

SUMMARY OF EVENTS RELATED TO NATO NUCLEAR POLICY 2005

Karel Koster PENN-NI /10 May 2005

Recent events at the UN NPT Review Conference regarding the US nuclear weapons deployed for NATO use in Europe were preceded by a number of developments in the countries involved. Below is a summary of the events, followed by various documents and articles in the appendices.

Jan 2005

19 Jan. Mayor Akiba of Hiroshima visits the European, Belgian and German parliaments to put his case for nuclear disarmament. In Belgium the strong anti-nuclear movement co-ordinates the 'Mayors for Peace' campaign while at the same time campaigning against NATO nuclear weapons on Belgian soil.

Feb 2005

9 Feb. Report by Hans Kristensen (www.NRDC.org, Wash DC) on US nuclear weapons in Europe receives substantial press coverage in Netherlands and Belgium

14 Feb. Questions are asked in the Netherlands parliament (see under 'documents' below). Besides the usual 'no confirmation or denial' on the presence of nuclear weapons Minister Bot of Foreign Affairs denies there is a link between the NATO nuclear weapons and the NPT. ("*The deployment of American nuclear weapons on European soil within the framework of allied defence does not violate the NPT*").

March 2005

1 March. Hans Kristensen (NRDC) makes presentation in Netherlands parliament on his report

2 March. Conference on NPT and nuclear arms race at Netherlands foreign policy thinktank Clingendael, co-organised by MPI. One of the presentations is on NATO nuclear policy

22 March. Belgian Senate foreign affairs committee approves a resolution calling for nuclear disarmament measures, including withdrawal of NATO nuclear weapons.

23 March. Questions in Belgian parliament on NATO nuclear weapons

April 2005

13 April. In Germany the opposition liberal FDP tables a resolution calling for the withdrawal of NATO nuclear weapons, which in the first instance is not supported by the governing Greens and Social Democrats (Grünen and SPD).

16 April. 'Bombspotting day' in Belgium against nuclear weapon related installations. 1000 participate, hundreds are arrested after trespassing.

21 April. In Belgium a large majority in the Belgian Senate supports a resolution calling for a series of disarmament measures, including the withdrawal of NATO nuclear weapons from Belgium.

26 April. A leading Norwegian parliamentarian, Lars Rise of the Christian Democrats, the prime minister's party, states in the foreign affairs committee "*It is a problem that NATO-countries themselves use nuclear weapons as deterrence. We want US to remove its tactical nuclear weapons from the soil of other NATO-countries.*"

28 April.

After a debate in the Netherlands parliament on 26 April the opposition parties table a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all NATO nuclear weapons from Europe. One of the three parties in the coalition government, D66 (centrist liberals) votes with the opposition. However, the resolution is voted down.

May 2005

2 May. The weekly German magazine Der Spiegel publishes an opinion poll which shows that a large majority of the German population wants the NATO nuclear weapons withdrawn.

That afternoon in New York at the NPT Review Conference German Minister Fischer of Foreign Affairs (Greens) states that:

"...as a first step we propose the complete implementation of the respective unilateral commitments that were made by the United States and Russia in 1991 and 1992 to reduce their sub-strategic nuclear arsenals. It is our objective to reduce and eliminate these weapons on all sides...."

This means that withdrawal is linked to negotiations with the Russian government. This was the position of the social democrats in the Netherlands (PvdA) until this year. They now support unilateral withdrawal

6 May. Minister Struck, the German Defence Minister declares: "*I'm of the same opinion as Foreign Minister Fischer, that we will have to talk about this issue (nuclear weapons removal) in the appropriate NATO bodies.*" (DPA). The position has then apparently shifted to taking the issue into the relevant NATO organs: probably the Nuclear Planning Group in June. This would mean that there will be no decision during the NPT revcon.

In that same report he is also quoted as going a step further: "*We will have to clarify this issue in consultation with the other European allies, which still host nuclear weapons on their territory.*" Apparently there will be consultations with the allies who also form part of the NATO nuclear strike force, (Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Turkey), or perhaps some of them. This could be done more quickly, within the period of the NPT revcon.

Comment

There has been some optimism in ngo circles in reaction to the German statements. However, as long as German moves are conditional on other developments and not unequivocally unilateral (i.e. all nuclear weapons will be removed from German soil) caution must prevail. The following points should be kept in mind:

1. It may be interesting to look at the possibility of unilaterally abrogating the bilateral treaties between the US and the host countries, which regulated the nuclear sharing arrangement for each of the countries concerned. (see NRDC report at www.nrdc.org, page 12)
2. There should not be a mere displacement of nuclear bombs from one location to another within Europe. In this regard the exact geographic definition of Turkey is important.
3. The arrangements should include the US nuclear weapons allocated for nuclear strike missions by US aircraft based in NATO member states.

Karel Koster
PENN-NI

APPENDED (languages: English, French, Dutch, German)

Documents: parliamentary reports, questions and answers, and significant quotes from government and others

Articles: newspaper reports of significant steps

DOCUMENTS

WRITTEN QUESTIONS PUT TO NETHERLANDS GOVERNMENT BY PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE LOWER CHAMBER REGARDING THE NEW EVIDENCE ON US NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEPLOYED IN THE NETHERLANDS (unofficial translation by Karel Koster, PENN/NL 14 February 2005 -questions and 11 March 2005 -answers)

2040508310

Questions by the members Timmermans and Koenders (both Labour Party) to the ministers of foreign affairs and defence regarding American nuclear weapons on Dutch territory (put on 11 February 2005).

1. Have you taken note of the report of the Natural Resources Defense Council on American nuclear weapons in Europe?
2. Does this report provide sufficient reason to publish information on the presence of American nuclear weapons in the Netherlands? Are there indeed about twenty American nuclear weapons on Dutch soil, at Volkel air base?

Answer

Because of allied agreements no comment can be made regarding numbers and locations of American nuclear weapons deployed in Europe

3. Do you agree that nuclear weapons have lost their military-strategic rationale since the end of the Cold War, as there is no conceivable threat to European territory against which tactical nuclear weapons could be deployed?
4. If you agree, are you prepared to ask the US government to remove these weapons from Dutch territory and to inform the Chamber of this as soon as possible?

ANSWER

The NATO Strategic Concept reviewed in 1999 emphasises the presence of American nuclear weapons on European soil and that the nuclear tasks of the European allies remain the irreplaceable political and military components of transatlantic unity. The Alliance will maintain nuclear forces in Europe at the minimum level necessary for maintaining peace and stability.

There have been no structural changes since 1999 in the strategic environment of NATO that would necessitate a review of this policy.

- 1) www.nrdc.org/nuclear/euro/euro.pdf

2040508320

Questions by member Karimi (GreenLeft) to the ministers of foreign affairs and defence regarding American nuclear weapons on Netherlands territory (put on 11 February 2005).

1. Have you read the articles 'US said to remove its nukes from Greece' 1) and 'In Europa staan 480 kernwapens' 2) (translation KK: '480 nuclear weapons deployed in Europe')?

ANSWER

Yes

2. Can you confirm that the total number of American nuclear weapons deployed in European NATO member states amounts to 480? If not, why not?
3. Is the claim by William Arkin, author of the book quoted in the NY times, that there are twenty American nuclear weapons deployed on Volkel air base, correct? 3) If not, how many weapons are there?
4. Can you confirm that the nuclear weapons deployed in Greece have in the meantime been withdrawn? If not, why not?

ANSWER

Because of allied commitments no comments can be made regarding numbers and locations of American nuclear weapons deployed in Europe

5. Do you agree with the proposition that, as the Netherlands has signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the government should do all it can to attain a nuclear weapons free world?

ANSWER

Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty determines that the states-parties to the treaty must strive for nuclear disarmament, as well as for a treaty on general and complete disarmament. The government completely agrees with this and believes that the process of taking useful steps to get closer to this goal should be continued. In this context reference should be made to the so-called NATO3 paper, previously sent to the Lower House (parliamentary year 2003-2004, 29 200V, nr.101), in which a number of such concrete steps is proposed, such as the speedy entry into force of the Comprehensive Test ban treaty (CTBT) and the maintenance of a nuclear test moratorium as long as this treaty has not yet entered into force.

Besides this the Netherlands, as chair of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, has made active attempts to reach agreement on the agenda so that, among others, progress can be made with regard to a negotiating mandate for a Fissile-Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT). Finally, the government welcomes the signing of the Treaty of Moscow, implementation of this treaty should lead to a further reduction in the total number of strategic nuclear weapons in the US and the Russian Federation.

6. Are you prepared to encourage the American government to take back the remaining nuclear weapons deployed on Netherlands territory? If not, why not? Is such a deployment a violation of the NPT, which the Netherlands signed? Will you provide an explanation for your reply?

