



---

# **TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS**

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

**PENN – NL Facts and Reports Nr. 3**

March 2002

---

Werkgroep Eurobom

---

PENN-Nederland

## Transatlantic Relations

March 2002

Working Group Eurobomb is the Netherlands part of the international PENN network set up with the following aims:

- to monitor official discussions about the future of nuclear weapons in Europe and to help make them more transparent
- to publish analyses and political commentaries on these developments
- to promote further nuclear disarmament steps in Europe and substantial European contributions to nuclear arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation
- to promote full compliance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty by NATO, the European Union and their member states
- to encourage the creation of political obstacles to developments which might lead to a nuclear armed European Union
- and to promote developments encouraging the European Union and all its member states to become non-nuclear members of the NPT.

This publication was made possible by the W. Alton Jones Foundation (Charlottesville, USA)

**Working Group Eurobomb/PENN-NL**  
Obrechtstraat 43NL - 3572 EC UtrechtThe Netherlands  
Tel (+31) (0)30 271 43 76(+31) (0)30 272 25 94Fax (+31) (0)30 271 47 95Email: k.koster@inter.nl.net  
Logo: Len Munnik

## CONTENTS

Crisis in transatlantic relations? - chronology of events	4
State of the Union	7
Official Reactions	9
Annex 1: Persbericht ARGOS: Amerikanen bestempelen NAVO als 'irrelevant'	21
Annex 2: Report based on press release 'Argos', investigative radio program Netherlands	22
Annex 3: Kamervragen Hoekema (D66) en Koenders (PvdA) over de aanpassing van de NAVO	23
Annex 4: Kamervragen Koenders (PvdA) over transatlantische betrekkingen	24
Annex 5: Observer: Blair and Bush to plot war on Iraq	25
Annex 6: Press Release Argos: Dutch radio programme 'Argos' makes report public of secret NATO Meeting	26

### **PUBLICATIES EUROBOM**

Eerder verschenen in de reeks Facts and Reports:

nr. 1: US Unilateralism - Official foreign comments

Citaten van internationale politici en diplomaten over het Amerikaans unilateralisme

nr 2: Veiligheidsvraagstukken en de verkiezingen - standpunten van de politieke partijen

Relevante delen van de partijprogramma's van de Nederlandse politieke partijen, plus citaten van politici op het terrein van oorlog en vrede

Te bestellen door € 5,- per exemplaar over te maken op rekening nr. 7549774 van Stichting AMOK  
inz Werkgroep Eurobom te Utrecht ovv F&R 1 of 2

## CRISIS IN TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS?

- Chronology of events

According to a variety of sources, both insider reports and newspaper articles, NATO has entered a period of crisis. The depth of the crisis is as yet difficult to gauge, but the sequence of events suggests that it has not ended, and that the US is making a serious attempt to change the defence policies of the European NATO member states.

### Political framework

Although longer-term forces have been at work redefining the alliance, specifically the slow development towards a European Foreign and Security policy, these have now become irrelevant in the light of the US declared war on terrorism. After the attack on New York and Washington DC NATO, at the instigation of secretary general Robertson, invoked article 5 of its charter: i.e. its member states considered the attack on the USA to be an attack on themselves. This gave rise to expectations that the Alliance would act militarily as a whole in the war against terrorism. In fact the war in Afghanistan was fought almost entirely by the US, with some support from the UK. NATO support was logistical and political. The military role of the alliance appears to have become irrelevant by the way in which the war against the Taleban and Al Qaeda was waged by the US armed forces. Subsequent events suggest a growing chasm between the policies of the US government and its European NATO allies.

### Chronology of events

2001

11 September

Attack on WTC/Pentagon

12 Sept

Art V invoked by NATO

11-13 Nov

CTBT Entry into Force conference NY

US boycotts conference

11-22 November 2001

Biological and Toxic Weapons Review Conference: US proposes ending negotiating process to establish verification protocol, leading to suspension of conference.

13-15 November

Texas summit Presidents Putin and Bush:

Declaration of unilateral reductions of strategic nuclear weapons

6 December

NATO ministerial meeting: communiqué states that the "Alliance must have the capability to defend appropriately and effectively against the threats that the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and their means of delivery can pose." (par 15, M-NAC-2 (2001)158)

13 Dec

US declares it will withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty

19 Dec

'Report to Congress on the defeat of hard and deeply buried targets' made public by US ngo's.  
Options on the use of low-yield nuclear weapons kept open.

Jane's Defence Weekly reports deployment US 3<sup>rd</sup> Army forward HQ to Kuwait

2002

9 January

US government presents its (classified) Nuclear Posture Review to Congress

A report published 13 February by the Natural Resources Defense Council (Washington DC) describes it as a plan to "strengthen US nuclear forces".

18 January

US-NATO Missions Annual Conference Brussels

Senator Lugar describes the NATO alliance as "irrelevant"; all American speakers at the conference agreed that if NATO does not adapt, it would become irrelevant. Sen Lugar stated that his speech had been coordinated with President Bush (according to the Dutch Prof. Rob de Wijk, present at this meeting).

Speech Senator Lugar (see elsewhere in this booklet):

"The Alliance invoked article 5 for the first time in its history in response to September 11. But, NATO itself has only played a limited, largely political and symbolic role in the war against terrorism."

"Rightly or wrongly, the legacy of Kosovo has reinforced the concern that NATO is not up to the job of fighting a modern war."

21 January

Lord Robertson calls for more European investment in defence spending

24 January

Wall Street Journal reveals plans to cut NATO programs for lack of sufficient funding:

Among them : WMD centre and Ukraine information centre

29 January State of the Union (see elsewhere in this booklet)

President Bush defines an "axis of evil": Iran, Iraq, N. Korea

30 January

Netherlands presents paper on NATO role countering terrorism at High Level meeting

1 February

Atlantic News (Brussels) reports decision by Permanent Council weekly meeting on 30 Jan for a " 'broad discussion' on the need to adjust the alliance to the new situation after the events of 11 Sept 2001."

2 February

Munich conference: Wolfowitz and McCain call on NATO allies to join in an effort against rogue states (see elsewhere in this booklet)

4 February

US defence budget FY 2003 presented: \$ 369 billion, of which \$ 9.4 billion against terrorism

Wall Street Journal reports on World Economic Forum New York: Solana, asked if Europe can speak with one voice on foreign policy, replies: "not if the US attacks Iraq".

5 February The Guardian (UK)

German deputy foreign minister L. Vollmer states, "Iraq is a bad state", "but the solution cannot lie in attacking it militarily."

12 Feb Die Welt (Germany)

Fischer states: "The international coalition against terrorism is not the basis for waging any war against any one – and certainly not alone."

"Alliance partnership cannot be reduced to subservience, alliance partners are not satellites."

13 Feb

German NBC troops arrive in Kuwait (according to Kuwait Times, quoted by Xinhuanet on 18 Feb) for military exercises with 8000 US troops stationed there. They will stay one month.

15 February

Chris Patten, EU commissioner for external affairs, warns the US to "curb its unilateralist urge" (Int. Herald Tribune 16 Feb 2002)

17 Feb

Powell rejects European criticism of US: "My European colleagues should be pounding on Iraq as quickly as they pound on us ..." (IHT 18022002)

19 Feb

Joint public hearing on transatlantic relations in European Parliament

21 Feb

Questions asked in Dutch parliament on non-paper presented at NATO (see 30 Jan above) and the plans to cut funding for NATO WMD centre (24 Jan)

22 Feb

Dutch radio broadcast 'Argos': Prof. Rob de Wijk reveals disagreements 18 January NATO meeting.

