



December 2003 – No. 32A – aanvulling bij nr. 32

### BEGROTING BUITENLANDSE ZAKEN PROLIFERATIEVRAAGSTUKKEN (AANVULLING)

#### INHOUDSOPGAVE

Tweede Kamer	1
NAVO	3
Irak – massavernietigingswapens	4
Missile Defense	7
Verenigde Naties	8
Noord-Korea	9
Divers	10

#### TWEEDE KAMER

##### Tweede Kamer

##### **Verlag Algemeen Overleg Vaste Commissies voor Buitenlandse Zaken, voor Defensie en voor Europese Zaken over EVDB, transatlantische betrekkingen en de NAVO (13 november 2003)**

21501-02, 26348, 28676 – nr. 510 – vastgesteld 28 november 2003

[...]

De heer **Koenders** (PvdA) merkt op dat er vanwege de crisis in Irak nogal wat is veranderd in de transatlantische betrekkingen. Het is de vraag of de huidige verschillen tussen Europa en de VS veroorzaakt zijn door structurele veranderingen of dat zij te maken hebben met de conjunctuur van de regering-Bush en een aantal Europese regeringsleiders. Het is zeker van belang om de transatlantische betrekkingen hoog in het vaandel te houden, maar zij moeten wellicht herijkt worden in het licht van de huidige ontwikkelingen. Het lijkt erop dat de VS zich beginnen te realiseren dat hun macht beperkingen heeft, terwijl een aantal grotere Europese landen juist relevant wilde blijken door een enorm aantal missies te beginnen in onder meer Afghanistan. De heer Koenders ergert zich er in ieder geval aan dat de VS een soort chantage plegen met betrekking tot de toekomst van het Europese veiligheidsbeleid en een en ander relateren aan de toekomst van de NAVO. Wat vindt de minister van Buitenlandse Zaken ervan dat de VS een Europa van twee snelheden en een mutual defense clause onaanvaardbaar noemen en een zinnige coördinatie van autonome Europese operaties bijna automatisch als duplicatie kwalificeren? Waarom zou een aantal Europese landen niet sneller mogen samenwerken op het terrein van het defensie- en veiligheidsbeleid?

Waar gingen de gesprekken over tijdens de speciale bijeenkomst van de NAVO die gehouden is op verzoek van de Amerikanen, en welke bijdrage heeft Nederland daaraan geleverd? Ook is het de vraag in hoeverre Nederland betrokken is bij de gesprekken over een Europees hoofdkwartier en waar een en ander verder toe kan leiden. Is het overigens mogelijk om Frankrijk weer meer bij de NAVO te betrekken, nu het heeft aangegeven dat het weer bij de NAVO-staven betrokken wil zijn? De mission creative alliance is de grootste uitdaging waar het gaat om het aantonen van de relevantie van de NAVO. Als interventies steeds maar door een paar landen worden uitgevoerd en andere landen vervolgens de zaak mogen opruimen, dan zal dat op termijn een probleem zijn voor de toekomst van de NAVO. In dit verband is het nog de vraag hoe in Europa tot een effectievere besluitvorming over capaciteit gekomen kan worden.

Het parlement moet natuurlijk betrokken worden bij besluitvorming over een bijdrage aan de NRF. Staat de Helsinki headline goal in de praktijk echt niet in de weg aan de uitwerking van het NRF-concept? Waarom worden de Petersbergtaken trouwens alleen gedefinieerd als niet-vredeafdwingend? De regering wil terecht multilateralisme «met tanden». Daarom moet het initiatief van Kofi Annan in de Verenigde Naties inzake het gebruik van geweld en de forsere rol van multilateralisme gesteund worden. Welke positie neemt de regering in ten aanzien van MPF? Verder is het nog de vraag wat de rol van Nederland is in het PSI (Proliferation Security Initiative) en hoe op dit punt wordt samengewerkt met Frankrijk. Kan het parlement een en ander controleren? Hoe verhoudt het PSI zich tot de internationale wapenbeheersingsafspraken? Tot slot merkt de heer Koenders op dat de VS met de verdere ontwikkeling van mini nukes echt het verkeerde signaal afgeven.

[...]

