. EST) Meets with President Hafez al-Assad. Filing center will be in ballroom of Intercontinental Hotel.

2:30 - 3 p.m. (8:30 a.m. - 9 a.m. EST) Wheels up for Andrews AFB.

Clinton returns late afternoon.

Tentative 6:00 pm - (which is 12 noon EST) - press charter departs

5:15 p.m. EST Clinton back at Andrews

BRUSSELS

The centerpiece of the visit to Brussels is the NATO summit, on Monday Jan. 10 - Tuesday Jan. 11. Clinton will give a kickoff speech on Sunday, Jan. 9, at the Brussel's Town Hall setting the stage for the whole trip. The general theme will be: the new Europe, overtures to Eastern Europe and a press for more aid from the West for Yeltsin's Russia. Issues before the 16-nation North Atlantic Treaty Organization include whether to expand NATO membership to include some former Warsaw Pact nations and new rules of military engagement (for instance: can NATO move in local disputes without involving U.S. troops?). NATO membership is not expected to be expanded at this time. The West is papering this over with its "Partnership in Peace" program - offering eastern European nations like Poland and Hungary what amounts to observer status for now. As of late December, there was a chance defense ministers might be invited to the session. It comes as France seems to be easing in its decades-old reluctance to join NATO in military discussions. While in Brussels, Clinton will also pay a courtesy call on the king of Belgium and visit European Union/Community officials.

CURIOUS NOTE NO. 1: Many Belgians feel that the United States slighted the country last August by sending a low-level delegation to the funeral of the country's beloved King, Baudouin I, that contained no high-ranking Clinton administration officials and was led by Gerald Ford. The administration is aware of this sensitivity and may bend over backwards to reach out to the new king, Albert II, brother of Baudouin. Albert II likes motorcycles, by the way. The monarch's proper title is king of the Belgians, not king of Belgium.

CURIOUS NOTE No. 2: Oh, no, not another saxophone event! Yes, believe it or not, the inventor of the saxophone was a Belgian - Adolphe Sax - and he was born in a small village not far from Brussels. The 100th anniversary of his death is being celebrated. There may be some kind of saxophone presentation event.

CURRENCY: The currency is the Belgian Franc, which is a strong currency (vs. the dollar). Thus, don't expect any bargains. The rate is 36.1 francs to the dollar. Something with a \$1,000 BF pricetag will cost you \$27.70.

HOTELS. There are two that concern us: the Hilton and the Conrad. The president, most White House staffers, and the pool will stay in the Conrad. The filing center is there also, in a large lobby-floor ballroom. Most of the press will stay in the Hilton, about a half mile away (an easy 15-minute walk). There will be shuttles. And cabs are easy. Both places have rooms with phones with modular jacks. The Hilton has a Godiva chocolate outlet on the lobby level. **PRICE REALITY CHECK:** Buffet breakfast at the Conrad is about \$30. By contrast, a hearty lunch (subsidized) at the NATO cafeteria is about \$3.

LANGUAGES. Brussels is officially bilingual - French and Dutch - although you hear French the most. Many store merchants speak English.

SHOPPING. Some of the best shopping in Europe. There are stores all over the place. Dozens within a half mile of both hotels. Some of the specialties: handmade lace, embroidered items, chocolates.

DINING: There are fine restaurants EVERYWHERE. Make reservations and don't expect to spend less than two hours in any restaurant. Enjoy!

GRAND-PLACE. This is one of the best of Europe's medieval squares. It is beautiful, especially at night (it is floodlit). Clinton may walk here on his first evening in Brussels, although this is not being announced.

HOTEL De VILLE (Town HALL). The site of Clinton's Sunday night address. It has a gothic facade and an imposing tower. Parts of the building date back to 1402. It faces the Grand-Place. A lot of dark rooms, with old paintings on the walls. His Sunday speech, setting the stage for the entire trip, will be to about 200 young adults gathered from around Europe. They are from all walks of life. The site for the speech is the aptly named "Gothic Room."