28 Feb

Senate Armed Services Committee Hearings on the Future of NATO

1 March

Literal quotes from Report of NATO 18 January meeting broadcast by Argos

March

EU parliament will debate EU/US relations

# STATE OF THE UNION

## State of the Union address

George Bush: [...] "What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. Most of the 19 men who hijacked planes on September the 11th were trained in Afghanistan's camps, and so were tens of thousands of others. Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs, set to go off without warning.

Thanks to the work of our law enforcement officials and coalition partners, hundreds of terrorists have been arrested. Yet, tens of thousands of trained terrorists are still at large. These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield, and we must pursue them wherever they are. So long as training camps operate, so long as nations harbor terrorists, freedom is at risk. And America and our allies must not, and will not, allow it.

Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world.

Our military has put the terror training camps of Afghanistan out of business, yet camps still exist in at least a dozen countries. A terrorist underworld -- including groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, Jaish-i-Mohammed -- operates in remote jungles and deserts, and hides in the centers of large cities.

While the most visible military action is in Afghanistan, America is acting elsewhere. We now have troops in the Philippines, helping to train that country's armed forces to go after terrorist cells that have executed an American, and still hold hostages. Our soldiers, working with the Bosnian government, seized terrorists who were plotting to bomb our embassy. Our Navy is patrolling the coast of Africa to block the shipment of weapons and the establishment of terrorist camps in Somalia.

My hope is that all nations will heed our call, and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own. Many nations are acting forcefully. Pakistan is now cracking down on terror, and I admire the strong leadership of President Musharraf.

But some governments will be timid in the face of terror. And make no mistake about it: If they do not act, America will.

Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th. But we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.

Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens -- leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections -- then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

We will work closely with our coalition to deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology, and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction. We will develop and deploy effective missile defenses to protect America and our allies from sudden attack.

And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our nation's security.

We'll be deliberate, yet time is not on our side. I will not wait on events, while dangers gather. I will not stand by, as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.

Our war on terror is well begun, but it is only begun. This campaign may not be finished on our watch -- yet it must be and it will be waged on our watch.

We can't stop short. If we stop now -- leaving terror camps intact and terror states unchecked -- our sense of security would be false and temporary. History has called America and our allies to action, and it is both our responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom's fight.

Our first priority must always be the security of our nation, and that will be reflected in the budget I send to Congress. My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we'll protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy.

September the 11th brought out the best in America, and the best in this Congress. And I join the American people in applauding your unity and resolve. Now Americans deserve to have this same spirit directed toward addressing problems here at home. I'm a proud member of my party -- yet as we act to win the war, protect our people, and create jobs in America, we must act, first and foremost, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans.

It costs a lot to fight this war. We have spent more than a billion dollars a month -- over \$30 million a day -- and we must be prepared for future operations. Afghanistan proved that expensive precision weapons defeat the enemy and spare innocent lives, and we need more of them. We need to replace aging aircraft and make our military more agile, to put our troops anywhere in the world quickly and safely. Our men and women in uniform deserve the best weapons, the best equipment, the best training -- and they also deserve another pay raise.

My budget includes the largest increase in defense spending in two decades -- because while the price of freedom and security is high, it is never too high. Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay." [...]

(State of the Union address, Office of the Press Secretary, January 29, 2002)



## OFFICIAL REACTIONS

(Chronological order)

### US Senator Richard G. Lugar

“The minimum standard for victory in this kind of war (we are currently fighting) is the prevention of any of the individual terrorists or terrorist cells from obtaining weapons or materials of mass destruction.”

[...]

“...a satisfactory level of accountability, transparency and safety can and must be established in every nation with a WMD program. When such nations resist such accountability, or their governments make their territory available to terrorists who are seeking weapons of mass destruction, then NATO nations should be prepared to join with the U.S. to use force as well as all diplomatic and economic tools at their collective disposal.”

[...]

“The Alliance invoked Article 5 for the first time in its history in response to September 11th. But, NATO itself has only played a limited, largely political and symbolic role in the war against terrorism.”

[...]

“Rightly or wrongly, the legacy of Kosovo has reinforced the concern that NATO is not up to the job of fighting a modern war. The U.S. did have confidence in a select group of individual allies. But it did not have confidence in the institution that is NATO.”

[...]

“With Europe increasingly secure, the Alliance needs to be "retooled" so that it can handle the most critical threats to our security. If that means it has to go beyond Europe in the future, so be it.”

[...]

“Americans do not want to carry the entire military burden of the war on terrorism by themselves. Nor should we. We want allies to share the burden.”

[...]

“I find it hard to believe that the US and Europe – some of the richest and most advanced countries in the world – are incapable of organizing themselves to come up with an effective military alliance to fight this new threat.”

[...]

“My view can be easily summarized. America is at war and feels more vulnerable than at any time since the end of the Cold War and perhaps since World War II. The threat we face is global and existential. We need allies and alliances to confront it effectively. Those alliances can no longer be circumscribed by artificial geographic boundaries. All of America's alliances are going to be reviewed and recast in light of this new challenge, including NATO. If NATO is not up to the challenge of becoming effective in the new war against terrorism, then our political leaders may be inclined to search for something else that will answer this need.”

[...]

“...if NATO does not help tackle the most pressing security threat to our countries today – a threat I believe is existential because it involves the threat of weapons of mass destruction -- it will cease to be the premier alliance it has been and will become increasingly marginal.”

[...]

“That is why this issue has to be front and center on NATO's agenda before, during and after Prague. The reality is that we can launch the next round of NATO enlargement as well as a new NATO-Russia relationship at Prague, and the Alliance can still be seen as failing -- that's right, failing -- unless it starts to transform itself into an important new force in the war on terrorism.”

(Press release Richard G. Lugar, US Senator for Indiana (R) – 17 January 2002, NATO'S Role in the War on Terrorism, Speech at US-NATO Missions Annual Conference, Brussels, Belgium, January 18, 2002)

Former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright

“Putting the three countries [Iraq, Iran and North Korea] together is a gross mistake.”  
(ABC, February 1, 2002)

US Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz

“..., countries must make a choice. Those that stand for peace, security and the rule of law-the great majority of countries in the world-stand united with us in this struggle between good and evil. Those countries that choose to tolerate terrorism and refuse to take action-or worse, those countries that continue to support it-will face consequences. As President Bush said last Tuesday, “Make not mistake about it: If they don’t act, America will.” Nations cannot afford to act like those neutral nations 60 years ago, of whom Winston Churchill so acidly observed: “Each one hopes that if he feeds the crocodile enough, the crocodile will eat him last.”

[...]

“One of the most important concepts concerns the nature of coalitions in this campaign and the idea that “the mission must determine the coalition, the coalition must not determine the mission. Otherwise, as the Secretary says, the mission will be reduced to “the lowest common denominator.”

As a corollary of that, there will not be a single coalition, but rather different coalitions for different missions, what the Secretary calls “flexible” coalitions. This means that the coalition will not ‘unravel’ if some country dtops doing something or fails to join in some missions. As Rumsfeld expressed it, “Since no single coalition has ‘raveled’, it is unlikely to unravel.”

[...]

“To ensure NATO can deal with surprise and uncertainty in the decades ahead, NATO must improve its structures and capabilities. A key objective for the Prague summit should be to launch a military transformation agenda.

A key component of that agenda should be to develop NATO’s capacities in counter-terrorism. Fighting terrorism, which has been so clearly linked to weapons of mass destruction, is part of NATO’s basic job description: Collective Defense.

The Prague summit also provides an appropriate time to launch a reform of the Alliance command structure to make it leaner, more streamlined, more cost efficient, and, above all, more flexible.”

(Remarks, Munich Conference on European Security Policy, Saturday, February 2, 2002)

US Senator (Republican) John McCain

“Let me be clear to our European friends: Americans believe we have a mandate to defeat and dismantle the global terrorist network that threatens both Europe and America. As our President has said, this network includes not just terrorists but the states that make possible their continued operation. Many of these are rogue regimes that possess or are developing weapons of mass destruction which threaten Europeans and Americans alike. We in America learned the hard way that we can never again wait for our enemies to choose their moment. The initiative is now ours, and we are seizing it.”