Mevrouw **Gerkena** (SP) memoreert dat er na een jarenlange discussie sinds kort taken door de NAVO worden uitgeoefend buiten het verdragsgebied. Wat is de stand van zaken bij de uitoefening van de NAVO-taken in Afghanistan, Irak en Israël en wat is de visie van de regering hierop? De unilaterale oorlog van de VS tegen Irak heeft niet alleen geleid tot de opkomst van een wereldwijde vredesbeweging, maar ook tot een barst in de NAVO zelf. Uit de poging van een viertal Europese landen om een eigen hoofdkwartier in Tervuren op te richten, blijkt dat de transatlantische spanningen zijn versterkt door de unilaterale koers van de Amerikaanse regering. De Franse regering lijkt trouwens nog steeds naar een eigen hoofdkwartier te streven.

Door de NRF en de Europese RRF zal een beroep worden gedaan op min of meer dezelfde eliteonderdelen van de diverse nationale krijgsmachten. Door de eenzijdige Amerikaanse politiek is het niet onlogisch dat sommige Europese landen meer greep willen houden op hun eigen militairen. Welke spanningen kunnen hieruit voortvloeien? Het is duidelijk dat ook de regering het Amerikaanse unilateralisme betreurt, maar multilateralisme met tanden is hiervoor geen alternatief. Multilateralisme doelt namelijk niet noodzakelijkerwijs op de NAVO, maar op de gelegenheidscoalities die door de NAVO-landen kunnen worden samengesteld, vooral op instigatie van de VS.

Het laatste jaar is duidelijk geworden dat de NAVO wil optreden tegen terrorisme en massavernietigingswapens en dat zij dat wellicht op gewelddadig wijze zal doen. Waarom heeft Nederland de Amerikaanse minikernwapens echter buiten beschouwing gelaten tijdens de algemene vergadering van de VN in september? Het gevaar bestaat dat door minikernwapens de grens tussen niet-nucleaire wapens en kernwapens vervaagt. Er bestaat ook een duidelijk verband tussen de ontwikkeling van minikernwapens en het idee van first strike. Het idee van first strike mag echter niet als een vorm van normaal politiek en militaire denken worden aanvaard. Verder moet voorkomen worden dat de NAVO hierdoor betrokken raakt bij de wapenwedloop. In dit verband is het ook de vraag hoe de regering denkt over de plannen van de Franse regering om de militaire doctrine te veranderen, in die zin dat er kernwapens kunnen worden ingezet tegen schurkenstaten die Frankrijk zouden kunnen bedreigen met biologische, chemische of nucleaire wapens. Hierdoor wordt een verkeerd signaal afgegeven. De wijze waarop de NAVO in het voetspoor van de VS op jacht gaat naar schurkenstaten, zal de neiging van deze staten om een massavernietigingswapen te bouwen, versterken. De logica van een dergelijk beleid zit ook in de schijnheiligheid van de non-proliferatie. Wat zal trouwens tegen de Israëlische kernbewapening ondernomen worden? De NAVO zal de komende jaren de structurele problemen die zich het afgelopen jaar hebben gemanifesteerd, moeten oplossen en de transatlantische spanningen die een en ander met zich kan brengen, moeten ondervangen.

De heer **Wilders** (VVD) heeft op veiligheidsgebied meer vertrouwen in de Verenigde Staten dan in Europa en meent dan ook dat er geïnvesteerd moet worden in een goede relatie met de VS. Uit onderzoek is trouwens gebleken dat het merendeel van de Nederlanders een transatlantische oriëntatie steunt. Verder is daaruit gebleken dat zowel de Europeanen als de Amerikanen terrorisme, het islamitisch fundamentalisme, massavernietigingswapens en het Israëlisch-Palestijnse conflict als internationale dreigingen beschouwen. Er zijn dus meer overeenkomsten dan sommigen wel eens doen voorkomen. [...]

Het lijkt de heer Wilders trouwens een goede zaak om te proberen, de Frans-Nederlandse betrekkingen weer te intensiveren. In dit verband is het de vraag hoe de regering de ambitie van de Fransen beoordeelt om zich in NAVO-verband meer te engageren. Verder wil de heer Wilders weten of er met de Fransen al een seminar is georganiseerd over de islam in Afrika en, zo ja, of de Kamer het verslag daarvan kan krijgen. Ook wil hij nader geïnformeerd worden over de ambitie om samen met de Fransen een versterkt Europees non-proliferatiebeleid uit te werken.