NATO HEADQUARTERS. BORING. The boxy buildings were built to be temporary after NATO was founded in 1949 - and still are standing. The head of NATO is Secretary General Manfred Woerner. Clinton is expected to have a short meeting with Woerner on the opening day. Woerner also opens the NATO session on Monday in Room 16 - the large ceremonial meeting room. Later working sessions will take place in the smaller, but more businesslike, Room 1. There is a press filing center already in existence at NATO. Also, a cafeteria and gift shops - where you can get good buys on chocolates and other items. There will be about 10 White House phones installed in a private room nearby.

LAEKAN PALACE. This is the home of the royal family. It is the site of a working NATO lunch on Monday, Jan. 9, hosted by King Albert II. We weren't permitted to look at it. There might be a photo session inside but with a very small pool. The Belgian government emphasizes that it is considered unacceptable to speak in the presence of the King much less ask questions. The castle was built in 1784 and is set in a 400 acre park. Clinton also is expected to go here on Sunday after his arrival, meeting with the king then spending some time in the Stuyvenberg guest house - where Reagan spent the night on a trip to Brussels. Clinton meets with the Belgian Prime Minister at the guest house.

CHATEAU VAL DUCHESSE. This is where the working dinner will be held on Monday, Jan. 10. It is not quite a castle, but a very fancy huge home, that is owned by the Belgian government and often used both by the European Union and NATO, both whose headquarters are in Brussels. There are flags of the member nations outside. There is a charming smaller house on the grounds - a former convent called "The Priory" - where the communique will be hammered out.

PRAGUE

GENERAL: Same time zone as Brussels, 6 hours ahead of EST. Power outlets are the basic European ones _ requiring two-prong plugs. The same adapter that worked in Brussels works here. Prague's mostly narrow streets for the most part are clogged with traffic in the best of times. With four foreign heads of state in town, there can be times when traffic can be expected to come to a near halt. Plan lots of time for getting around. There are two parts of the Prague trip: Clinton's official visit on Tuesday to the Czech Republic and meetings with President Vaclav Havel and Prime Minister Klaus; and his meetings the next day in the U.S. ambassador's residence (Wednesday, Jan. 12) with leaders from Poland, Hungary and Slovakia. The administration views the Prague stop as a bridge between the NATO meeting and the Moscow summit: a further reaching out to the nations that used to border and be captives of the Soviet Union. The Czech Republic is barely a year old - established Jan. 1, 1993. It was formerly part of Czechoslovakia. The president (Vaclav Havel) is the head of state while the prime minister (Vaclav Klaus) is head of government.

HOTEL ATRIUM. The White House has blocked out 650 rooms, so everyone including the president is staying here. Rooms have phones that are hard-wired and completely computer unfriendly. However, AT&T direct works fine from the room phones. Dial 0 and 00-420-00101. Bathrooms have built-in hair dryers. Breakfasts are included in the room charge. There is a casino on the lobby level of the hotel.

FILING CENTER is a large ballroom on the ground floor. Your basic ballroom filing center.

PRAGUE CASTLE. Was founded in the 9th century and is the seat of the head of state. The hilltop walled complex includes the imposing Gothic Cathedral of St. Vitus, a restaurant, a group of shops, and a group of small houses.

BOYS NIGHT OUT. Clinton and Havel are supposed to spend at least part of Tuesday night out on the town. This could mean a walk on historic Charles Bridge, then perhaps a visit to a pub like Havel did with Yeltsin during the Russian president's visit. Another possibility: a visit to the tiny theater where Havel got his start in drama, first as a stagehand and later as a playwright. The theater is Divadlo Na Zbradli, which means "Theater on the Balustrade" and it is truly tiny. The stage is postage-stamp size. The informal and intimate theater has a tiny balcony up a steep flight of steps.