[...]

“A day of reckoning is approaching. Not simply for Saddam Hussein, but for all members of the Atlantic community, whose governments face the choice of ending the threat we face every day from this rogue regime or carrying on as if such behavior, in the wake of September 11<sup>th</sup>, were somehow still tolerable.”

[...]

“The combined examples of regime change in Afghanistan and Iraq would likely compel several other state sponsors of terror to change their ways or go out of business, accomplishing by example what we would otherwise have to pursue through force of arms. These nations – Syria and Sudan, for instance – have a choice, and it is in their interest to make the right one.”

[...]

“The terrorist attacks, and the West’s common response, have also highlighted the critical contributions of Turkey. Turkey is a front-line state in the war on terrorism, as was Germany a front-line state during the Cold War. Turkey has made important contributions to securing the peace in Afghanistan and will be integral to any campaign against Iraq.”

[...]

“For too long, Europe has held Turkey at arm’s length. NATO’s southeastern expansion would secure Europe’s southern flank, enhance stability in the Western Balkans, and end Turkey’s strategic isolation from the Alliance. It would help diminish continuing frictions in Turkey’s relationship with the EU, minimizing Turkish grievances over ESDP and opening the door to the development of effective coordination between the EU and NATO.”

(Remarks, Munich Conference on European Security Policy, Saturday, February 2, 2002)

#### US Senator (Democrat) Joseph Lieberman

“One good way for our Administration in Washington to express its gratitude for the multilateral support we are receiving from our NATO and non-NATO allies would be for it to act more multilaterally in other important areas such as global climate change.”

[...]

“America’s military is the best in the world for a simple reason: we spend a lot to train our forces and to buy the sophisticated weapons systems they employ in combat. It’s time for all NATO nations to overcome internal political resistance and place an immediate priority on upgrading their capabilities.”

(Remarks, Munich Conference on European Security Policy, Saturday, February 2, 2002)

#### Russian Defense Minister Sergej Iwanow

“In the war against international terrorism it is impossible to achieve an absolute victory using only the military force. That is the reason why Russia along with other states has intensified its search for non-military ways for continuous elimination of international terrorism nourishing environment.”

[...]

“...only promoting and building up international cooperation on the basis of principles and norms of the international law, the UN Charter included, can effectively deal with such a phenomenon as international terrorism.”

(Remarks, Munich Conference on European Security Policy, Sunday, February 3, 2002)

#### European Union’s high representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana

Asked whether he believed that Europe can speak with one voice at least on the most important foreign policy issues it faces, Javier Solana [...] commented while at the [World Economic] Forum: “not if the U.S. attacks Iraq.”

(Wall Street Journal, Marc Champion, Europeans fear Bush’s signaling of unilateralist foreign policy, February 4, 2002)

#### German Deputy Foreign Minister Ludger Vollmer

"We Europeans warn against it. There is no indication, no proof that Iraq is involved in the terrorism we have been talking about for the last few months... this terror argument cannot be used to legitimise old enmities. [...]. Iraq is certainly a bad state. We see few positive signs there, but the solution cannot lie in attacking it militarily."

(Guardian, 5 February 2002)

### Dutch Foreign Minister Jozias van Aartsen

“De Verenigde Staten gebruiken de instrumenten waarvan zij denken dat die het beste werken: internationale instellingen, bilaterale kanalen of ad-hocstructuren zoals de gevormde coalitie. Dat is naar de mening van de regering overigens bij uitstek een zakelijke benadering. Het is geen principiële keuze voor unilateralisme of tegen multilateralisme. Unilateralisme kan overigens in een wereld waarin economieën zo verweven zijn geraakt, niet meer bestaan. Dat weet de administratie, de regering in Washington, ook.”

[...]

“Diegenen die menen dat het gevolgde Afghanistanmodel van een ad-hoccoalitie het leidende model zou kunnen worden voor de toekomst, hebben mijns inziens net zo ongelijk als diegenen die iets dergelijks hebben gezegd na Desert Storm. Wij weten eigenlijk niet welk model in de toekomst zal worden gebruikt, maar één ding staat voor het Nederlandse kabinet vast: de NAVO zal een uiterst belangrijke rol spelen op het gebied van multinationale crisispreventie en crisisbeheersing en in die zin doodeenvoudig de hoeksteen van ons veiligheidsbeleid zijn en blijven.”

[...]

“Het is ook tijd om de naar mijn oordeel ook wat steriele en theoretische discussie over de toekomst van de NAVO te stoppen en alle energie te steken in het verder aanpassen van deze organisatie opdat zij het hoofd kan blijven bieden aan nieuwe uitdagingen. Zoals gezegd, één punt van zorg en dat betreft het volgende. Europa zal meer militaire inspanningen moeten doen, of dat nu in het kader van de NAVO is of in het kader van de Europese Unie. Ik meen dat dit een van de belangrijkste middelen is om op langere termijn de Transatlantische band te behouden en goed te houden. Die handschoen moet de NAVO, moeten met name de Europese NAVO-leden oppakken.”

[...]

“Ik ben het wel eens met diegenen die stellen dat alleen een harde waarschuwing aan het adres van die landen [Irak, Iran en Noord-Korea] niet genoeg is. Daarnaast moeten wij – zoals de Nederlandse regering al sinds jaar en dag bepleit – multilaterale overeenkomsten sluiten gericht op het terugdringen van proliferatie van rakettechnologie, het biologisch-wapenverdrag en het chemisch-wapenverdrag en al die elementen moeten bijdragen aan het vinden van oplossingen voor dit probleem. Over die aanpak discussiëren wij bij tijd en wijlen met de VS.

De VS willen in het licht van de post-koudeoorlogrealiteiten de strategische relatie met Rusland wijzigen. In plaats van het inmiddels door de VS opgezegde ABM-verdrag dient een nieuw strategisch raamwerk tot stand te komen dat naast verdergaande reducties van strategische kernkoppen, tevens reguliere militaire consultaties en afspraken over raketverdediging en non-proliferatie dient te omvatten. Zoals bekend, zijn er nog geen harde afspraken gemaakt over de wijze waarop de reducties dienen te worden vastgelegd en uitgevoerd, maar de regering hoopt dat de besprekingen tussen de VS en de Russische Federatie tot een gunstig resultaat zullen leiden en dat tot een werkbare post-ABM-relatie kan worden gekomen.

In dit verband is het bemoedigend dat Rusland gematigd heeft gereageerd op de opzegging van het ABM-verdrag en dat de besprekingen met de VS over het nieuwe strategisch raamwerk worden voortgezet. De ontwikkeling van een raketverdediging dient eveneens binnen dit kader gestalte te krijgen. In de brief van het kabinet van 5 juli jongstleden hebben de minister van Defensie en ik de uitgangspunten van de regering over het thema raketverdediging uiteen gezet. Die analyse is door de situatie van 11 september niet gewijzigd, omdat de raketverdediging een deel van het antwoord op nieuwe bedreigingen kan vormen. De Nederlandse theatre missile defence inspanningen moeten bijvoorbeeld ook in die context worden gezien. Uiteraard moet er wel voor worden gewaakt dat de ontwikkeling van een raketverdediging niet ten koste gaat van de mondiale strategische stabiliteit.”

[Eerste Kamer, Behandeling begrotingen Defensie en Buitenlandse Zaken, Handelingen, 5 februari 2002, EK 18-925 – 18-927]

### French Minister of Foreign Affairs Hubert Védrine

“Nous sommes menacés aujourd'hui d'un nouveau simplisme qui est de ramener tous les problèmes du monde à la seule lutte contre le terrorisme. Ce n'est pas sérieux. On ne peut pas accepter cette idée. Si

nous ne sommes pas d'accord avec la politique américaine, nous devons le dire. Nous pouvons le dire et nous devons le dire."