ANSWER

The deployment of American nuclear weapons on European soil within the framework of allied defence does not violate the NPT. There is after all no question of the transfer of nuclear weapons or control over the weapons.

7. Is it correct that the NATO supreme allied commander, general James L. Jones, supports the removal of American nuclear weapons from Europe, but that such a decision has met opposition from certain politicians? If so, which politicians? Are you prepared to support his arguments? If not, why not?

ANSWER

The NATO Strategic Concept reviewed in 1999 emphasises the presence of American nuclear weapons on European soil and that the nuclear tasks of the European allies remain the irreplaceable political and military components of transatlantic unity. The Alliance will maintain nuclear forces in Europe at the minimum level necessary for maintaining peace and stability.

There have been no structural changes since 1999 in the strategic environment of NATO that would necessitate a review of this policy. The government does not assume that General James L. Jones (Supreme Allied Commander Operations) wants to throw doubt on the Strategic Concept regarding this point.

- 1) New York Times, 9 Feb 2005
- 2) De Volkskrant 10 Feb. 2005
- 3) Radio 1 Journaal, 10 Feb 2005

note:

These questions serve to supplement earlier questions on this issue by the members Timmermans and Koenders (both Labour Party), also put on 11 February 2005 (question number 2040508310)

2040509450

Questions by the member Van Velzen (SP) to the ministers of foreign affairs and defence regarding nuclear weapons in the Netherlands (put on 14 February 2005)

1. Is true that the Netherlands government signed bilateral agreements on nuclear weapons with the United States in the 'fifties? 1) If not, what are the facts? If yes, what is the content of these treaties? For how long were these treaties valid?

2. Is it true that the Netherlands government made a technical agreement in 1978 with the American air force regarding nuclear matters? 2) If not, what are the facts? If yes, what are the contents of the agreement? Is this 1978 technical agreement an elaboration bilateral treaties signed earlier or is it a treaty in its own right? Can you explain your reply?

3. Is it true that the Netherlands government signed a nuclear agreement with the United States under the name 'Toy Chest'? 3) If not, what are the facts? If yes, what are the contents of this treaty? For what period is this treaty valid?

4. On the basis of what treaty are the American units 752 MUNSS and 703 MUNSS operational in Volkel? 4) What are the contents of this treaty? For how long is it valid?

7. Are you prepared to publish the treaties on which the deployment of these nuclear warheads at Volkel is based? If not, why not?

ANSWER

For reasons of national security no answer can be given regarding possible bilateral or multilateral treaties related to the nuclear task of the Netherlands within the framework of allied defence policy.

5. Is it true that 'Nuclear Strike' exercises can take place on the bombing ranges at Noordvaarder (Terschelling) and Vliehors (Vlieland)? 5) Can you indicate which Nuclear Strike exercises have taken place at the Noordvaarder and how often exercises with dummies/nuclear weapons took place there until it was closed down? Can you indicate which Nuclear Strike exercises have taken place until now at the Vliehors, where more of such exercises have been planned and how often exercises with dummies/nuclear weapons have taken place there? Is it true that American pilots also train at the Noordvaarder and Vliehors? If yes, can you give the House a list of these exercises to date?

ANSWER

As you know the Netherlands has a nuclear task. A single squadron has been given the mission of carrying out this task. No information can be given concerning training and exercises related to this task.

6. Is it true that nuclear bunkers have been built at Volkel air base with a capacity of 44 nuclear warheads? If not, what are the facts? 6) Have that many nuclear warheads ever been stored at Volkel? If so, during which period?

ANSWER

Because of allied commitments no comments can be made regarding numbers and locations of American nuclear weapons deployed in Europe

8. Can you indicate what the judicial position of the State of the Netherlands as a signatory of the UN Non-Proliferation treaty (NPT) is as far as the following are concerned: 1. the 'hosting' of American military personnel on Netherlands territory with the aim of enabling them to execute a nuclear mission 2. the deployment of American nuclear weapons on Netherlands territory and 3. facilitating exercises on Netherlands territory with the aim of being able to execute a nuclear mission? Do you agree that the nuclear weapon treaties and the technical co-operation agreements between the Netherlands and the United States mentioned above are a violation of the (spirit of) the NPT, in which the State of the Netherlands committed itself "not to receive the transfer...of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices directly, or indirectly...? 7) If not, why not and can you explain your reply?

9. Are you prepared to adhere to the NPT and the spirit of the NPT and to have all nuclear weapons removed from the Netherlands and also no longer give permission for exercises on Netherlands territory which serve to train for the execution of nuclear missions? If not, why not?

ANSWER

The NATO nuclear tasks were already operational during the negotiations on and the entry into force of the NPT and were accepted. They were and are completely in conformity with the NPT.

- 1) U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, a review of Post-Cold War Policy force levels, and war planning. Natural Resources Defense Council, Hans M. Kristensen. February 2005. See p.12.
- 2) Ibid., see p. 13.
- 3) Ibid., blz 13. See also William H. Arkin, Code Names: Deciphering U.S. Military Plans, Programs, and Operations in the 9/11 World (Hanover, New Hampshire: Steerforth Press, 2005), pp 458, 515, 592, 531.
- 4) U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, a review of Post-Cold War Policy force levels, and war planning. Natural Resources Defense Council, Hans M. Kristensen. Februari 2005. See p. 63
- 5) Ibid., see p. 42.
- 6) Ibid., see Appendix A.
- 7) Ibid., see p. 71. T.a.p."Arm control and Disarmament Agreements (Washington, D.C.: ACDA, 1990), p 99.

Note:

These questions serve to supplement earlier questions on this issue by the members Timmermans and Koenders (both Labour Party), put on 11 February 2005 (question number 2040508310) and of member Karimi (GreenLeft), also put on 11 February 2005 (question number 2040508320)

+++++

Belgian parliament questions and answers on NATO nuclear weapons

**Chambre des Représentants – Commission de la Défense
Réunion du 23 mars 2005 – Compte rendu intégral (CRIV 51 – COM 545)**

05 Questions jointes de

- **Mme Zoé Genot au ministre des Affaires étrangères sur "l'utilisation "out of area" d'armes nucléaires américaines stationnées en Europe" (n° 5976)**

- **Mme Zoé Genot au ministre de la Défense sur "la sécurité des armes nucléaires américaines stationnées en Europe" (n° 5977)**

05.01 **Zoé Genot** (ECOLO): Monsieur le président, monsieur le ministre, il ressort de documents publiés aux Etats-Unis sur base du Freedom of Information Act et d'écrits dans le rapport du Natural Resources Defense Council sur les armes nucléaires américaines en Europe que le soutien apporté par les militaires américains en Europe sous commandement Eucom à leurs collègues au Moyen-Orient sous commandement CENTCOM peut également inclure l'utilisation d'armes nucléaires stationnées en Europe. Le NATO Nuclear Planning System permet également la définition de cibles "out-oarea".

Monsieur le ministre,

1. Les doctrines politique et militaire de l'OTAN permettent-elles l'utilisation d'armes nucléaires out-of-area? Si oui, dans quelles circonstances?
2. Les accords bilatéraux avec les Etats-Unis relatifs aux tâches nucléaires, que la Belgique assure dans le cadre de l'OTAN, permettent-ils l'utilisation d'armes nucléaires out-of-area?
3. Y a-t-il des circonstances dans lesquelles le gouvernement belge permettrait l'utilisation d'armes nucléaires après une première attaque chimique ou biologique contre des forces de l'OTAN?

Monsieur le président, je passe maintenant à ma deuxième question. Monsieur le ministre, il ressort de documents publiés aux Etats-Unis sur base du Freedom of Information Act et décrits dans le rapport du Natural Resources Defense Council sur les armes nucléaires américaines en Europe qu'à peine 50% des militaires chargés de la sécurité des armes nucléaires est à même de satisfaire à la Nuclear Surety Inspection de l'Air Force (p. 72 du rapport). Cette situation pose des questions quant à la sécurité des tâches nucléaires effectuées par la Belgique dans le cadre de l'OTAN.

Mes questions sont les suivantes:

1. Quels sont les résultats à ces tests du personnel américain du MUNSS présent en Belgique? Quand ont-ils eu lieu et pour quand les prochains sont-ils prévus?
2. Quels sont les résultats du personnel belge impliqué dans les tâches nucléaires aux tests de sécurité de l'armée américaine? A quels tests et contrôles ce personnel est-il soumis? Quand les derniers tests ont-ils eu lieu et quand les prochains auront-ils lieu?
3. Quels sont les résultats du personnel belge impliqué dans les tâches nucléaires aux tests et contrôles menés par l'OTAN? A quels tests et contrôles ce personnel est-il soumis? Quand ont eu lieu les derniers tests et pour quand les prochains sont-ils prévus?