[...]

**De Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken** [...] De landen van de Europese Unie willen steeds meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid nemen voor een geïntegreerd veiligheids- en defensiebeleid. De OVSE kan politiek actief zijn bij het opzetten van crisisbeheersingsoperaties, maar is niet in staat om zo'n operatie uit te voeren. De OVSE zal de uitvoering ervan dus moeten delegeren naar een ander daarvoor meer in aanmerking komend gremium, zoals de EU of de NAVO. De transatlantische betrekkingen zijn onderhevig aan structurele

veranderingen doordat de EU meer en meer verantwoordelijkheid gaat nemen voor het veiligheids- en defensiebeleid. Dat mag echter niet gedaan worden, omdat sommige Europese landen zich willen afzetten tegen de VS. Daarom is gesteld dat het EVDB complementair moet zijn, hetgeen overigens niet betekent dat de EU niet haar eigen verantwoordelijk kan en moet nemen. De VS hebben eerder wel terecht gesteld dat afspraken die de EU met de VS maakt, ook nagekomen moeten worden. Wat dat betreft, is de afronding van Berlijn-plus een belangrijke mijlpaal in de relatie tussen de EU en de VS. [...]

Tijdens de speciale bijeenkomst van de NAVO die op verzoek van de VS gehouden is, is gebleken dat de VS bang zijn voor disengagement en duplication. Een en ander is nu echter uitgepraat. De NAVO-raad is trouwens ook het forum voor dit soort gesprekken.

Het onderzoek naar kernwapens met een explosieve waarde van minder dan 5 kiloton verhindert op zichzelf niet de inwerkingtreding van het Alomvattend kernstopverdrag. Er is echter wel een duidelijk verband daartussen. Zolang een aantal landen, waaronder de VS, het Alomvattend kernstopverdrag niet ratificeert, kan dit verdrag namelijk ook niet in werking treden. Daarom hebben de minister-president en de minister van Buitenlandse Zaken tijdens hun bezoek aan Washington gewezen op het belang van versterking van het multilaterale non-proliferatieregime. Het feit dat de VS het verdrag niet ratificeren, biedt landen als India en Pakistan een politiek alibi om het verdrag ook niet te ondertekenen. Wanneer een land uit het NPV stapt, zou de Veiligheidsraad trouwens eigenlijk moeten vaststellen dat er sprake is van risico's voor de vrede en veiligheid. De regering is natuurlijk ook voor een kernwapenvrij Midden-Oosten. Het is niet zeker of Israël over kernwapens beschikt, maar ook Israël moet natuurlijk opgeroepen worden om het NPV te ondertekenen.

Met Frankrijk en aantal andere landen wordt gewerkt aan het PSI. Mocht uit ervaringen met het PSI blijken dat de internationale juridische kaders terzake moeten worden aangepast, dan moet daar uiteraard toe overgegaan worden.

In het Europese veiligheidsconcept is inmiddels geen sprake meer van pre-emptive engagement, omdat een aantal landen van mening was dat dit verkeerde connotaties opwekte. De Europese veiligheidsstrategie moet in ieder geval op de kortst mogelijke termijn onderwerp van gesprek met de VS zijn.

[...]

De **Minister van Defensie** [...] Voor de samenwerking tussen de EU en de NAVO zijn onder meer de Berlijn-plus-afspraken gemaakt. In de praktijk zijn er echter wat spanningen. Geprobeerd moet worden om die spanningen aan de hand van praktijkvoorbeelden op te lossen. In ieder geval moet voorkomen worden dat er op dit gebied concurrentie ontstaat tussen de EU en de NAVO. De minister zegt toe dat hij zich zal inzetten voor een optimale afstemming tussen de EU en de NAVO op het punt van de defensie-inspanningen en terrorismebestrijding. [...]