(Le Monde, 7 February 2002)

“Dat is onze taal niet. Typisch Amerikaanse retoriek, die kennelijk in de VS heel goed in de smaak valt. Buiten Amerika staat men perplex. Daar denkt niemand dat je de wereld in zulke simpele termen kunt analyseren, dat je op die manier problemen kunt oplossen. Ik vind het zorgwekkend. [...] Wij hoeven niet alle Amerikaanse beslissingen te kopiëren. Er zijn in de VS machtige economische krachten, die denken dat wereldproblemen met militaire middelen moeten worden opgelost. En die bijgevolg het militaire budget willen verhogen. Dat betekent veel orders, veel belastinggeld in het militaire systeem, een soort verborgen keynesiaanse benadering. Dat hoeven wij niet ook zo te doen. [...] We moeten een stabielere, een veiliger wereld hebben. Een rechtvaardiger wereld ook, en daarmee komen we op de consequenties van de mondialisering. [...] Ik heb de Amerikaanse buitenlandse politiek vergeleken met een ziekenhuis dat maar één ziekte behandelt. Een belangrijke ziekte, het terrorisme, maar toch.”

(Volkskrant, Martin Sommer, “Bush analyseert wereld in zorgwekkende termen”, February 7, 2002)

#### French Prime Minister Lionel Jospin

“We hope the United States does not give in to the strong temptation of unilateralism. [...] We cannot reduce the problems of the world to the single dimension of the struggle against terrorism, despite its pressing importance, nor rely on the predominance of military means.”

(CNN, France steps up criticism of US, 8 February 2002)

#### Dutch Prime Minister Wim Kok

Premier Kok neemt afstand van de kritiek van de Franse minister van Buitenlandse Zaken Védrine op de Amerikaanse buitenlandse politiek. 'Ik heb minder behoefte aan het uiten van zorg, ik wil de dialoog levend houden', zei Kok gisteren na afloop van de ministerraad.

(Volkskrant, Kok neemt afstand van Franse kritiek op Bush, February 9, 2002)

#### US Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (Democrat)

“I think that it is very important for us to look at each of these countries [Iran, Iraq, North Korea] as threats to this country clearly, as problems that we've got to address clearly, but I think we've got to be very careful with rhetoric of that kind. We've already seen the moderates in Iran scramble to draw distance between us and them, and I think we've got to be very careful with how to approach all three countries.”

(Washington Times, Daschle disputes Bush's 'Axis' use, February 12, 2002)

#### German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer

“Die internationale Koalition gegen den Terror ist nicht die Grundlage, irgendetwas gegen irgendwen zu unternehmen – und schon gar nicht im Alleingang. [...] Eine Welt mit sechs Milliarden Menschen wird selbst von der mächtigsten Macht nicht allein in eine friedliche Zukunft geführt werden. [...] Bündnispartnerschaft reduziert sich nicht auf Gefolgschaft, Bündnispartner sind nicht Satelliten.”

(Die Welt, Fischer warnt Bush vor Krieg gegen den Irak, February 12, 2002)

#### US Secretary of State Colin Powell

“We want to see a dialogue. We want to contain North Korea's activities with respect to proliferation, and we are going to keep the pressure on them. But there is no plan to begin a war with North Korea. Nor is there a plan to begin a conflict with Iran.”  
(Washington Post, Alan Sipress, No plans now for war with ‘Axis’, February 13, 2002)

#### US President George W. Bush

“Make no mistake about it. If we need to, we will take necessary action to defend the American people. And I think that statement was clear enough for Iraq to hear me, and I will reserve whatever options I have. I'll keep them close to my vest. . . . [Iraqi President] Saddam Hussein needs to understand I'm serious about defending our country.”  
(Washington Post, Alan Sipress, Bush says U.S. willing to take action against Iraq, February 14, 2002)

#### European Commissioner for External Affairs Chris Patten

“The attacks of September 11, in which citizens of more than 80 countries lost their lives, brought home in a terrifying way the vulnerability of the US and the rest of us to the actions of extremists plotting from safe places in failed states such as Afghanistan.

In the immediate aftermath of the attacks, it seemed that the US had rediscovered its need for allies to confront this common menace. The stunning and un-expectedly rapid success of the military campaign in Afghanistan was a tribute to American capacity. But it has perhaps reinforced some dangerous instincts: that the projection of military power is the only basis of true security; that the US can rely only on itself; and that allies may be useful as an optional extra but that the US is big and strong enough to manage without them if it must.

I hope those instincts will not prevail, because I believe them to be profoundly misguided. The lesson of September 11 is that we need both American leadership and international co-operation on an unprecedented scale. It is in the world's interest, as it is in the interests of the world's greatest power, that leadership should be exercised in partnership.

[...]

I need hardly say that as well as affection and admiration for America around the world, there is also fear and resentment. As the world's only superpower, the US carries a particular responsibility to maintain moral authority for her leadership. Do your own thing and everything seems clear and purposeful; but there is a cost in terms of legitimacy and long-term effectiveness. That cost accumulates over time.

So where does this leave us? It leaves me, at least, uneasy. I look to America - as I have always looked to America - to engage with a complex and dangerous world. There is much that is evil in that world. But to brand a disparate group of countries as an "axis of evil" did not strike me as the finest phrase ever produced by the president's speechwriters. Of course we must oppose what is evil. But we must also build on what is good - and on what offers hope of a better future.

In Iraq, for example, we must redouble our efforts to get the inspectors back in and to support the opposition to Saddam Hussein. But in Iran? When some in Washington say that European policy in Iran has failed, my immediate reaction is that we need to find new ways to support reform there, not that we should put up the shutters.

In the case of North Korea, the sunshine policy of Kim Dae-jung offers the best prospect in years of bringing real change. In the Middle East, we need dialogue, not isolation and further radicalisation of the Palestinians.”

(Jaw-jaw, not war-war: Military success in Afghanistan has encouraged the US to ignore European doubts about confronting the 'axis of evil'. Chris Patten warns that unilateralism will be self-defeating, Financial Times, February 15, 2002)

#### Russian Federation President Vladimir Putin

“We know which nations' representatives and citizens were fighting alongside the Taliban and where their activities were financed from. Iraq is not on this list.”  
(The Guardian, US split with allies grows, 15 February 2002)

#### German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer

"Mir hat man bis jetzt keine Beweise präsentiert, dass der Terror des Osama Bin Laden mit dem Regime im Irak zu tun hat. [...] Die internationale Koalition gegen den Terror ist für sich allein kein Freibrief für eine Invasion in irgendeinem Land - erst recht nicht im Alleingang." [...] Fischer kritisierte auch die geplanten Rekordausgaben der US-Administration für neue Militäranstrengungen. Diese seien "Ausdruck eines verkürzten militärischen Sicherheitsbegriffs, und der greift viel zu kurz". Dieses Geld, meinte der Außenminister, "fehlt dann für eine viel dringendere Aufgabe bei der Friedenssicherung: sozialer Ausgleich und mehr Gerechtigkeit für ärmere Weltregionen."  
(Der Spiegel, Fischer warnt USA vor Angriff auf den Irak, February 16, 2002)

#### US Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz

“You know, I hear people say that somehow the president made a mistake by identifying these countries as problems, that it was simplistic, it was outrageous, the president of the United States shouldn't talk like that. It's so much like what people said 16 years ago when Ronald Reagan talked about the Soviet Union as an evil empire.

[...]