Le **président**: Madame Genot, je tiens à vous féliciter pour votre concision et la précision de vos questions.

05.02 **André Flahaut**, ministre: Monsieur le président, j'ai déjà répondu à la question il y a une ou deux semaines, mais je ferai un effort pour lui répondre, parce que c'est elle. La politique de l'Alliance en matière nucléaire repose sur le concept stratégique adopté en 1999, en vertu duquel les moyens nucléaires alliés revêtent un caractère politique. C'est pourquoi l'Alliance maintient une capacité suffisante mais minimale, sans que ces armes visent l'un ou l'autre pays. La Belgique fait donc preuve de solidarité envers ses partenaires de l'Alliance en mettant à leur disposition des moyens pour l'exécution des tâches nucléaires et en leur offrant les capacités nécessaires de stockage d'éventuelles armes nucléaires. Les Etats membres qui disposent d'emplacements de stockage doivent répondre, en collaboration avec les unités de l'armée américaine qui y sont établies, à des normes de qualité déterminées dans les domaines de la sécurité, de l'entraînement, des opérations et du soutien technique. Pour contrôler le respect de ces normes, les installations de stockage sont soumises tous les 18 mois à une inspection du service général de l'armée américaine et, tous les 36 mois, à une évaluation par des équipes de l'OTAN. Pour des raisons de sécurité, je ne peux vous donner le détail de ces inspections et évaluations s'agissant des installations et des moyens belges; je peux néanmoins vous assurer qu'ils satisfont aux normes de qualité précitées. Je tiens par ailleurs à souligner que toute utilisation de l'arme nucléaire se fera en consultation entre les alliés et au terme d'une évaluation minutieuse de la situation. Préjuger de l'utilisation ou non de l'arme nucléaire en réponse à un type particulier d'agression affaiblirait le concept stratégique de l'Alliance qui reconnaît l'ambiguïté quant à la nature de la riposte comme un élément de renforcement de la discussion. Pour être complet, les documents parus dans la presse américaine sont déjà plus anciens; depuis lors, les choses ont sérieusement évolué, notamment quant aux contrôles de qualité et de sécurité des installations.

05.03 **Zoé Genot** (ECOLO): Monsieur le ministre, deux éléments de réponse. Tout d'abord, si les Américains font des efforts de transparence, je regrette que nous ne puissions pas accomplir les mêmes efforts, même si c'est avec un certain décalage. En effet, c'est quand les problèmes sont résolus qu'on apprend qu'ils ont existé. Mais au moins, un effort de transparence est réalisé de la part de l'armée américaine qui reconnaît que 50% de son armée n'a pas satisfait aux tests. Je trouve dommage que nous ne puissions pas être pleinement rassurés en ayant connaissance de la nature des tests et de leurs résultats du côté belge. En ce qui concerne l'utilisation des armes "out of area", si je comprends bien votre réponse, il n'existe en fait aucune doctrine en la matière: on réagira au cas par cas. L'impression qu'on pouvait avoir que les armes nucléaires d'une zone étaient affectées spécifiquement à cette zone et qu'il faudrait des actes totalement spéciaux pour pouvoir les utiliser en dehors de cette zone n'a pas l'air fondée.

+++++

Deutscher Bundestag Drucksache 15/5257

15. Wahlperiode 13. 04. 2005

Antrag

der Abgeordneten Dr. Werner Hoyer, Harald Leibrecht, Rainer Brüderle, Ernst Burgbacher, Helga Daub, Jörg van Essen, Ulrike Flach, Horst Friedrich (Bayreuth), Rainer Funke, Hans-Michael Goldmann, Ulrich Heinrich, Birgit Homburger, Michael Kauch, Dr. Heinrich L. Kolb, Jürgen Koppelin, Ina Lenke, Sabine Leutheusser-Schnarrenberger, Dirk Niebel, Günther Friedrich Nolting, Eberhard Otto (Godern), Detlef Parr, Gisela Piltz, Dr. Rainer Stinner, Carl-Ludwig Thiele, Jürgen Türk, Dr. Claudia Winterstein, Dr. Volker Wissing, Dr. Wolfgang Gerhardt und der Fraktion der FDP

Glaubwürdigkeit des nuklearen Nichtverbreitungsregimes stärken – US-Nuklearwaffen aus Deutschland abziehen

Der Bundestag wolle beschließen:

Der Deutsche Bundestag stellt fest:

Im Mai 2005 tagt in New York die alle fünf Jahre stattfindende Überprüfungskonferenz des Nuklearen Nichtverbreitungsvertrages (NVV). Die gegenwärtige Krise um Nuklearwaffen-Ambitionen des Iran und Nordkoreas, aber auch die Befürchtungen, dass künftig möglicherweise weitere Staaten oder sogar internationale Terroristen Zugriff auf Nuklearwaffen erhalten könnten, machen das nukleare Nichtverbreitungsregime zu einer zentralen Säule der Sicherheit und des Friedens weltweit. Es liegt in den Händen der 188 Mitgliedsländer des Nichtverbreitungsregimes, diese wichtigste globale Abrüstungskonferenz unbedingt zu einem Erfolg zu führen.

Das NVV-Regime beruht auf drei Säulen: Verpflichtung der Mitglieder zur Nichtverbreitung, Verpflichtung der Nuklearwaffenstaaten auf Abrüstung ihrer Nuklearwaffenarsenale und Berechtigung aller Staaten zum Zugang zur zivilen Nutzung der Kernenergie. Nur wenn alle drei Prinzipien gleichberechtigt verfolgt und umgesetzt werden, behält das Nichtverbreitungsregime seine Glaubwürdigkeit. Deutschland bekennt sich als Nicht-Nuklearwaffenstaat aktiv zur nuklearen

Nichtverbreitung und zeigt bei den Bemühungen um eine Lösung der Iran-Krise, dass es bereit ist, auch bei der Frage der zivilen nuklearen Teilhabe die Verpflichtungen aus dem NVV ernst zu nehmen. Das nukleare Nichtverbreitungsregime wird aber auf die Dauer nur Bestand haben und Staaten mit potentiellen Nuklearwaffenambitionen werden sich nur dann weiter an ihre Verpflichtung halten, auf Nuklearwaffen zu verzichten, wenn auch bei der Umsetzung der Abrüstungsverpflichtung der Nuklearwaffenstaaten weitere Fortschritte gemacht werden. Dazu müssen der Atomteststoppvertrag in Kraft gesetzt und Verhandlungen über ein Ende der Produktion von spaltbarem Material für Waffenzwecke aufgenommen werden. Dazu müssen aber auch die NATO-Staaten die Bereitschaft dokumentieren, die Rolle der Nuklearwaffen in ihrer Militärstrategie zu reduzieren und weitere nukleare Abrüstungsschritte vorzunehmen.

Die USA haben bis heute fast 500 taktische Nuklearwaffen in Europa stationiert, davon etwa 150 in Deutschland. Im Rahmen der nuklearen Teilhabe ist bis heute die Bundeswehr an den Vorbereitungen zu einem Einsatz dieser Waffen beteiligt. Dabei ist die Fähigkeit zum Einsatz von taktischen Nuklearwaffen von deutschem Boden aus heute angesichts der veränderten Bedrohungslage sicherheitspolitisch nicht mehr zwingend, die gegenwärtige NATO-Strategie könne auch ohne diese Option beibehalten werden, und eine Verlegung dieser Waffen in eine rückwärtige sichere Aufbewahrung in den USA wäre im Umfeld der Überprüfungskonferenz zum NVV ein wichtiges erstes Signal, dass auch die Abrüstungsverpflichtung als integrativer Bestandteil des Nichtverbreitungsregimes ernst genommen wird.

Der Deutsche Bundestag fordert die Bundesregierung auf,

1. sich auf der anstehenden Überprüfungskonferenz zum NVV aktiv für eine Stärkung aller drei Säulen des Nichtverbreitungsregimes einzusetzen und damit zu einem Erfolg dieser wichtigen Konferenz beizutragen;
2. an ihren im Rahmen der EU-3 gemeinsam mit Frankreich und Großbritannien verfolgten Bemühungen um eine Lösung der Iran-Krise unvermindert festzuhalten und gemeinsam mit den USA nach Möglichkeiten zu suchen, wie der Iran unter Gewährung der zivilen Nutzung der Kernenergie verifizierbar von Nuklearwaffenambitionen abgebracht werden kann;
3. zur Stärkung der Glaubwürdigkeit des Nichtverbreitungsregimes und als Zeichen dafür, dass auch die Abrüstungsverpflichtung der Nuklearwaffenstaaten als integraler Bestandteil des NVV ernst genommen und nachdrücklich verfolgt wird, bei den amerikanischen Verbündeten darauf zu drängen, dass die bis heute in Deutschland stationierten taktischen Nuklearwaffen der USA abgezogen werden.