Bij de simulatieoefening tijdens de informele bijeenkomst van NAVO-ministers van defensie werd uitgegaan van een crisis ergens in de wereld waarmee de NAVO zich zou kunnen bezighouden, omdat de NAVO bij het betrokken land de verwachting heeft gewekt dat het geholpen zal worden bij een aanval. In de simulatieoefening is de reactie van de NAVO op die aanval nagespeeld. Gaandeweg bleek dat in dat scenario heel gemakkelijk ook een terroristische aanval op NAVO-grondgebied kon worden ingebouwd. Toen de minister daar anderhalf uur mee bezig was geweest, vond hij de wereld zo ingewikkeld dat hij blij was dat Nederland onderdeel uitmaakt van de NAVO en de EU. [...]

## NAVO

### North Atlantic Council

#### **Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO Headquarters**

Press release (2003)152 - Brussels – 4 December 2003

1. As we meet today, NATO is acting to preserve peace through its operations; spreading stability through its partnerships; and reinforcing our community of shared values through the most robust round of enlargement in our history. The North Atlantic Alliance remains the basis of our collective defence and the essential transatlantic forum for security. Today, we took stock of NATO's ongoing transformation to meet 21 st century threats and challenges to the security of our populations, territory and forces, from wherever they may come, and gave direction on work still to be done, as we look ahead to our Summit in Istanbul next June.

[...]

15. NATO and the European Union share common strategic interests, and we remain strongly committed to enhancing our cooperation. Since our last meeting, NATO-EU cooperation has made concrete progress and is

developing in a constructive manner. We agreed a concerted approach for the Western Balkans. We look forward to further substantive cooperation with the EU, including through the Berlin+ arrangements. A joint NATO-EU crisis management exercise was successfully held in November. NATO-EU consultations and cooperation on questions of common interest relating to security, defence and crisis management, such as the fight against terrorism, mutually reinforcing capabilities, and civil-emergency planning, were stepped up and will continue to be developed. We have tasked the Council in Permanent Session to consider how to reinforce, by the time of the Istanbul Summit, the strategic partnership between NATO and the EU as agreed between our two organisations, including through effective consultations with the EU, respecting the autonomy of the two organisations, and in a spirit of transparency. NATO and the EU could also co-sponsor a seminar on terrorism.

[...]

18. The NATO-Russia Council, in which NATO member states and Russia work together as equal partners in areas of common interest, continues to make valuable contributions to security throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. Our political dialogue has developed on key security issues, including Afghanistan and the Balkans. Our practical cooperation has reached a new level, including in military-to-military projects; and, through our focus on improving interoperability, we have also laid the groundwork for future military cooperation, including potentially in joint peacekeeping operations. We welcome progress made on nuclear confidence building measures, and on the safe management of nuclear and radiological material. We look forward to approval of an ambitious Work Programme for 2004. We are committed to building on this progress, and to further enhancing the NATO-Russia relationship.

[...]

21. The Alliance's policy of support for arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation will continue to play a major role in the achievement of the Alliance's security objectives, including preventing the spread and use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and their means of delivery. We stress the importance of abiding by, fully implementing and strengthening existing international arms control and disarmament accords and multilateral non-proliferation and export control regimes. Early admission of all invitees into all appropriate existing non-proliferation regimes could play a positive role in that regard. In particular, we underline our commitment to reinforcing the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the pre-eminent non-proliferation and disarmament mechanism, and ensuring the full compliance with it by all states party to the Treaty. We will also strengthen our common efforts to safeguard nuclear and radiological material.

22. The Alliance supports the aims of the Proliferation Security Initiative to establish a more co-ordinated and effective basis through which to impede and stop shipments of WMD, delivery systems, and related materials flowing to and from states and non-state actors of proliferation concern, consistent with national legal authorities and relevant international law and frameworks, including the United Nations Security Council.

23. We remain committed to the protection of civilian populations. We welcome the progress made in the implementation of the Civil Emergency Planning Action Plan for the Improvement of Civil Preparedness against possible Terrorist Attacks against Civilian Populations with Chemical, Biological and Radiological Agents. We look forward to its full implementation in order to reinforce national preparedness and reaction to civil emergencies.

[...]

