

UNCLASSIFIED

RWANDA Ref

R # 14

BRIEFING MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

IS/FPC/CDR JPO

Date: 11/23/91

RELEASE
 EXCISE
 DENY
 DELETE Non-Responsive Info

DECLASSIFY
 DECLASSIFIED
IN PART

MR Cases Only
EO Citations 93

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

TS authority to:
 CLASSIFY as S or C
 DOWNGRADE TS to S or C

TO: Ambassador Albright
THRU: Ambassador Walker
FROM: POL - Robert T. Grey
SUBJECT: SC informals on Rwanda, June 21, 3:30 pm

The French will be distributing their most recent draft of the Rwanda resolution setting up an observer force on the Uganda side of the border. The French told us of the changes they incorporated at the request of the NAM, and those should not cause any problem. Both the French and the NAM are looking at adopting the resolution tomorrow (Tuesday, 6/22). This is acceptable to us. The Tanzanians, in their role as facilitator of the peace talks, at first reflected the RPF's objection to the border force, and lobbied to delay the resolution until signing of the Arusha Accords on June 24. However, the RPF reportedly have lifted their objections, so the resolution can move forward earlier.

If the NAM, or others, question the need in operative paragraph 9 for "contingency planning", you may explain that we asked that language on this point be added to the draft. Washington considers it vital to avoid the delays in deployment of an interpositional force within Rwanda which would inevitably result from waiting until a) the Arusha agreement is signed, b) the UN SYG prepares a report, and c) the SC adopts a second resolution establishing a Neutral International Force. We want the UN to be able to move in as soon as feasible, to allow the displaced to return safely to their homes. To that end, we would like to see the UN Secretariat working on contingency plans for a UN-led force, without, of course, committing the UN in advance.

Also, the U.S., not the French, drafted the language of operative paragraph 3 enunciating the mandate of the border monitoring group, with an eye towards narrowing the mandate in order to ensure that it is achievable. We would not like to see the language amended to make it more vague or all-encompassing. Washington prefers a limited mandate.

drafted:POL:LLShestack, wang 13696, 6/21/93
cleared:POL:JSBoardman
dist:exec(4), pol(3), subj, chron, ref

UNCLASSIFIED