Berlin, den 12. April 2005

Dr. Werner Hoyer

Harald Leibrecht

Rainer Brüderle

Ernst Burgbacher

Helga Daub

Jörg van Essen

Ulrike Flach

Horst Friedrich (Bayreuth)

Rainer Funke

Hans-Michael Goldmann

Ulrich Heinrich

Birgit Homburger

Michael Kauch

Dr. Heinrich L. Kolb

Jürgen Koppelin

Ina Lenke

Sabine Leutheusser-Schnarrenberger

Dirk Niebel

Günther Friedrich Nolting

Eberhard Otto (Godern)

Gisela Piltz
Dr. Rainer Stinner
Carl-Ludwig Thiele
Jürgen Türk
Dr. Claudia Winterstein
Dr. Volker Wissing
Dr. Wolfgang Gerhardt und Fraktion

+++++

BELGIAN SENATE RESOLUTION 21 APRIL 2005

See

<http://www.senate.be/www/?MIval=/publications/viewPub.html&COLL=S&LEG=3&NR=985&VOLGNR=4&LANG=nl>

Relevant excerpt and unofficial translation (Hans Lammerant):

"(.....)

6. bij de NAVO initiatieven ter sprake te brengen in verband met :
 - 6.1. de herziening van strategische doctrines inzake kernwapens;
 - 6.2. de graduele terugtrekking van de Amerikaanse tactische kernwapens uit Europa met het oog op de naleving van artikel VI van het non-proliferatieverdrag en de vereiste diplomatieke maatregelen nemen om in de NAVO-Rusland-Raad onderhandelingen aan te vatten over de vermindering en de vernietiging van de Amerikaanse tactische kernwapens in Europa en de Russische tactische kernwapens en de beveiliging ervan, en wat dat betreft, de maatregelen te versterken die de transparantie en het vertrouwen tussen de NAVO en Rusland ten goede komen;
 - 6.3. de toepassing van het onomkeerbaarheidsbeginsel inzake de niet-aanwezigheid van kernwapens in de nieuwe lidstaten van de NAVO;
 - 6.4. stappen die moeten leiden tot een kernwapenvrije zone, bestaande uit alle niet-kernwapenstaten in Europa;
 - 6.5. een verdergaande transparantie dan in de huidige praktijk;

(...)

TRANSLATION

(...)

6. to propose initiatives in NATO concerning:
 - 6.1. the review of strategic doctrines concerning nuclear weapons;
 - 6.2. the gradual withdrawal of the American tactical nuclear weapons from Europe as fullfilment of art. VI NPT and to take the necessary diplomatic measures to start in the NATO-Russia Council negotiations on the reduction and the destruction of the American tactical nuclear weapons in Europe and the Russian tactical nuclear weapons and on making them secure, and to strengthen on this point confidence and transparency measures between NATO and Russia;
 - 6.3. the application of the irreversibility principle on the non-presence of nuclear weapons in the new NATO member states;
 - 6.4. steps towards a nuclear weapon free zone, formed by all NNWS in Europe;
 - 6.5. a transparency policy which goes farther than the existing practice;

(...)

+++++

26 April 2005

INTERPELLATION DEBATE ON NPT IN NORWEGIAN PARLIAMENT

(provided by Kirsten Osen)

(Norwegian Christian Democrats call for removal U.S. tactical nuclear weapons from Europe)

This is a non-professional, unauthorized translation of citations from a 50 min plenary debate 26. April 2005 in the Norwegian Parliament following an interpellation from MP Thorbjorn Jagland (Ap), Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to Foreign Minister Jan Petersen (H). The citations cover all parts of the debate related to the role of nuclear weapons in security policy in general and in NATO in particular. As appears, security policy and NATO were not central themes of the debate. No mention was made of these themes by the Foreign Minister.

Here are the abbreviations and number of seats in the Norwegian Parliament (165 altogether):

Ap, Arbeiderpartiet = social democrats, 43 seats.

H, Høyre = conservatives, 38 seats.

KrF, Kristelig Folkepartiet = christian democrates, 22 seats.

Sp, Senterpartiet = sentral/agrar, 10 seats

SV, Socialistisk Venstre = social left, 23 seats

Did not participate in the debate:

FrP, Fremskrittspartiet = ultraconservatives, 25 seats

V, Venstre = left sentral, 2 seats

Kp, Kyst partiet = costal, 1 seat

U, Uavhengig = independent, 1 seat.

The present Government is a coalition between H, KrF and V. Prime minister Kjell Magne Bondevik belongs to KrF, while the Foreign minister Jan Petersen belongs to H. Petersen is very obedient to USA. It is expected a government shift to red-green (Ap, SV, Sp) by the election this fall.

Excerpts from the debate:

Question: "What is the Government going to do to secure a best possible outcome of the NPT Review Conference, and so that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is reinforced?"

Thorbjorn Jagland (Ap): "If (the nuclear powers) retain their nuclear weapons and develop new ones, this is a clear signal that they regard nuclear weapons an important part of their security policy, and accordingly other countries can do exactly the same, and then the whole regime is undermined."

Bjorn Jacobsen (SV): "We know that for certain countries the identity as a nation is dependent upon the position of nuclear weapons. Norway has long traditions in self imposed restrictions. We don't have any nuclear weapons on our soil in peace time. Hellas has returned their nuclear weapons. It is reason to believe that this policy can be extended. I am aware of the problem with North-Korea, and with Pakistan, but let us see what we can do on our own continent. We can dare to discuss NATO's nuclear strategy within NATO. There may be possibilities to obtain results and work within the organization."

Lars Rise (KrF = party of our Prime Minister): "The significance of nuclear weapons in security and defense policy must be reduced. At the Review Conference one must, according to my view, strongly advocate that the nuclear weapons states immediately start real nuclear disarmament. US, Russia and other nuclear powers must be pressed to comply with agreed obligations to reduce the operational status of the nuclear weapon systems. If the five nuclear weapon states do not fulfill their obligations under the NPT, the other countries will not be willing to fulfill their obligations either. The reductions must be verifiable, transparent, and irreversible. It is a problem that NATO-countries themselves use nuclear weapons as deterrence. We want US to remove its tactical nuclear weapons from the soil of other NATO-countries."

Bjorklund (SV): "Our time is characterized by rearmament rather than disarmament. The main reason is that our military doctrines make us dependent upon nuclear weapons. NATO, with US in the leadership, often proclaims its right to first use of nuclear weapons. This is the reality. With such a reality it is not enough to hope for the best. As nations we must contribute more actively, whether we have nuclear weapons or not. This is difficult, and I am pleased by the agreement on this matter in this hall. I think we must try harder with greater determination also in fora other than the review conference, not least within NATO and in the context of NATO's strategy for first use of nuclear weapons. Here Norway can strengthen its effort in the time to come."

Thorbjørn Jagland (Ap): I would like to emphasize what Bjorn Jacobsen said, the problem that nuclear weapons are regarded as political weapons. This is what happens when the nuclear powers continue to store and develop new nuclear weapons. Then the other countries can say the same, that they too want political nuclear weapons. Among others one has speculated whether Brazil may think so in the future. The great danger is if terrorist groups also regard nuclear weapons as political weapons, although in a different way, to be used to obtain political aims. This of course would not threaten the entire globe, but it would be extremely destabilizing if terrorist groups used nuclear

weapons at a smaller scale for political aims. Therefore it is extremely important to stick to the plan to abolish all nuclear weapons. They cannot be used, neither for military nor for political aims.”
(provided by Kirsten Osen, Norway 3 May 2005)

+++++

**RESOLUTION IN NETHERLANDS PARLIAMENT CALLING FOR THE
WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS FROM EUROPE 28 April 2005**

A resolution (translation below) to remove American nuclear weapons from Europe was tabled in the Netherlands parliament on 28 April following the debate described in News in Review nr 5. (www.reachincriticalwill.org). This was done by three opposition parties: GreenLeft (Farah Karimi), Socialist Party (Krista van Velzen) and Labour Party (Bert Koenders), which together have 58 seats in the 150 member parliament. The resolution was also supported by the Groep Lazrak en D66, making a total of 65 votes. Although the resolution was defeated it is noteworthy that D66, one of the parties of the governing coalition, voted for it. In doing so it contradicted government policy.

Karel Koster PENN/Netherlands

**29 800 V Vaststelling van de begrotingsstaten van het
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (V) voor het
jaar 2005 's-Gravenhage 2005 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2004–2005, 29 800 V, nr.
101**

Nr. 101 motie van het lid Karimi c.s.