## **IRAK – MASSAVERNIE TIGINGSWAPENS**

Guardian

### **Blair and BBC will get Hutton report one day before publication**

By David Hencke and Richard Norton Taylor – 3 December 2003

Lord Hutton will break constitutional precedent early next year by handing over his report into the death of the Iraq weapons expert Dr David Kelly simultaneously to the BBC, Tony Blair and other leading witnesses to his inquiry.

The law lord has decided that the Downing Street spin machine cannot be trusted not to misrepresent or leak his findings in advance if he allows ministers to see a draft version of his report. As a result, ministers, officials and the BBC will receive a copy of the report one day before Lord Hutton expects Mr Blair and Lord Falconer to make statements to parliament on his findings.

"Lord Hutton is determined that his report will not be leaked in advance or misrepresented. He does not want the government to be able to hold on to his findings so that information can be selectively leaked," sources close to the inquiry said yesterday.

The BBC will be asked to sign a binding legal undertaking not to leak the report a day in advance. There is a clear understanding that recipients of the report will be able to publish after 24 hours.

Copies will only be given to the leading players in the inquiry, including the prime minister, Geoff Hoon, the defence secretary, Sir John Scarlett, head of the joint intelligence committee, Gavyn Davis, chairman of the BBC, and the BBC reporter Andrew Gilligan. Lobby journalists, friends and colleagues of Dr Kelly will not be sent copies of the report in advance. The report is expected to run to more than 1,000 pages.

Lord Hutton, who is preparing the report alone, aims to write a readable narrative. In its present draft form there are no recommendations or appendices. Instead he will rely on acerbic comments in the narrative to make it absolutely clear who is to blame and what needs to be done. Lord Hutton is understood to take the view that those who are to be criticised - including senior Ministry of Defence officials - received notice to that effect at the end of the first round of the inquiry, before they were recalled for cross-examination in the second phase.

It is believed no one will be subject to significant fresh criticism as a result of the cross-examination. However, witnesses will not know until shortly before the report's publication whether their response to cross-examination - by their own lawyers as well as by those of other witnesses - has changed Lord Hutton's judgment.

He has also laid down a number of other guidelines which he expects Mr Blair to follow. The law lord has told Lord Falconer that he has no intention of producing his report during the parliamentary recess, or in the dying days of the present session, because he believes ministers would try to bury bad news. Instead he would like it published in January, preferably on a Thursday, with a commitment from the prime minister that parliament could debate his findings within a week. Originally, he proposed even more drastic curbs on its release, giving ministers three hours to read it before it was released to the public.

The procedure is in marked contrast to that adopted by Lord Scott during his arms-to-Iraq inquiry. There was no cross-examination at his inquiry and Lord Scott gave witnesses passages of his draft report where they were criticised. That led to a series of leaks which allowed government and other witnesses to manipulate the debate before that report was published.

## Guardian

### **Gulf troops put at risk by failures**

Watchdog says vital equipment missing

By Richard Norton-Taylor – 12 December 2003

British troops invading Iraq were deprived of vital equipment, including body armour and protection against chemical or biological attack, as well as such basic items as desert boots and clothing, a devastating report on the failure to prepare the army properly for the war revealed yesterday.

The report, by parliament's public spending watchdog, the National Audit Office, discloses that troops were so desperate that they were driven to carry out a "considerable degree of misappropriation" to get their hands on equipment they needed.

The watchdog describes an extraordinary catalogue of problems, with commanders unaware of where equipment was stored, life-saving plates for body armour "disappearing", and weapons turning up so late that soldiers did not have enough time to train with them.

The report also states that many troops were not protected against chemical weapons - a particularly damaging finding in the light of the weight and publicity the government gave to claims in its intelligence dossier in September 2002 that Iraqi forces could attack western soldiers with them within 45 minutes of an order to do so.

Yesterday's report was published as the Ministry of Defence released a white paper in which it said Britain's armed forces should be equipped with hi-tech weapons systems and that the number of tanks, ships and aircraft should be cut. It also said they will need to be "interoperable with US command and control structures".

The NAO contradicts claims by the defence secretary, Geoff Hoon, that all was well on the supply front before and during the Iraq war. On May 14, he told the Commons defence committee: "All the requisite numbers of boots and clothing and equipment were there ... The truth is that when they went into operations

all of our forces were given the right boots. There was sufficient clothing and protective equipment in theatre to deal with a force of this size."