CHARLES BRIDGE. Was built in the early 15th century and is a popular promenade and the site of much sidewalk trade activity. The bridge crosses the Vltava River (sometimes called Moldau, its German name) and offers great views of Prague and the castle. Some advisers are suggesting Clinton and Havel walk across the bridge as part of their evening stroll. However, such a walk would not be publicized in advance.

OLD JEWISH CEMETERY. Clinton is expected to visit this historic cemetery - the oldest undamaged Jewish cemetery to survive the period of the Nazi occupation. Some 12,000 gravestones are crowded together on a small piece of land, some from the early 15th century. As many as 90,000 may be buried here in different strata. Clinton will also visit the Pinkas Synagogue a synagogue where a restoration project is under way to re-inscribe on the walls the names of 77,297 Czech holocaust victims.

U.S. AMBASSADOR'S RESIDENCE. The site of the meetings with the leaders of the four eastern European democracies. Clinton will meet separately with the Presidents of Hungary, Poland and Slovak Republic and then will meet with all four, including Havel, for a group session at lunch. The residence is an opulent old building built to near-palace dimensions - complete with a huge underground swimming pool that is in disrepair. The back steps, where the "class photo" might be made, opens onto a huge back yard.

ATTENTION SHOPPERS: K-MART VISIT. Clinton is expected to meet with a group of about 50 Czech business people in a K-Mart in downtown Prague. The message is two-way trade: Not only does K-Mart benefit directly from the investment, but the store also provides an outlet for other U.S.-made products. Conversely, K-Mart has agreed to sell more Czech-made products in its U.S. stores.

The store is one of 13 former state-owned department stores that K-Mart has purchased in the Czech Republic (six) and Slovakia (seven), according to manager Don MacNeill. It is a part of the privatization program by the former Communist states.

K-Mart bought the store about two years ago, but the grand opening was last October. MacNeill said there was a major facelifting to turn the store into a U.S.-style department store. It is not a discount outlet here, by the way, although the store does have sales with its trademark flashing blue light.

Yes, MacNeill said, the westernization brought something to the store that wasn't present when it was run by the state: shoplifting. But, he said, the level of shoplifting in its stores here is the same percentage as shoplifting in the U.S. stores.

Clinton will hold the meeting on one of the shopping floors, with merchandise behind him.

In case you're interested, the "blue light special" is announced in Czech as "Majak" which literally translates into "lighthouse" or beacon."

There is also a Little Caesar's Pizza on the street level of the store.

CURRENCY: 100 Czech Korunas are equal to \$3.38. Most stores require cash. Hotels and larger stores and restaurants take credit cards.

WARNING: There has been a rise in street crime lately, especially by pickpockets.

SHOPPING: Prague is known for crystal, ceramics and garnet jewelry. According to folks at the embassy, good shopping areas include National Avenue (Narodni Trida), Wenceslas Square, Old Town Square and the roads leading to the Charles Bridge. Charles Bridge itself cluttered with merchants selling souvenirs and artwork.

RESTAURANTS. Reservations are generally needed.

Here are a few good ones:

- U Kalicha (At the Chalice) Na Bojisti 12. Phone 290-701. Just off Wenceslas Square. Czech food. Strolling musicians. On the site of the original pub frequented by Czech writers, including Jaroslav Hasaek (Good Soldier Svejk).

- U Sixtu. Celetna Street, Just off Old Town Square. Czech food. Downstairs vaulted dining room. phone 2422-5724.

- There is a U.S.-owned bookstore, The Globe, that serves soups, sandwiches, salads and espresso until midnight each night.

- There is a restaurant on the first floor of the Atrium which is open fairly late. Also serves breakfast, which is included in the room charge.