Voorgesteld 28 april 2005

De Kamer,

gehoord de beraadslaging,

overwegende, dat in mei 2005 een nieuwe toetsingsconferentie plaatsvindt
in het kader van het Non-Proliferatie Verdrag;

van mening, dat de kernwapenstaten ondubbelzinnig moeten streven naar
een volledige eliminatie van hun nucleaire arsenalen;

van mening, dat naar aanleiding van de aanstaande NPT-Toetsingsconferentie
initiatieven genomen moeten worden voor nucleaire ontwapening

en non-proliferatie in diverse internationale fora, zoals de NPT-Toetsingsconferentie,
de NAVO en de EU;

verzoekt de regering zich in te zetten voor een strikte ontwapeningsagenda,
waaronder de terugtrekking van alle Amerikaanse kernwapens uit

Europa met het oog op de naleving van artikel VI van het Non-Proliferatie
Verdrag,

en gaat over tot de orde van de dag.

Karimi

Van Velzen

Koenders

UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION (translation by Karel Koster, PENN-NI)

29 800 v Nr. 101

Resolution by Karimi et.al.

Tabled 28 April 2005

This Chamber,

Having heard the consultation,

Considering that a new review conference in the framework of the Non Proliferation Treaty is
taking place in May 2005;

Is of the opinion that the nuclear weapon states should unreservedly strive to completely eliminate
their nuclear arsenals;

Is of the opinion that in view of the upcoming NPT Review Conference initiatives should be taken
for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in various international fora, like the NPT Review
Conference, NATO and the EU;

Requests the government to undertake steps for a strict disarmament agenda, including the withdrawal of all American nuclear weapons from Europe in order to comply with article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty,
And resumes its daily order of business.

Karimi

Van Velzen

Koenders

+++++

German Federal Foreign Office

Speech by Joschka Fischer, Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the 7th Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

New York, 2 May 2005

[...] It is also our aim to reduce sub-strategic nuclear weapons – with the ultimate goal of their complete elimination. In Germany, there is a serious public debate on this issue which calls for practical steps. The European Union Common Position on this Review Conference also highlights this aim. In it, the EU takes up a step-by-step approach that was advocated in a Working Paper that Germany presented to the Preparatory Committee of this conference.

For example, as a first step we propose the complete implementation of the respective unilateral commitments that were made by the United States and Russia in 1991 and 1992 to reduce their sub-strategic nuclear arsenals. It is our objective to reduce and eliminate these weapons on all sides.

We also believe transparency measures could be agreed that would account for these weapons. A further step could then be the formalization and verification of the unilateral commitments.

These would be important steps that would make progress towards the elimination of sub-strategic nuclear arsenals. [...]

+++++

Church of Norway Council on Ecumenical and International Relations

The Norwegian Government must press for a breakthrough at the Review Conference in New York!
(provided by Stine Rødmyr)

The Seventh Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) started in New York, Monday, May 2. The Conference marks a decisive point in the choice between future generations living in fear of the worst man-made threats to human security, or the international society taking important steps towards minimizing these threats.

The end of the Cold War led to a significant reduction in the strategic importance of nuclear weapons. There existed a certain optimism regarding disarmament. In 1995, the treaty was made permanent, and in year 2000 the parties agreed on a nuclear test ban, together with the 13 steps for disarmament and non-proliferation.

The developments following the terrorist attacks September 11, 2001 no longer leaves any room for optimism. It is the view of many observers that if the parties during this conference does not reach agreement concerning seeing the lacking will of the nuclear powers to disarm (vertical proliferation) as belonging together with the proliferation of nuclear technology and weapons to new states (horizontal proliferation), then world society is facing a future development where the only existing and binding agreement on nuclear weapons will be undermined and eventually will disappear. This years conference means either a breakthrough or a collapse.

The Committee on International Relations of Church of Norway (KISP), gathered at their meeting March 7-8 declares:

KISP last fall called on the Norwegian Government to vote yes to the NAC resolution in the UN First Committee, and is happy to observe that Norway along with several NATO-countries bravely voted yes to the resolution.

Year 2005 is an important year in the work for disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In addition to the Review Conference, the Leaders of State of the NATO-members will meet this fall. KISP calls on the Norwegian Government to take up a comprehensive position with regard to nuclear disarmament, both in the ongoing Review Conference and concerning the revision of the NATO Doctrine in such a way that it speaks with one voice on nuclear weapons not being a part of the strategy of the Alliance.

As a non-nuclear NATO-member under NATO's nuclear umbrella, Norway has an important role to play

KISP calls on the Norwegian government to take up the following positions:

- Norway must maintain the relation between the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear arms. The nuclear powers must assume their responsibility.
- Norway has to be clear on the full implementation of the 13 steps for disarmament and non-proliferation.
- Norway must work for the rolling back of nuclear capabilities of new nuclear states
- Norway must support all steps to prevent the horizontal spread of nuclear arms
- Norway must support a strengthening of the international regime for disarmament and non-proliferation

ARTICLES

Spiegel online 22.4. (Vorabmeldung) (Germany)

FDP fordert Abzug von Atomwaffen aus Deutschland

Den Abzug der amerikanischen Nuklearwaffen aus Deutschland verlangt die FDP. In einem Bundestagsantrag anlässlich der nächsten Monat in New York stattfindenden Konferenz zum Atomwaffensperrvertrag monieren die Liberalen zudem, dass die Bundeswehr noch immer an den "Vorbereitungen zu einem Einsatz" solcher US-Bomben beteiligt ist. Tatsächlich üben deutsche "Tornado"-Piloten im rheinland-pfälzischen Büchel weiterhin den Nuklearkrieg. Etwa 150 Atombomben lagern laut FDP-Papier in Deutschland. Sie befinden sich in Büchel und Ramstein unter amerikanischem Verschluss. Auch der belgische Senat drängte vergangene Woche einmütig auf den "schrittweisen" Abbau der insgesamt knapp 500 US-Atomwaffen in Europa. SPD und Grüne nahmen derart konkrete Forderungen in ihren Bundestagsantrag zur Sperrvertragskonferenz allerdings nicht auf. Das Auswärtige Amt des Grünen Joschka Fischer und das Wehressort des Sozialdemokraten Peter Struck waren offenbar dagegen, weil sie keinen neuen Streit mit den USA wollen.

Spiegel online 22.4. (Vorabmeldung)

Westerwelle fordert Abzug von US-Atomraketen aus Deutschland

Hamburg (AFP) - FDP-Chef Guido Westerwelle hat den Abzug von rund 150 US-Atomwaffen aus Deutschland gefordert. Die Raketen seien "ein Überbleibsel des Kalten Krieges", sagte Westerwelle der "Bild"-Zeitung vom Samstag. Für die Verteidigung seien die Waffensysteme wegen ihrer kurzen Reichweiten "überflüssig". Sie würden "im Ernstfall unsere europäischen Partner treffen, niemanden sonst", betonte der FDP-Chef. Die FDP-Fraktion appelliert dem Bericht zufolge in einem Bundestagsantrag an die Bundesregierung, sich international für die Verlegung der taktischen Atomwaffen aus Deutschland einzusetzen.

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung – Weekly

Arms withdrawal urged

German politicians want nuclear weapons out of their country

29 April 2005

Members of Germany's coalition and opposition parties are calling for the United States to remove its nuclear weapons from Germany.

The effort is being pushed by the Free Democratic Party, an opposition party that has played a large role in past coalition governments. In a parliamentary resolution, the Free Democrats appealed to the government of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder to urge the United States to remove these tactical nuclear weapons. The party's chairman, Guido Westerwelle, said the weapons would do nothing for the nation's defense. "In a war, they would hit our European partners, and no one else," Westerwelle told the Bild newspaper recently.

The Free Democrats' effort is being supported by Angelika Beer, a former co-leader of the Greens, the junior coalition partner in Berlin. "Up to now, nothing has been said about what will happen to the tactical U.S. military weapons that are still in Europe," Beer told the newspaper Berliner Zeitung. A spokesman for the German government did not want to comment on the issue this week. But he did point out that Germany has obligations to fulfill as member of NATO.

The calls for the nuclear pullout come at a time when the U.S. military is facing another major stage in its reduction of forces since the end of the Cold War. In 1989, the year that the Berlin Wall fell, the U.S. military had about 213,000 troops in Europe, including 198,000 in West Germany. The totals have fallen steadily since. In the upcoming phase, the Army will cut its force from 62,000 soldiers across Europe to 24,000.

The exact number of tactical U.S. nuclear weapons is classified. The Free Democrats' resolution cites the figure of around 150. A non-governmental organization in Washington, the Natural Resources Defense Council, recently issued a study that said there were about 480 atomic weapons still in Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, and Turkey.