Well, I'd say, first of all, the notion that we're unilateralists is just nonsense. The president is on a trip right now to Asia to talk to two of our closest allies and to one of the most important countries in the world, China, about building relationships, including in the war on terror. And, by the way, not just the war on terror. It's part of the longer-term policy of addressing what is perhaps the most important area of the world, or one of the most important areas in the world today. We're not being unilateralists in Afghanistan. In fact, I think Americans should recognize we're getting a lot of contributions from other countries. Right now, today in Afghanistan, if you count up the troops in Kabul as part of the international security force, as well as those who are fighting with us, there're more non-Americans than there are Americans.

What I would say to people who say we're being simplistic is it sounds an awful lot to me like people who said when the war in Afghanistan started that the Americans are attacking Afghanistan; it's going to send the Arab world and the Muslim world up in flames. We weren't attacking Afghanistan. We were liberating the Afghan people. And it's become very clear now that that criticism that we heard was a simplistic criticism. And I think some of the criticisms we're hearing today are simplistic.”

(Interview with Brit Hume, Fox News Sunday, 17 February, 2002)

#### US Secretary of State Colin Powell

“There has been some angry European reaction, as you call it, but there has also been, I think, some clear-headed reality within Europe at the same time that it is hard not to look at a regime such as Iraq, which is developing these kinds of weapons, and is ignoring the international community.

All my European friends should be that outraged that this regime is ignoring, for ten years now, the international community's direction to it.

I think my European colleagues who are doing business with Iran should also be concerned over the fact that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and the means by which those weapons can be delivered. So that should be of great concern to them as well.

And so there is a bit of a stir in Europe, but it is stir I think we will be able to manage with consultations, with contacts of the kind I have almost every day with my European colleagues. And we will find a way to move forward that will gather the support we need.

What the President has said is: I'm calling it the way it is. He did it in a very straightforward, direct, realistic way that tends to jangle people's nerves; but once they settle down and understand that he is going to go about this in a prudent, disciplined, determined way, they realize that is what leadership is about and they begin to understand why it might make sense for them to join in whatever efforts we may be getting ready to undertake.

Joschka [Fischer] and I have talked a couple of times this week, and I have the greatest respect for Chris Patten and the others who have spoken out, and my other colleague in Paris, Hubert Vedrine, the Foreign Minister of France. But I think we need to just slow down a little bit. What unilateral action have we taken that is causing them to get so upset? The President made a statement in his speech, a clear statement identifying nations that deserve to be labeled as evil because of the nature of their regimes, and now we are in discussion with our allies. So what unilateral action have we taken that has them all so shocked?

We are in the process of examining all our options -- within the UN, within the context of the conversations that the President has with heads of state and government on a regular basis, within the context of all the consultations that I have with Hubert Vedrine, with Joschka Fischer. And in due course I will have a chance to talk to Chris Patten and Javier Solana of the European Union. So we are in touch with them; it is just that they get a little upset when the President speaks with such clarity and such direction. But that is what leadership is about. I am sure as we go forward, as we discuss these matters with them, I hope we will see some of this excitement calm down a bit.

Our policy with respect to North Korea remains one of hoping they will engage. We haven't taken that off the table. We have asked North Korea, "Come, let's talk -- any time, any place, without any preconditions. We're waiting." Does that mean we can't identify the nature of that regime for what it is -- evil? It is evil. Not the people of North Korea, but the regime itself and the way it has conducted its business for the last 50 years.

Because we are waiting for the inspectors to get into Iraq, we should ignore the nature of that regime? My European colleagues should be pounding on Iraq as quickly as they pound on us when the President makes a strong, principled speech.

With respect to Iran, some good things have been happening there, but some not so good things have been happening. And so I think the President's characterization was an accurate one, and perhaps some of the condemnatory language we have been hearing should be directed toward these nations, as opposed to the President's very powerful and clear and honest statement.

(Interview on CNN's Late Edition, February 17, 2002)

#### US National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice

"I can assure you he [Bush] has taken no decision about the use of force against Iraq."

(International Herald Tribune, Brian Knowlton, U.S. softens tone on 2 'axis' nations, February 18, 2002)

#### U.S. Assistant Secretary Of State For Political-Military Affairs Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr.

"Instead of lamenting military disparities in the alliance [NATO], and drawing negative contrasts between American policy pronouncements and those of other governments, we need to seize upon, and build on, the overwhelming commonality of interest we all have in prevailing against global terrorist threats."

(Remarks given on February 18, 2002 at The Royal Institute Of International Affairs 2002 Defence Conference; "Europe And America: A New Strategic Partnership", February 18-19, 2002, Chatham House, London, U.K.)



### Dutch MP Bert Koenders (Labor Party)

Bert Koenders, the foreign affairs spokesman for the country's Labor Party, says the United States has "legitimate concerns" about its safety but that he would prefer to see the country act more in concert with its European allies. The Dutch, like many in Europe, like to see international problems addressed in international forums, such as the United Nations or NATO.

(Baltimore Sun, Bill Glauber, Some in Europe uneasy about US talk of war, February 20, 2002)

### European Union's high representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana

"De verhouding tussen de Verenigde Staten en de EU is cruciaal. Daar moeten we niet lichtvaardig mee omgaan en ook de Verenigde Staten moeten dat niet doen. [...] We moeten subtieler zijn en ons niet vastbijten en termen. Ik vind niet dat de Amerikanen simplistisch zijn; ze hebben er veel over nagedacht. Als vrienden onder elkaar moeten we de waarheid spreken, maar je hoeft dat niet via een megafon te doen."

(Financieele Dagblad, Solana heeft genoeg van kritiek op VS, February 20, 2002)

### Former US President Jimmy Carter

Former President Jimmy Carter on Thursday criticized President Bush's labeling three countries an "axis of evil," saying the statement was "overly simplistic and counterproductive." Carter said Bush's statement seriously jeopardized progress made with North Korea, Iran and Iraq in recent years. "I think it will take years before we can repair the damage done by that statement."

(Washington Post, Carter rips Bush on 'Axis' label, February 21, 2002)

### US President George W. Bush

"We're a peaceful people. We have no intention of invading North Korea. South Korea has no intention of attacking North Korea. Nor does America."

(International Herald Tribune, Elisabeth Bumiller (New York Times), North won't be hit, Bush tells Koreans, February 22, 2002)

### French Ambassador to the US Francois Bujon

The French ambassador to the United States says Europe will not support any U.S. military action against Iraq without clear evidence that a military response is warranted. "We would not pledge support. They (the United States) would be on their own." [...] Mr. Bujon stressed that Europe will not simplify "complex and multidimensional problems" such as Iraq into a one-dimensional analysis.

(Washington Times, Steve Park, France won't back U.S. attack on Iraq, February 22, 2002)

### German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer

Er glaube, dass die "etwas kräftige transatlantische Debatte eher gut getan hat". Sie sollte aber "sicher nicht in dieser Tonlage fortgeführt werden".

(Der Spiegel, Streit nein, Debatte ja, February 22, 2002)

#### Dutch Foreign Minister Jozias van Aartsen

“Bush’ speech [State of the Union] was realistisch. Het valt niet te ontkennen dat massavernietigingswapens zorgen baren.”

(Metro, Straw niet bezorgd over uitspraak Bush, February 22, 2002)

#### Communiqué from the Stockholm Progressive Summit

“We, 12 Heads of State and Governments, from five continents, are united in a commitment to pursue modern and progressive policies. [...] In the face of new global threats we are committed to ever-greater international co-operation to close divides and overcome conflicts. The horrors of the September 11 attack on the United States, served to reaffirm our resolve. Terrorists who seek confrontation, and put their distorted perceptions above regard for human life and dignity, must not prevail. Our response is clear: we must be resolute in fighting terrorism and equally resolute in tackling its causes. For the only lasting answers lie in justice, more effective international co-operation, peace and freedom, democracy and development.