MOSCOW

GENERAL. Moscow is a bleak, cold and intimidating place in mid-winter. After all, the Russian winter defeated Napoleon and Hitler. One can only wonder how the White House press corps will fare. The recent political turmoil only adds to this sense of bleakness. The Russian parliament ("White House,") which Yeltsin had shelled on Oct. 4, was still being repaired when the advance team was there in mid-December _ the high rise part completely draped in a white shroud that covered the extent of the damage. The huge television station outside town, visited as a possible site for a Clinton appearance, still bore the signs of the Oct. 3 unsuccessful coup attempt _ fragmented glass in the lobby of the building housing the news operation and many bullet holes in the walls and windows. Clinton will meet with Yeltsin in the Kremlin, will pay a call on the patriarch of Russia, may do one or two "street events," and will give a foreign policy speech - either at the TV station or at Moscow State _ where Reagan spoke in 1988. Hillary (possibly with Chelsea) will come on Friday, maintaining a separate schedule but joining her husband for Friday night's State Dinner. Present plans call for Clinton to stay at the Slavanskaya-Radisson. The filing center is at, and a large number of U.S. press will stay at, the Radisson. The rest of the press will stay at the Metropol (a nicer hotel). A word of warning: street crime is on the rise in Moscow, much worse than it was even a year ago when Bush visited. With Russia's strained economic situation, foreign tourists are crime targets. Gangs of children roam the streets looking for foreigners. A member of our pre-advance team in fact was mugged (escaping without injury) a block from the Radisson Hotel in early afternoon. Travel in groups, dress and behave conservatively. Be low-key.

PRESS HOTELS AND FILING CENTER. The main hotel where press will be is the Slavanskaya-Radisson. So will most of the traveling staff and much of the U.S. press. The filing center is in a ballroom. There is a lobby bar and a hall filled with shops. The hotel has several restaurants, including one with a \$30-per-person dinner buffet. Room phones have modular jacks. Nice hotel but bad neighborhood. The old train station right next door is a prime spot for pickpockets and would-be muggers. The other press hotel is the Metropol - an opulent hotel in the heart of Moscow, near both the Bolshoi Ballet and Red Square. The rooms are posh. The lavish glass-ceilinged dining room was used for the filming of a party scene in the movie "Dr. Zhivago." And both Lenin and Stalin gave speeches in the hotel. Rooms have floor phone jacks and phones with modular jacks.

CURRENCY: \$1 will get you about 1,200 rubles. Dollars are accepted everywhere, however, and you can get by with just a few rubles. The hotels where we'll be staying - and some restaurants - will only take hard currencies like dollars, or credit cards.

SHOPPING. Some good bargains can be had, partly because of the value of the dollar and low wages of the average Russian worker. There are street vendors in many public places _ including around Red Square and in the overlook across from Moscow State University - hawking souvenirs like nesting wooden dolls, painted eggs and lacquer boxes. Nicer items can be found - at good prices - in some of the stores. The GUM Department Store on Red Square has many shops. Also: "The New Arbat," a pedestrian street lined with shops and Tverskaya Street, another big shopping street with many shops and vendors.

TRANSPORTATION. There will be shuttles back and forth between the two hotels. Cabs are available at the hotels and may be hailed at most busy locations. Authorized taxis have a checkerboard stamp on the side, and usually a green light in the window showing they are available. **AVOID GYPSY CABS!** The embassy warns that you can get mugged inside a cab as easily as on the street. Do not get into cabs if other individuals are in the vehicles or into "independent" cabs. Driver might not speak English, so you may want to have something that shows the destination written in Russian if possible. Moscow's Metro system is advanced and pretty well covers the city. **ON FOOT:** Watch out, pedestrians don't have the right of way. Moscow has one of the highest pedestrian fatality rates in the world. **NOTE:** The penalty for running a red light is higher than for killing a pedestrian.

THE KREMLIN. The walled fortress is situated on the bank of the Moscow river. In addition to government buildings, it also contains cathedrals, museums, many towers and historical buildings. The former high-ceilinged Supreme Soviet chambers will be used for the Clinton-Yeltsin news conference on Friday. The showpiece is the Grand Kremlin Palace, once the home of czars but now housing offices of the government and used to receive visiting foreign heads of state. The State Dinner will be in the extremely ornate Hall of Facets, with a low vaulted ceiling and brightly colored murals on the walls. Working sessions will be in the large St. Catherines Hall, with gilded walls, large chandeliers and a huge wooden door with embedded diamonds. The ceremonial welcome and departure ceremonies will be in St. George's Hall, at the top of a sweeping staircase. The hall contains six immense gilt chandeliers and parquet flooring.