Security experts have long questioned the need for the continued storage of nuclear weapons in Europe. Karl-Heinz Kamp of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, told the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung that the weapons served as proof of the American security commitment to Europe during the Cold War. Afterward, they served as a form of insurance against possible aggressive activities in Russia, Kamp said. Both reasons no longer apply, he said.

Deutsche Welle

Germans Question US Nuclear Weapons

29 April 2005

German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder called Thursday for progress to be made on strengthening disarmament measures -- but an opposition demand that the US pull its nuclear weapons from Germany has fallen on deaf ears.

Ahead of next week's five-yearly review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in New York, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder called Thursday for progress on strengthening disarmament measures.

"We have two expectations from the talks," Schröder said in a press conference with visiting New Zealand Prime Minister Helen Clark.

"The first is that we reinforce the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as it is now and we need to put all our efforts into that," he said. "The second is that there is a credible disarmament mechanism and we hope we will see movement from countries on this point."

Clark (photo, with Joschka Fischer) said she hoped the meeting would focus on "striking a balance and ensuring that a country's right to produce nuclear energy does not provide cover for developing nuclear weapons." She pointed out that Germany, Britain and France should be congratulated for their efforts on attempting to obtain guarantees from Iran that it will not use its nuclear program to build weapons.

Focus on North Korea

Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer will lead the German delegation at the conference in New York which begins Monday and lasts until May 27.

Attended by diplomats from some 190 countries, it will re-examine the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which was first introduced in 1970.

The US is expected to push for discussions on tightening NPT rules that have been either bent or broken by, for example, Iran and North Korea.

North Korea is set to be a major talking point at the conference. The communist state said this month it had shut down a nuclear power plant and was preparing to re-process the plant's spent fuel, a move that could result in the production of enough plutonium to build up to six more nuclear bombs.

US in the hotseat

But the US may well come in for some criticism itself. President George Bush's track record of tinkering with international anti-nuclear rules has prompted critics to say Washington is top among those undermining the authority of the NPT. Bush has refused to support a test-ban treaty, threw out the anti-ballistic missile treaty with Russia, and is still dragging his feet on negotiating a global treaty to end the production of fissile material for bombs.

To many, Washington's perceived double standards set a bad example when it comes to negotiations with countries such as North Korea and Iran.

The US Energy Department, meanwhile, is keen to promote plans to make stockpiled warheads less sensitive to ageing, thereby saving on weapons maintenance and cutting back its stores.

FDP gets tough on nuclear weapons

It's a matter with particular relevance in Germany, where the nuclear question unexpectedly reared its head again this week. In the Bundestag, the opposition Liberal Democrats (FDP), with backing from the Green Party, called for an immediate withdrawal of some 150 land-based US nuclear weapons still housed on German soil -- a surprise move from a party generally known for its staunchly pro-American stance.

But party leader Guido Westerwelle described the weapons as a relic of the Cold War, and pointed out that the credibility of the NPT depended on states coming through on their pledge to disarm.

According to Article II of the NPT, ratified by the US in 1970 and Germany in 1975, "Each non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty undertakes not to receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly."

"It's time to reconsider whether their presence still serves a relevant purpose," Liberal Democrat MP Werner Hoyer told German weekly *Der Spiegel*. Harking back to the days of the Iron Curtain, most of the 480 US nuclear weapons stored in Europe are located in Germany, strategically closest to eastern Europe.

The German delegation in New York, however, is not expected to raise the issue. For the time being, it's reluctant to rock the boat of transatlantic relations.

Der Spiegel

2 May 2005

A poll published Monday by Der Spiegel (18/2005) on May 2, shows that more than three-quarters of Germans want US nuclear weapons withdrawn from Germany. The poll shows a very high support for a withdrawal even among supporters of the conservative parties. The Liberal Party (FDP), which recently submitted a resolution in the Parliament calling for a withdrawal, ironically has the lowest number of support for such a move among its supporters. Yet even there the support is overwhelming.

The poll asked the participants the following question:

"In Germany there are still 150 nuclear weapons under US command. Should these nuclear weapons be withdrawn from Germany?"

Overall CDU/CSU SPD Greens FDP

Yes 76 73 82 90 66

No 18 24 15 5 29

The poll was conducted by TNS Infratest and involved 1.000 individuals. During a meeting with the German foreign ministry in February, the head of the arms control section said he personally favored a withdrawal but that there was "no political pressure" to do so. The poll seems to change that.

The German poll follows last month's event where the Belgian Senate unanimously passed a resolution calling for the removal of US nuclear weapons.

Over the last 24 hours, numerous prominent German politicians have gone on record in media interviews saying the time has come to withdraw the remaining nuclear weapons. This includes defense and foreign affairs spokespeople from both government parties (Greens and Social Democrats). German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer acknowledged today at the UN NPT Review Conference that "there is a serious public debate on this issue [in Germany] which calls for practical steps." But although he advocated the eventual elimination of non-strategic nuclear weapons, his speech failed to propose concrete steps other than full implementation of the unilateral commitments made by the United States and Russia in 1991 and 1992 to reduce their non-strategic nuclear weapons. This in effect leaves the initiative to Russia, because the US already has fully implemented the unilateral steps, and fails to address what the debate in Germany is about: the withdrawal of the remaining US nuclear bombs from Europe.

Berliner Zeitung

"Sie gehören vernichtet"

2. Mai 2005

Kurz vor Beginn der Überprüfungskonferenz des Atomwaffensperrvertrages haben Politiker von Grünen, SPD und FDP von den USA einen Abzug ihrer taktischen Atomwaffen aus Deutschland und Europa gefordert. Die Parteichefin der Grünen, Claudia Roth, sagte der Berliner Zeitung: "Die noch in Deutschland lagernden Atomwaffen sind ein Relikt des Kalten Krieges. Für sie gibt es keine Notwendigkeit. Sie gehören abgezogen und vernichtet." Nach Schätzungen lagern in Deutschland an den Standorten Ramstein und Büchel unter US-Aufsicht noch etwa 150 taktische Nuklearwaffen. Im Verteidigungsfall sollten sie von Tornados der Bundes-Luftwaffe ins Ziel geflogen werden.

Roth betonte, dass die vollständige nukleare Abrüstung weiterhin das bestimmende Ziel der internationalen Nichtverbreitungspolitik sein müsse. "Hierbei sind die Atomwaffenstaaten gefordert, die bisher ihrer Verpflichtung zur Abrüstung nicht gefolgt sind und so die Nichtverbreitungspolitik erschweren."

Auch FDP-Chef Guido Westerwelle forderte einen Abzug. "Bundesaußenminister Joschka Fischer sollte auf der Atomwaffenkonferenz in New York den Abzug der verbliebenen Atomwaffen aus Deutschland vorschlagen", sagte FDP-Chef dieser Zeitung. Die Waffen seien nach dem Ende des Kalten Krieges überflüssig geworden. "Sie würden mit ihrer kurzen Reichweite im Einsatzfall allenfalls unsere europäischen Verbündeten treffen können, unsere Freunde also." Ein Abzug der Waffen würde zudem "die Glaubwürdigkeit für Verhandlungslösungen mit Ländern stärken, die jenseits aller weltpolitischen Vernunft auf eine eigene atomare Aufrüstung setzen".

Signal für Abrüstungsprozess

Ähnlich äußerte sich der außenpolitische Sprecher der SPD, Gert Weisskirchen. Mit dem Abzug der Kernwaffen könnten die Amerikaner "ein Signal in Richtung Russland setzen und den Abrüstungsprozess

wieder in Gang bringen". 15 Jahre nach der deutschen Vereinigung und wegen der politischen Veränderungen in Russland sei für jeden zu erkennen, dass der europäische Raum "keine Zone der äußersten Bedrohung" mehr sei. Der verteidigungspolitische Sprecher der Grünen, Norbert Nachtwei, erklärte, für die Präsenz der Atomwaffen gebe es "keine politische und militärische Rechtfertigung mehr".

Die Bundesregierung gab bislang keine offizielle Stellungnahme dazu ab, ob Fischer auf der Konferenz in New York die Forderung nach einem Abzug der Atomwaffen erheben wird. In Regierungskreisen hieß es, die Frage der taktischen Nuklearwaffen, von denen in Europa nach Schätzungen zirka 480 Stück gelagert sind, sei kein Thema in New York. Es wurde aber darauf verwiesen, dass Bundeskanzler Gerhard Schröder (SPD) zuletzt "glaubwürdige Fortschritte" bei der nuklearen Abrüstung gefordert habe. Das könne als Appell zum Abzug der Waffen aus Deutschland interpretiert werden.