[...]

We are committed to a global perspective and a multilateral approach. Internationalism cannot be optional - it is at the core of our progressive values. We cannot insulate ourselves from the problems of an increasingly interdependent world by putting up barriers. If we are to solve challenges at home like economic instability, providing asylum from persecution, and illegal trade in drugs, arms and human beings we need to engage with the rest of the world. Only by working together can nation states restore the potential for political action to be effective in more and more crucial fields.

(A progressive agenda for democracy and development, Stockholm Progressive Summit 22-23 february 2002; Kwasniewski (President of Poland), Cardoso (President of Brazil), Mbeki (President of South Africa), Lagos (President of Chile), Chrétien (PM of Canada), Guterres (PM of Portugal), Blair (PM of the UK), Jospin (PM of France), Schröder (Chancellor of Germany), Clark (PM of New Zealand), Persson (PM of Sweden)).

#### UK Prime Minister Tony Blair

“The alliance with the United States is strong, it will remain strong. [...] We will deal with issues together. The Americans are absolutely right to emphasise the continuing importance of the war against terrorism and continuing the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.”

(The Observer, Kamal Ahmed, Blair and Bush to plot war on Iraq, February 24, 2002)

#### Spanish Foreign Minister Joseph Pique

“Our points of view on absolutely every topic are not always 100 percent congruent, but the amount of harmony is extremely, extremely high. And we hope this will continue to be the case, and our solidarity and friendship will increase as time goes by. What we intend to do is to continue emphasizing what brings us together, what unites us, and not emphasizing the things that separate us, which are very, very few indeed.”

(U.S. Department Of State Office Of The Spokesman, Remarks By Secretary Of State Colin L. Powell And Spanish Foreign Minister Josep Pique After Their Meeting February 25, 2002)

#### UN Secretary General Kofi Annan

“I don’t think Washington has taken any decision yet as to what to do about Iraq. But I am on record as saying any attack on Iraq at this stage would be unwise.”

(The Times, Tom Baldwin, Annan warns US not to attack Iraq, February 26, 2002)

### German President Johannes Rau

Rau hatte die USA vor einer Woche in einer Rede in Detroit ebenfalls vor Alleingängen gewarnt. In Berlin kam er jetzt darauf zurück und bemühte sich, Annan den Rücken zu stärken: "Gerade im Verhältnis zum Irak scheinen mir die Vereinten Nationen wieder an Bedeutung zu gewinnen, vor allem wenn es darum geht, die Rüstungskontrollinspektionen wieder aufzunehmen."

(Der Spiegel, Leise Kritik an Bush: rau gibt Annan Rückendeckung, Februar 27, 2002)

### UK Prime Minister Tony Blair

"I think that George Bush has shown tremendous leadership since September 11. I think he has acted always in a very measured way, in a calm way, but he is right to raise these issues and certainly he has our support in doing so."

[...]

"The accumulation of weapons of mass destruction by Iraq poses a threat, a threat not just to the region but to the wider world, and I think George Bush was absolutely right to raise it. Now what action we take in respect of that, that is an open matter for discussion."

(The Times, Blair: Iraq is a threat to the world, February 28, 2002)

### US Senator John Warner (Republican – Ranking Member Armed Services Committee)

"I start from the basic premise that NATO is first and foremost a military alliance. That is why NATO was founded. That is why it continues today. Nations should be invited to join NATO only if there's a compelling military rationale, not political, for additional members, and only if those additional members will make a positive military contribution to the alliance."

In my view, that case has yet to be made for the nine nations currently seeking consideration. We must always keep in mind that any country joining NATO will be extended the protection of Article 5 of the NATO charter, which states, "An armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all," end quote. That article was proudly invoked for the first time following the attacks on the United States on September the 11<sup>th</sup>."

[...]

"Maybe we should consider proudly retiring the colors of NATO and start over again, and figure out what is it we need by way of an organization and such military capabilities to meet the future threats and therefore preserve the integrity and the traditions of this organization, which so many have made - - given their -- indeed their lives and their careers to make it what it is. I think that's something that fundamentally we ought to take a look at."

(Hearing on the Future of NATO, Senate Armed Services committee, February 28, 2002)

### US Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Douglas Feith

"If I may, Mr. Chairman, the -- your point that it is not all black and white and that what you have is a real problem -- and I think that what Senator Sessions is calling attention to is a real problem, and we shouldn't leave the impression that we are denying the premise of his question, which is that the larger the group [NATO] gets the more the danger of it being unwieldy. That's absolutely correct. That does have to be balanced against the whole range of benefits of enlargement. I mean, it needs to be netted out. And I think that the point that my colleagues have made is that, first of all, the problem in practice hasn't been as great as one might think theoretically. And, secondly, the irreducible problem still has to be netted out against the other points."

(Hearing on the Future of NATO, Senate Armed Services committee, February 28, 2002)

### French Minister of Foreign Affairs Hubert Védrine

“Il ya un réelle perplexité européenne dace à une administration américaine qui, en un peu plus d’un an, s’est opposée au Protocole de Kyoto, à la Cour pénale internationale, à plusieurs accords sur le désarmement et abuse des veto au Conseil de sécurité dès qu’il est question de Proche-Orient. Après le 11 septembre, beaucoup de pays européens ont fait des offres de service, soit directement, soit indirectement au travers de l’Otan, mais sans résultat. Tout cela explique les réactions européennes. Je ne m’étonne guère de cette situation puisque, dès 1998, j’avais parlé d’hyperpuissance américaine. Ce qui n’était pas une critique, mais un constat. Nous sentions monter cette tendance lourde. Les Etats-Unis ne sont certes pas le seul pays convaincu d’être chargé d’une mission universelle, mais c’est le seul qui en ait tous les moyens et qui s’estime entièrement légitime dans ce rôle.

Il y a eu peut-être une certaine sous-estimation en Europe du choc épouvantable qu’a été la découverte par les Américains de leur vulnérabilité. Mais ce n’est pas cela qui explique cette tentation unilatéraliste ascendante. Notre amitié et notre solidarité pour le peuple américain sont bien réelles, mais cela ne signifie pas que nous devons nous aligner sur tous les aspects de leur politique. Il ne s’agit pas de critiquer les Etats-Unis de façon stérile, mais de les appeler à avoir une attitude différente. Il s’agit de savoir comment retrouver un partenariat. Le débat actuel est légitime et salubre. Je souhaite qu’il contribue à convaincre les Etats-Unis de faire un usage plus responsable de leur puissance et qu’ils manifestent une attention véritable pour leurs alliés et partenaires. Nous souhaitons qu’ils acceptent à nouveau la diversité du monde comme une richesse. Je souhaite, pour reprendre la formule de Lionel Jospin, qu’ils se réengagent dans un système multipolaire. La lutte contre le terrorisme ne peut pas tenir lieu de politique pour tous les problèmes du monde, même si celle-ci n’a pas été prise en compte auparavant avec toute l’énergie nécessaire.

[...]

Il y a un écart énorme et croissant entre les Etats-Unis et l’Europe sur le plan militaire et dans les budgets de défense. Depuis cinquante ans, à l’exception de la France et de la Grande-Bretagne, les autres pays occidentaux s’en sont complètement remis au système de l’Otan et à la protection américaine. Les Etats-Unis n’ont jamais encouragé chez leurs partenaires l’esprit de défense, sinon pour leur demander de prendre une plus large part du fardeau, mais jamais de la décision, et ont encore moins favorisé les coopérations industrielles européennes en matière d’armement!

[...]