RED SQUARE. Still looks the same as always, with St. Basil's onion-domed cathedral on one end and the Lenin Museum (closed) on the other, flanked by the huge GUM Department Store to the left (looking toward St. Basil's) and the walls of the Kremlin and Lenin's Tomb (which Mrs. Clinton, but not the president, may visit). Clinton may stroll through Red Square the evening of his arrival. This is still under discussion. Such a walk would not be announced ahead of time. If he takes in Red Square, he may visit Kazan Cathedral - a small cathedral that Stalin destroyed which has recently been reconstructed to the original specifications.

OSTANKINO TELEVISION CENTER. There are two huge buildings, facing each other across a highway, and joined by an underground tunnel. This is the site of the Oct. 3 showdown when anti-reformist forces sought to take over the central broadcasting facility. Although broadcasts went off the air briefly, Yeltsin forces never lost control. Clinton is likely to use a studio for an address to the Russian people, perhaps with a live audience.

MOSCOW STATE UNIVERSITY. A potential back-up site. Located in one of Moscow's look-alike, massive, high-towered "Seven Sisters" buildings, the university's auditorium - with its 1200 seats - was the site of Reagan's speech in 1988. Then, as you may remember, Reagan shared the stage with a huge bust of Lenin. All that's left of the bust now is a rectangle of lighter wood on the floor behind the podium. However, quotes from Marx and Lenin remain on the walls. Clinton may use the same auditorium for a speech.

DANILOVSKIY MONASTERY AND MEETING WITH THE PATRIARCH. A very picturesque walled cluster of buildings. This is the site of Clinton's meeting with the patriarch of Russia, Alexey II. He is expected to take Clinton briefly to the private chapel, then to the Throne Room for a meeting. It is in this room that the patriarch, head of the Orthodox Church in Russia, met with opposing sides in early October in an unsuccessful effort to strike a compromise between Yeltsin and his opponents in Parliament. The patriarch will give Clinton some kind of present. The 2nd floor room is where the patriarch takes secular visitors. There is a similar room on the other side of the building where he takes religious leaders.

SPASO HOUSE AND MEETING WITH "OPINION LEADERS." This large mansion is the home of the U.S. ambassador and the site for Thursday evening's reception with artists, writers, other cultural figures and some politicians (but definitely not ultra-nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovsky). There will be pool coverage of the President's brief remarks to the guests.

ZIL FACTORY, Avtozavodskaya 23. This possible - although diminishing in likelihood - Clinton site is a joint venture between Zil (of the long heavy black Russian limo fame) and U.S.'s caterpillar. There is a long assembly line of pickup trucks that have Zil bodies and Caterpillar engines. The plant has been privatized and now is partially employee-owned. But times are hard. Few of the pickup trucks have been sold since the venture began early last year, and the plant has downsized to a four-day work week. The White House is exploring other sites for the business-entrepreneurship event.

DACHA. On Thursday night, Clinton will have a private dinner with Yeltsin at the Russian President's dacha on the outskirts of Moscow. It will be a small dinner with only a few guests. The meeting is totally private. Only planned coverage is protective travel pool.

RESTAURANTS. Make reservations and ask if the establishment wants payments in rubles or hard currency. Find out if they serve alcohol or if you have to bring your own beverages. There is a list of suggestions that the embassy puts out that will be included in the trip book. There is also a McDonald's near Pushkin Square.

ADDITIONAL NOTES FOR MOSCOW TRIP:

- We also checked out these sites, all potential Clinton spontaneous stops: Pyatnitskaya Street, Tretyakov Museum, Danilovskiy Market, Novodeivichiy Cemetery and Museums, metros and markets.
 - Travel pools will be formed each morning at 6:30 a.m. in case Clinton jogs.
 - White House filing center is in the Radisson. Press is divided between the Radisson and the Metropol.
- There will be shuttle buses back and forth between the two hotels 24 hours a day.