Deutsche Welle

Germany Pressures US Over Nuke Removal

2 May 2005

Germany is using a meeting to review the effectiveness of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on Monday to urge the United States to remove its nuclear missiles from German soil.

Germany will take the opportunity of a meeting in New York on Monday on the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to officially increase pressure on the United States to remove its Cold War-era nuclear weapons from German soil.

The meeting of some 190 nations, convened to address how seriously the world's fight against the spread of atomic weapons has been imperiled since the NPT went into effect in 1970, will give Germany the chance to directly air its concerns over the 150 or so land-based US nuclear weapons still deployed on German soil.

"The nuclear weapons still housed in Germany are a relic from the Cold War," said leader of the Green Party Claudia Roth in Monday's Berliner Zeitung newspaper. "There is no need for them to be there. They should be removed and destroyed." She added that while nuclear states continued to hesitate in disarmament issues, the NPT would be weakened further.

Roth was not alone in calling for the missiles to go. Social Democrat Gert Weisskirchen from the German foreign ministry and Liberal Democrat leader Guido Westerwelle echoed the call for the missiles, mostly based at the Rammstein and Büchel air bases, to be removed. The removal of the missiles would "add credibility and strengthen negotiations with other countries," Westerwelle said.

German politicians join in call for nuke removal

Last week, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder called for progress to be made on strengthening disarmament measures -- but an opposition demand that the US pull its nuclear weapons from Germany fell on deaf ears.

Ahead of Monday's five-yearly review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in New York, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder called Thursday for progress on strengthening disarmament measures.

"We have two expectations from the talks," Schröder said in reference to the NPT conference. "The first is that we reinforce the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as it is now and we need to put all our efforts into that," he said. "The second is that there is a credible disarmament mechanism and we hope we will see movement from countries on this point."

Continued purpose of missiles in question

But the opposition Liberal Democrats (FDP), with backing from the Green Party, went further and called for an immediate withdrawal of the US nuclear weapons from Germany -- a surprise move from a party generally known for its staunchly pro-American stance.

"It's time to reconsider whether their presence still serves a relevant purpose," Liberal Democrat MP Werner Hoyer told German weekly Der Spiegel. Harking back to the days of the Iron Curtain, most of the 480 US nuclear weapons stored in Europe are located in Germany, strategically closest to Eastern Europe.

German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer will be attending the NPT meeting on behalf of Germany and politicians are urging him to make an official case for the removal of missiles will fall to him. The call, however, is likely to go unheeded as Washington has more pressing concerns as the dual crises in North Korea and Iran worsen and threaten to undermine the treaty further. [...]

Expatica News

Politicians demand withdrawal of US nuclear arms

2 May 2005

BERLIN - Politicians from the Greens, SPD and FDP have called for a withdrawal of American nuclear weapons from Germany, shortly before the beginning of a conference in New York on reviewing the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

In remarks to the daily Berliner Zeitung on Monday, Green party chief Claudia Roth said that US nuclear weapons in Germany were "a relic of the Cold War." She added that there was no need for the weapons and that they should be "withdrawn and destroyed".

Roth emphasised that the aim of the NPT was complete nuclear disarmament, saying that nuclear states who do not fulfil their responsibility to disarm make measures towards non-proliferation more difficult. FDP leader Guido Westerwelle also demanded a withdrawal of US nuclear weapons. "Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer should suggest the withdrawal of the remaining nuclear weapons from Germany at the nuclear weapon conference in New York," said Westerwelle, adding that the weapons had become superfluous since the end of the Cold War. "If they were used, their short range would mean that they could hit our European neighbours, in other words, our friends."

The foreign policy spokesman of the SPD, Gert Weisskirchen, made similar remarks, saying that, by withdrawing the atomic weapons, the US could "send a signal to Russia and get the disarmament process moving again."

The US is estimated to have around 150 tactical nuclear weapons stored at its bases in Ramstein and Büchel, although information about the exact number of nuclear warheads and their sites is classified.

International Herald Tribune

Opposition to nuclear weapons

by Judy Dempsey – 4 May 2005

Three German parties, including the Social Democrats of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, have called on the United States to withdraw its nuclear weapons from German territory, denouncing the arms as a relic of the cold war.

The calls were issued as the Social Democrats competed in a bitter struggle to maintain control over the traditionally Social Democrat region of North Rhine-Westphalia, where voters go to the polls on May 22.

The appeal appears to be falling on deaf ears. The United States said on Tuesday that it had no intention of pulling out the weapons, which it called essential for peace and stability in Europe.

"The nuclear weapons will be maintained at a minimum level to preserve peace and stability," said an American diplomat who requested anonymity. "It is something all the NATO allies have agreed on. They are the essential military and political link between the United States and Europe."

The official would not comment on the number of American nuclear weapons still in Germany. But according to the Natural Resources Defense Council, a research institute in Washington, there are 480 U.S. nuclear warheads in Europe, of which 130 are deployed at the U.S. base at Ramstein in southwestern Germany.

A NATO diplomat in Brussels also declined to comment. "This is a bilateral issue between Germany and the United States, and not with NATO," said the official, who asked not to be identified.

But with the weapons integrated into the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, this would appear to give the deployment question more than a bilateral scope.

NATO says that nuclear weapons play a central role in the alliance's strategy of flexible response.

The Schröder coalition has already tried to broach the matter with NATO, but without success, largely because some of the alliance's 26 members fear it could generate a wider discussion on French and British nuclear capabilities.

Besides the Social Democrats, the two other German parties that have said it was time the United States took the weapons out of Germany are the Greens, the coalition partner of the Social Democrats, and the liberal Free Democrats, the small opposition party that could be the kingmaker in federal elections next year.

Claudia Roth, leader of the Greens, told The Berliner Zeitung newspaper this week that the weapons "have to be pulled out and destroyed."

She added: "Nuclear weapons in Germany are a relic of the cold war."

Gert Weisskirchen, foreign policy spokesman for the Social Democrats, issued similar calls, adding: "If the weapons were removed, the United States could send a signal to Russia, which is sitting on a nuclear arsenal."

Guido Westerwelle, head of the Free Democrats, told The Berliner Zeitung that the weapons were superfluous because the cold war was over.

The renewed interest in the U.S. arsenal coincides with the start of a review meeting of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty at the United Nations in New York. It also comes at a time when German political parties are doing everything possible to get support, even if it means questioning U.S. policy, ahead of the state elections in North-Rhine Westphalia, in which the Social Democrats could face their first regional electoral defeat in more than three decades.

Since the end of the cold war, NATO has reduced its weapons in Europe by more than 85 percent. All nuclear warheads for NATO ground-launched missile forces, including nuclear artillery and surface-to-surface missiles, were eliminated, and the number of air-delivered bombs was reduced by 50 percent.

DPA

6 May 2005

ABRÜSTUNG

Struck will US-Atomwaffen loswerden Die Bundesregierung plant einen neuen Vorstoß in der Nato. Verteidigungsminister Struck will im Nordatlantischen Bündnis den Abzug der in Deutschland lagernden US-Atomwaffen erreichen. Struck: "Wir werden das zu klären haben" Großbildansicht DPA Struck: "Wir werden das zu klären haben" Ramstein - "Ich bin mir mit Außenminister Fischer einig, dass wir in den Gremien der Nato dieses Thema ansprechen werden", sagte Peter Struck (SPD) bei einem Besuch auf dem US- Luftwaffenstützpunkt im rheinland-pfälzischen Ramstein. (Translation: German Minister of Defense Peter Struck, visiting Ramstein: "I'm of the same opinion as Foreign Minister Fischer, that we will have to talk about this issue (nuclear weapons removal) in the appropriate NATO bodies.")