Je veux le croire, certains signes l’indiquent, même si, depuis le 11 septembre, le poids du Pentagone le moins enclin à la concertation s’est encore accru. Mais les Américains sont pragmatiques et savent évoluer. Donald Rumsfeld lui-même a reconnu que l’expression «*axe du mal*» n’était peut-être pas la plus appropriée. Regardez quelle fut l’approche spontanée de l’administration Bush face à la Chine; après l’affaire de l’avion espion, gérée très intelligemment par Colin Powell, elle s’est adaptée. Cela a été pareil vis-à-vis de la Russie dont, au début, elle voulait faire un antagoniste. Je note aussi que lors de son dernier voyage à Washington, Ariel Sharon n’a pas obtenu le chèque en blanc qu’il espérait et le président Bush lui a fixé des lignes rouges au moins sur quelques points. Cela est encore loin de ce que préconisent les Européens, mais c’est déjà quelque chose. En tout cas, nous menons cette discussion avec les Etats-Unis dans un esprit constructif.”

(Libération, Jacques Amalric and Marc Semo, Hubert Védrine s’exprime sur la tension franco-américaine: “Washington doit avoir une attitude différente”, March 1, 2002)

### French President Jacques Chirac

Jacques Chirac a affirmé hier que la France et les Etats-Unis étaient “exactement sur la même ligne” dans la lutte contre le terrorisme et a réfuté toute divergence de vues à ce sujet. “Nous avons les mêmes préoccupations et nous avons participé à la demande des Etats-Unis nous acceptons toutes leurs demandes aux actions pour lutter contre le terrorisme qui ont été menées à l’intérieur ou autour de l’Afghanistan”, a déclaré le chef de l’Etat, déplorant “ici ou là des commentaires de nature polémique”.

(Libération, Autre son de cloche à l’Elysée, March 1, 2002)

## Annex 1

Persbericht Argos – 22 februari 2002

### **Amerikanen bestempelen NAVO als ‘irrelevant’**

- NAVO-raad ontgoocheld door Amerikaanse kritiek

Op het hoogste niveau binnen de NAVO, de NAVO-raad, zijn de afgelopen weken buitengewoon harde woorden gevallen tussen de Amerikanen en de Europeanen. Dit bericht het *VPRO-radioprogramma Argos* (radio 1, vrijdag 22 februari 2002). Tijdens een geheime informele bijeenkomst van de NAVO-ambassadeurs op 18 januari in Brussel bestempelde de invloedrijke Amerikaanse senator Lugar, daarbij bijgevallen door de Amerikaanse NAVO-ambassadeur, het Atlantische bondgenootschap ronduit als ‘irrelevant’ indien het de bestrijding van het internationale terrorisme niet als de voornaamste taak gaat aanpakken. De Europese NAVO-ambassadeurs reageerden ontgoocheld op deze uitlatingen. Nederland heeft de NAVO-raad op 20 januari een zogenaamd ‘non-paper’ voorgelegd in een poging de kloof te overbruggen en het dreigende uiteenvallen van de NAVO te voorkomen.

De Nederlandse defensiedeskundige prof. Rob de Wijk, als een van de weinige buitenstaanders op 18 januari aanwezig bij de NAVO-raad, ziet de bijeenkomst als teken dat het bondgenootschap zich in een zeer ernstige crisis bevindt. “Ik loop al twintig jaar mee in dit vak en heb dit nog niet eerder meegemaakt”, zegt hij. Volgens De Wijk was afgesproken dat niets van de bijeenkomst naar buiten zou worden gebracht, maar tot zijn verbijstering viel er gisteren een door een Amerikaanse ‘Information Officer’ opgesteld ‘Conference Report’ bij hem in de bus. Hierdoor voelt ook De Wijk zich nu vrij om openlijk over de bijeenkomst in Brussel te vertellen, waar “keiharde taal” werd gesproken. Die is volgens De Wijk ook als zodanig terug te vinden in het door de Amerikanen rondgestuurde verslag. “Er staat dat de boodschap van de Amerikanen aan de NAVO-ambassadeurs is: als de NAVO niet volstrekt zijn koers bijstelt en zich niet aanpast de nieuwe dreigingen na 11 september dan wordt de NAVO irrelevant en zal de NAVO de Amerikaanse steun verliezen.”

De Wijk, die naast de Nederlandse NAVO-ambassadeur Patijn de enige Nederlander was op de bijeenkomst op 18 januari, heeft de indruk dat de Amerikanen het verslag bewust naar buiten hebben gebracht, kennelijk met de bedoeling om duidelijk te maken hoe ernstig de crisis in het bondgenootschap is. Het verslag is volgens de Clingendael-deskundige en oud-topambtenaar van het Ministerie van Defensie in “ongebruikelijk ondiplomatieke taal” opgesteld. “Normaal gesproken probeer je als er dermate grote meningsverschillen zijn binnen een organisatie dat toch een beetje met de mantel der liefde te bedekken. Dat is nu gewoon niet meer gebeurd.” Uit het verslag blijkt “dat er een duidelijke consistente boodschap was van alle Amerikaanse sprekers: als de NAVO zich niet aanpast dan zal ze irrelevant worden.” De slotconclusie in het verslag is volgens De Wijk “dat er absoluut geen Europese visie was hoe je de NAVO relevant kunt houden”. De republikeinse senator Lugar, die, net als De Wijk, op de bijeenkomst een inleiding hield, zei nadrukkelijk dat hij zijn tekst had gecoördineerd met president Bush.

Tweede Kamerlid Jan Hoekema (D66) heeft minister Van Aartsen van Buitenlandse Zaken gevraagd of de Kamer inzage kan krijgen in het ‘non-paper’ dat Nederland - volgens informatie die Argos deze week uit buitenlandse diplomatieke bron kreeg – op 20 januari heeft verspreid onder de NAVO-ambassadeurs. “Het is een typisch Nederlandse poging, overigens zeer gewaardeerd”, zegt hij “om als vriend van Amerika en tevens als Europees land die brug te slaan naar de Verenigde Staten”. Hoekema vindt het “belangrijk om ook als parlement te weten wat minister Van Artsen doet” met het oog op de actuele crisis binnen de NAVO.

## Annex 2

### **Report based on press release 'Argos', investigative radio program Netherlands**

Karel Koster, 23 February 2002

In a program broadcast on Dutch radio on Friday 22 February 2002, Prof. Rob de Wijk, a national security expert and NATO insider, revealed that there is a serious conflict taking place inside NATO. The conflict came to a head at an informal meeting of NATO ambassadors in Brussels on 18 January, when Senator Lugar described the NATO alliance as "irrelevant" unless it adapted itself to fight the war against terrorism. De Wijk was present at the meeting.

Lugar:

"The Alliance invoked article 5 for the first time in its history in response to September 11. But, NATO itself has only played a limited, largely political and symbolic role in the war against terrorism."

"Rightly or wrongly, the legacy of Kosovo has reinforced the concern that NATO is not up to the job of fighting a modern war."

Lugar stated at the beginning of his speech that he had coordinated its contents with President Bush.

De Wijk, who has been involved in policy making for 20 years, stated that the 18 January meeting concluded that there was absolutely no European vision on how to maintain NATO's relevancy. The language used at the conference was unusually hard and undiplomatic, according to De Wijk. He also concluded that the US government has decided to bring this confrontation into the open, because a conference report on the 18 January meeting was being distributed by US information officers (it reached him on 21 Feb). He therefore did not feel himself bound to secrecy.

On 20 January the Netherlands government presented a non-paper to the NATO Permanent Council in which an attempt was made to bridge the differences between the European NATO members and the US government.

In reaction to this the Dutch parliamentarians Jan Hoekema and Bert Koenders (foreign affairs spokesmen for D66 and the Labour Party, two of the governing coalition parties) have tabled questions on the nature of the non-paper. They also asked about the NATO plans to cut back the funding of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre, reported in the Wall Street Journal Europe (24 January 2002)

According to other sources a meeting of the NATO Council on 15 February concluded that the public confrontation between the US and its European allies should stop.