MRS. CLINTON'S SCHEDULE:

She, and possibly Chelsea, arrive on Friday and maintain a separate schedule. This may include a visit with Mrs. Yeltsin to a hospital and a lunch at Spaso House hosted by Mrs. Pickering.

MINSK

GENERAL INFORMATION. The president is only expected to spend about four hours in Belarus. One purpose of the trip is to "reward" the former Soviet republic for agreeing to give up its nuclear missiles. Belarus (once called White Russia) is landlocked, bordered by Russia on the east, Ukraine on the south, Lithuania and Latvia to the north and Poland to the west. The country has been a battleground throughout history, and Minsk has been levelled several times - including in World War II. Thus, most of the buildings are post-war, and are in the blocky, utilitarian, graceless, Stalinist style of architecture. As if Belarus hadn't suffered enough, it took the brunt of radiation from the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident in 1986. As part of the visit, Mrs. Clinton may go to a hospital where children are being treated for radiation-related illnesses, like leukemia. Although Belarus was quick to ratify the START treaty and agree to adhere to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, political reforms have been slow in coming. Popular elections have not been held nor has a new constitution been adopted. And, for the most part, the same communist bosses who ran things when the republic was part of the Soviet Union are still in charge.

KUROPATY. Clinton will visit this site on his way in from the airport. Just off a ring road that encircles Minsk, this is the burial ground for up to 30,000 Belarussians killed by Stalin between 1937-41. The bodies were discovered by construction crews building the ring road in the early 1960s. The Soviets initially blamed the deaths on the Germans, but it later became clear that they predated the failed German offensive across Belarus. A large cross and several smaller ones marks the burial grounds. Clinton is expected to meet with the Belarussian who discovered the site.

VOSGOVIY FOUR. This is the guest house where Clinton's meetings with leaders, and possibly others, will take place. It is a large boxy building typical of many in Minsk.

PLANETA HOTEL. A second-floor restaurant will be the site of the press filing center. Senior White House staff and officials will also use the hotel as working space. The hotel smells like stale cigarette smoke throughout - and there will be few phones available. There should be (if you pardon the expression) food, however.

CRAFT FACTORY. One potential site is a former state-run factory that used to make toys but which was privatized in 1990 and now makes women's clothing in addition to toys and craft items.

VICTORY SQUARE. This square is in the center of Minsk and has an obelisk and an eternal flame commemorating World War II dead. Clinton may visit it briefly. As a backdrop, there are buildings topped by large cryllic letters that say: "Victory of the People...Is Eternal." The square is two blocks from the apartment where Lee Harvey Oswald rented a room.

SPECIAL NOTE: Winter weather remains a major variable. There is a chance that, in the event of a snowstorm, the Minsk leg could be seriously truncated.

The press charter will be brought to Minsk a few hours early. Tours of the sites that Clinton will visit will be conducted for interested press.

- 12 -
GENEVA

Details are still being worked out. Clinton will most likely stay in the InterContinental. Some press (pool) will stay there, with the rest of the press staying in the President and Warwick hotels. Clinton will meet with the Swiss Prime Minister Saturday night, but nothing else is planned. Perhaps a private dinner with his family. On Sunday, 9 a.m. to noon is basically blocked out. Location of the site for the meeting between Clinton and Assad is still being decided. The last time a President was in Geneva, was November 1990, when President Bush met with Assad at the International Conference Center. In any event, the filing center will be at the Intercontinental Hotel. Phones in press hotel rooms (President & Warwick) reportedly do not have U.S. computer-friendly modular jacks. There will be 24 hour transportation between the press hotels and the Filing Center. Swiss security is expected to be extremely tight at the Intercontinental, so allow for extra time to get in. Clinton expected to leave town early afternoon, getting back to Andrews in early evening. Press charter to follow by several hours.