Zur Frage, ob die Bundesregierung auf einen Abzug der Atomwaffen dringen werde, sagte Struck: "Wir werden das in Absprache mit den anderen europäischen Verbündeten, in deren Ländern auch noch Atomwaffen stationiert sind, zu klären haben." (TRANSLATION: "We will have to clarify this issue in consultation with the other European allies, which still host nuclear weapons on their territory.") Der Verteidigungsminister wies darauf hin, dass "schon 95 Prozent der in Europa stationierten Atomwaffen nach dem Fall der Mauer abgezogen wurden". Ramstein gilt als ein Ort, an dem noch Atomwaffen stationiert sind. Die USA machen jedoch zu Zahl und Stationierungsorten keine Angaben. Der rheinland-pfälzische Ministerpräsident Kurt Beck (SPD), sagte: "Ich bin völlig mit der Bundesregierung einer Meinung, dass wir keine Bedrohungslage haben, die es in irgendeiner Weise rechtfertigt, dass diese Lagerung auf Dauer aufrechterhalten wird. Und deshalb unterstütze ich die Bemühungen, gemeinsam mit der Nato zu einem Abzug dieser Waffen zu kommen." (TRANSLATION: Prime Minister Beck of Rhineland Palatine at the same opportunity: "I'm in full consensus with the Federal Government, that there is no threat any longer, that could justify to continue their (nuclear weapons) deployment permanently (= over a longer time) in any way. Therefore I'm supporting endeavours to jointly with NATO come to a removal of these weapons.") In Europa sind nach dem Ende des Kalten Krieges und dem damit verbundenen drastischen Abbau der Nato-Atomwaffen seit 1999 nur noch Atombomben stationiert, die von Flugzeugen abgeworfen werden können. Die anderen Atomwaffen - vor allem Kurzstreckenraketen, Marschflugkörper, Artilleriemunition und Tiefenbomben für den U-Boot-Krieg - sind seither entfernt. Atomwaffen befinden sich auch noch an Bord britischer U-Boote sowie - außerhalb der Nato-Kontrolle - im Besitz Frankreichs. Vor Wochen hatte die Bundesregierung die USA verprellt, weil sie auf eine Reform des Nordatlantischen Bündnisses gedrängt hatte.

Defense News

Germany's Struck To Take Up U.S. Nuclear Withdrawal by AFP, Ramstein – 6 May 2005

German Defense Minister Peter Struck said May 6 he planned to broach the subject of a withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from German soil at NATO.

"I agree with Foreign Minister (Joschka) Fischer that we should take up this issue in NATO committees," Struck said during a visit to the U.S. air base Ramstein in western Germany.

When asked whether he backed calls by members of the ruling coalition for a total withdrawal of the U.S. weapons, Struck said: "We will have to discuss that with the other European allies that also still have nuclear weapons stationed."

During an international conference in New York this week to review the 1970 nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT), Fischer said that calls from his Greens party and Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder's Social Democrats for a removal of all U.S. nuclear weapons stationed in Germany were "a reasonable initiative." Struck noted that "95 percent of the nuclear weapons stationed in Europe were withdrawn after the fall of the Berlin Wall" in 1989.

The only U.S. nuclear weapons remaining in Europe are those that can be transported by aircraft. U.S. short-range missiles, cruise missiles and nuclear submarines have been withdrawn, according to German sources.

An estimated 150 atomic weapons are stationed on German soil out of a total of about 480 in Europe. In a case of self-defense after a nuclear attack, they would be carried by German Tornado jets under current pacts.

Proponents of a removal of the weapons argue that they are a Cold War relic and undermine the international non-proliferation process.

TAZ

7 May 2005

US-ATOMWAFFEN DÜRFTEN IN EUROPA KÜNFTIG KAUM NOCH ZU HALTEN SEIN

Rot-Grün ist aufgewacht

Von einem Abzug der Atomwaffen hat Struck in Ramstein nicht gesprochen, auch nicht von einem Verzicht der Bundesrepublik, US-

Dennoch: Gemessen an der lächerlichen Heimlichtuerei, mit der alle bisherigen Bundesregierungen nukleare Fragen behandelt haben, war Strucks gestrige Erklärung, die Stationierung von US-Atomwaffen in Deutschland innerhalb der Nato anzusprechen, geradezu revolutionär. Das Thema war bislang tabu. Auch bei Rot-Grün. Seit Joschka Fischer in den ersten Monaten seiner Amtszeit als Außenminister bei seinem Versuch ausgebremst wurde, in der Nato wenigstens vom Ersteinsatz von Atomwaffen abzurücken, hatte sich die Bundesregierung nicht mehr an Fragen der nuklearen Bewaffnung herangewagt: mit Rücksicht auf die USA und mit Blick auf die Atomwaffenstaaten Frankreich und Großbritannien.

Auch das neueste Statement lässt noch viele Lücken zum Einlenken. Aber alles andere als eine baldige Abzugsentscheidung innerhalb der Nato wäre jetzt eine Niederlage für die Bundesregierung. Doch steht sie in dieser Frage nicht allein. In Belgien, wo ebenfalls US-Atomwaffen lagern, hat sich der Senat bereits für einen Abzug ausgesprochen. Und selbst im Washingtoner Außenministerium wird gefragt, ob die Stationierung in Europa noch lohnt. Denn sollte ein Atomwaffeneinsatz im Nahen und Mittleren Osten tatsächlich beschlossen werden, lässt sich der ebenso von den USA aus fliegen. Auch dem Pentagon ist ein stillschweigender Abzug allemal lieber als eine neue Debatte über die nukleare Erstschlagstrategie der USA. Gleichzeitig wächst der innenpolitische Druck in Deutschland. Eine deutliche Mehrheit der Bundesbürger ist gegen eine Stationierung von Atomwaffen in Europa. Den meisten war lange Zeit nicht bewusst, dass immer noch Atomwaffen vor ihrer Haustür lagern. Die Koalition hat das Thema sehr lange entweder verschlafen oder verdrängt. Insbesondere für die Grünen ist das mehr als peinlich. Auch deshalb gibt es seit Strucks gestriger Ankündigung für Rot-Grün kein Zurück mehr. US-Atomwaffen dürften in Europa künftig kaum noch zu halten sein. ERIC CHAUVISTRÉ

taz Nr. 7658 vom 7.5.2005, Seite 16, 48 Kommentar ERIC CHAUVISTRÉ
+++++

TAZ

Rot-Grün will US-Atomwaffen abschieben

Die Bundesregierung bricht ihr Schweigen über nukleare Sprengkörper in Deutschland und kündigt Gespräche zum Abzug an. Auf der US-Airbase Ramstein lagern unter US-Kontrolle 130 Atombomben, auf dem Fliegerhorst Büchel in der Eifel weitere 20

VON KLAUS-PETER KLINGELSCMITT

Bundesverteidigungsminister Peter Struck (SPD) will in der Nato über den Abtransport der noch in Europa lagernden Atomwaffen der USA sprechen. Bei einem Besuch auf der Airbase der US-Luftwaffe in Ramstein kündigte Struck gestern eine entsprechende, mit Außenminister Joschka Fischer (Grüne) abgestimmte Initiative an. Direkten Druck auf Washington aber will die Bundesregierung wohl nicht ausüben. "Wir werden das in Absprache mit den anderen europäischen Verbündeten, in deren Ländern auch noch Atomwaffen stationiert sind, zu klären haben", sagte Struck. Bei der UNO in New York findet zurzeit eine Konferenz gegen die weltweite Verbreitung von Atomwaffen statt.

Bislang hieß es aus dem Verteidigungsministerium zu Anfragen auch aus dem Bundestag dazu nur lapidar, dass sich das Ministerium "generell nicht zu allem äußert, was mit Atomwaffen zu tun hat". Und dass man ohnehin über keinerlei Kenntnisse über amerikanische Atomwaffen auf deutschem Boden verfüge.

Das ist ganz sicher glatt gelogen, denn 20 Atombomben - bei insgesamt 150 in Deutschland - befinden sich auf dem Bundeswehr-Fliegerhorst Büchel an der Mosel beim Bombengeschwader 33 der deutschen Luftwaffe. Und deutsche Piloten sind für eventuelle Flüge ihrer Jaedbomber vom

Typ Tornado IDS mit der atomaren Bombenlast ausgebildet worden. Davon will Struck nichts gewusst haben?

Die restlichen 130 Atombomben sind dort eingebunkert, wo Struck und der rheinland-pfälzische Ministerpräsident Kurt Beck (SPD) gestern mit dem stellvertretenden Kommandeur der US-Streitkräfte in Europa, General Charles F. Wald, und der Standortkommandantin Rosanne Bailey redeten: auf der US-Airbase in Ramstein.

Die Atombomben-Standorte sind seit Jahren bekannt. Die genaue Zahl der dort eingelagerten Atombomben veröffentlichte jetzt die renommierte US-Friedens- und Umweltschutzorganisation Natural Resources Defence Council (NRDC). Die Kontrolle über die Atomwaffen obliegt allerdings US-amerikanischen Soldaten. Den Einsatz der Atombomben kann nur der US-Präsident anordnen.

In Büchel, so Otfried Nassauer, Leiter des Berliner Informationszentrums für transatlantische Sicherheit (Bits), seien rund 100 GIs der 702. Munitions Special Support Squadron vom nahen US-Flughafen Spangdahlem permanent im Wartungs- und Sicherheitseinsatz. Kein GI alleine und kein Europäer darf die unterirdischen Magazine für die Atombomben betreten.

meinung und diskussion SEITE 16

taz Nr. 7658 vom 7.5.2005, Seite 12, 88 TAZ-Bericht KLAUS-PETER KLINGELSCHMITT

+++++