On 19 February Solana, the EU foreign affairs coordinator, called publicly for a constructive dialogue between the US and the European Union.

A key issue in the background is the preparations by the US for a war against Iraq. 4000 US troops are involved in exercises in Kuwait. Intriguingly, a German NBC unit was also involved in those exercises, and has probably been joined by a Czech NBC unit.

Annex 3: zie pdf-bestand

Annex 4: zie pdf-bestand

## Annex 5

The Observer

### **Blair and Bush to plot war on Iraq**

Kamal Ahmed, political editor  
Sunday February 24, 2002

Tony Blair and the United States President George Bush are to hold a specially convened summit in April to finalise details of military action to overthrow Saddam Hussein.

Blair will travel to Washington in six weeks' time in a clear signal that Downing Street fully backs Bush's plans to launch a war against Iraq if Saddam does not agree to deadlines to destroy his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction.

'The meeting will be to finalise Phase Two of the war against terrorism,' a senior Number 10 official said. 'Action against Iraq will be at the top of the agenda.'

With evidence growing of a Labour Party backlash over American action against Saddam, the Government is now planning to publish for the first time detailed evidence of Iraq's nuclear capabilities. The document will reveal that Saddam is attempting to amass rudimentary nuclear capabilities and is also investigating a way to launch 'dirty' nuclear bombs - unsophisticated devices which would nevertheless wreak havoc if ever used.

Western intelligence services also believe Saddam is developing biological and chemical devices which could kill and maim tens of thousands of people.

The Number 10 official said that, as with Osama bin Laden and the war in Afghanistan, it is necessary to maintain public and international support for military action against Saddam.

It was a 'public persuasion' issue and would be tackled in the same way as the unprecedented 'indictment' against bin Laden published by Downing Street last year with the agreement of the White House.

Bush has been under increasing attack from Europe over his desire to see Saddam removed from power. His 'axis of evil' speech earlier this year, when he named Iraq, Iran and North Korea as international pariah states, has been attacked by both the French Prime Minister, Lionel Jospin, and the European Union commissioner for external affairs, Chris Patten. The Foreign Office in particular is irritated by the bellicose language, which officials said revealed that hawkish elements in Washington had won over the President's mind.

But The Observer can reveal that Blair has told his inner circle that he believes the attacks on the President are misplaced and that it is only by the threat of action that reformist elements within Iraq will be encouraged to rise up against Saddam.

In a series of long telephone conversations over the past two months, Bush has kept Blair aware of his plans for military action. Although there is no evidence of any link between Iraq and the attacks of 11 September, both leaders will make it clear that weapons of mass destruction are a legitimate target for military action. 'The alliance with the United States is strong, it will remain strong,' Blair said yesterday at a meeting of European leaders in Stockholm.

'We will deal with issues together. The Americans are absolutely right to emphasise the continuing importance of the war against terrorism and continuing the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.'

In an interview to be broadcast by the BBC's On the Record programme today, US Assistant Secretary of State, Beth Jones, admitted that 'nothing was off the table' when it came to Iraq.

'I think Americans aren't alone - there are many many people in the world who want Saddam to no longer be in charge in Iraq,' says Jones. 'There's no question about that. I think it's fair to say that nothing is off the table.'

The April summit will significantly increase world tension on the issue as Middle East nations watch warily for any signal that Bush will act precipitately against Saddam.

Many Muslim leaders fear a leadership vacuum and political chaos in Iraq, which could affect the standing of neighbouring countries in the region.

It now seems likely that Saddam will be set a deadline to allow in weapons inspectors who will oversee the destruction of Iraq's weaponry or face military consequences.

The Prime Minister is aware of a growing revolt within his own party and some elements of the British military against action in Iraq.

Intelligence officials in Britain have told The Observer that there is concern about over-committing in Iraq and of making military promises that cannot be kept.

They have advised Number 10 that the only 'window' for action is in the autumn and winter of this year, when the fierce heat in the region abates slightly.

A poll of 100 backbench MPs by On the Record, to be released today, reveals wide spread disquiet about the developments.

Asked if there was sufficient evidence to support an attack on Iraq, 86 MPs said no, while only 12 agreed, and three said they did not know.

Similar levels of opposition to Bush's 'axis of evil' speech were also apparent.

Asked about his attitude to attacks on Iraq, former Defence Minister Doug Henderson tells the programme: 'I think a lot of us would have severe worries - one, that the action wouldn't be successful, that Saddam wouldn't be toppled and it would be left with an invasion force in Iraq; or secondly, that we'd alienate too many of the other countries whose support we need to fight terrorism internationally.'

## Annex 6

Press Release Argos - March 1, 2002

### **Dutch radio programme 'Argos' makes report public of secret NATO Meeting**

- "US message to permanent representatives was clear: if NATO is not radically altered to meet new threats and challenges, it could become irrelevant and lose American support"

The Dutch investigative radio programme Argos (VPRO, Radio 1, March 1) today made public the report of a secret informal meeting of the permanent representatives to NATO, held on January 18, 2002 in Genval near Brussels. The radio programme reported last week already about the meeting and investigated this issue together with the German newspaper Hamburger Abendblatt. Yesterday Argos obtained a copy of the report, written by Diane Zeleny, U.S. Information Officer, NATO Country Relations, OIPS.

These are the most important passages of the report:

### **Conference Report: U.S. Mission to NATO Security Policy Workshop NATO and the new strategic environment: meeting the challenge Genval, January 18, 2002**

In addition to permreps attendees includes security experts and officials from NATO countries. Panelists included U.S. Senator Richard Lugar, Ambassador Richard Haass of the U.S. State Department, (...) Dr. Dominique Moisi, of IFRI in Paris, Dr. Horst Teltschik, Chairman of Wehrkunde (...), Professor Rob de Wijk of the Clingendael Institute in the Netherlands.

Key findings:

1. U.S. message to permreps was clear: if NATO is not radically altered to meet new threats and challenges, it could become irrelevant and lose American support.(...)
2. European message, while not unanimous, was also clear: we want some respect in Washington and less condescension. We offered help and you did not accept. We aren't convinced that if we spend more, do more, we will have more of say in the game. (...)
3. Transatlantic trust and confidence is frayed.  
(...)
6. U.S. policymakers wonder if NATO has lost its rationale, lost its monopoly with the advent of ESDP. (...)



(...)

8. There is a strong consensus that there has been re-nationalization of European security interests since 9/11.

(...)

11. NATO will be more a la carte – a lego box from which to choose the assets required for the job at hand.

(...)

Moisi commenced with an ironic statement on the new threat to NATO: Don Rumsfeld. In 1966, the greatest threat to NATO was de Gaulle and now it is the US Defense Secretary. Moisi had no further surprises in store, and sounded surprisingly like Vedrine (...) Moisi ended as ironically as he began: “I’m pro-NATO, but if the US isn’t what can I do?”

(...)

Richard Haass, Director of State Department’s Policy Planning department (...) asked if NATO has lost its rationale? NATO (...) must play a role outside of Europe. European capabilities and political will needs to strengthen significantly. (...) If capabilities don’t evolve, NATO will be talking shop only. (...)

Perm rep commentary:

(...)

- Is it true that if we do more we will have more of a say in the game? (...)

Conclusion:

Clearly a very strong and consistent message from U.S. speakers, both official and non-official, executive as well as legislative branches of government. NATO needs to reform significantly, or face probable irrelevance. U.S. has undergone a dramatic change in thinking since September 11<sup>th</sup>. Focus is now squarely on threats posed by terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. (...) No clear European consensus on how to get NATO ready for the next 50 years.

Diane Zeleny  
U.S. Information Officer  
NATO Country Relations, OIP

January 23, 2002