Mr Hoon said he was waiting for apologies "from either individual journalists or from their editors" for criticising inadequacies in the MoD's supply line.

The audit office said British armed forces were given an "insufficient number" of body armour sets, partly because no one knew where the supplies were located. Up to 200,000 sets, costing £170 a piece, had been issued since the 1999 Kosovo war but these "seem to have disappeared".

A quarter of all soldiers in the 7th Armoured Brigade, the Desert Rats, still had black boots and green uniforms rather than desert kit throughout the war.

David Clarke, the director of the audit team which visited Iraq in the summer, pointed out that this particular problem had not affected combat effectiveness. But he said it had had a profound impact on morale. "We're out here fighting and you can't even be bothered to buy us a uniform," was an attitude expressed by soldiers.

There was a "significant shortfall", of about 40%, in the number of nerve agent detection systems, the report says.

As many as 4,000 sets of a vapour detector used to monitor residual chemicals after an attack were unserviceable. There were no NBC defence filters for armoured vehicles to help protect the crew and soldiers inside.

A lack of supply confidence at the headquarters of 1 Armoured Division "led to a considerable degree of misappropriation of equipment and stores moving through the supply chain - items included desert combat clothing, boots, and nuclear, biological and chemical protective clothing".

Because commanders did not know when consignments of spare engines and other parts of equipment for Challenger 2 tanks and AS90 long-range howitzers sent by sea would arrive, they ordered batches cannibalised from equipment in Germany to be flown in.

But the report says British weapons performed well. It praises the defence establishment and military chiefs for the invasion's success and for deploying 46,000 personnel in 10 weeks, half the time it took in the first Gulf war.

Samantha Roberts, the widow of a British soldier killed in Iraq, told Channel 4 News last night that she was "disgusted" by the report's findings. The MoD is investigating the death of Sergeant Steven Roberts who was shot near Zubayr, near Basra, while trying to quell a riot apparently without a flak jacket.

Edward Leigh, the Conservative chairman of the Commons public accounts committee, said: "We expect the men and women of the armed forces to fight and maybe die for us. So it is an outrage that they could not expect all of the proper equipment, protection, and even clothing to do the job we ask of them ... They were shamefully let down."

The MoD acknowledged last night that its ability to distribute essential equipment to troops needed to be strengthened

## Reuters

### **Report: Saddam Tells Interrogators 'No WMD'**

14 December 2003

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Saddam Hussein denied during the initial interrogation after his capture that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, Time magazine reported on Sunday.

Citing a U.S. intelligence official in Iraq, the report said that when asked if his government had such weapons Saddam replied: "No, of course not. The U.S. dreamed them up itself to have a reason to go to war with us."

The news magazine reported that the official, who read a transcript of the interrogation of the former Iraqi president, said the interrogator asked: "If you had no weapons of mass destruction, then why not let the U.N. inspectors into your facilities?"

Saddam's reply: "We didn't want them to go into the presidential areas and intrude on our privacy."

The U.S. intelligence official, who was not identified, told the magazine that Saddam had not been very cooperative and did not answer any of the initial questions directly.

The transcript was full of "Saddam rhetoric type stuff," said the official, who paraphrased some of Saddam's responses.

According to the report, when asked, "How are you?" Saddam responded: "I am sad because my people are in bondage."

Both Time and Newsweek reported that after he was taken into custody Saddam had been taken to a holding cell at Baghdad airport, where other top Iraqi detainees are held for interrogation.

In its report on Saddam's capture, Newsweek said that the former Iraqi leader identified himself as he surrendered with no resistance.

"Don't shoot," Saddam said, according to a military source quoted by Newsweek. "I am Saddam Hussein, the president of the Republic of Iraq."

## **MISSILE DEFENSE**

Associated Press

### **Danish court upholds Inuit relocation**

By Jan M. Olsen – 29 November 2003

COPENHAGEN, Denmark — The Danish government acted within its legal rights when it removed native Greenlanders from their ancestral land to expand a U.S. air base in the 1950s, Denmark's Supreme Court ruled Friday.

The government moved 132 people from the Uummanaq settlement in 1953 so the U.S. air base in Thule, northern Greenland, could be expanded.

The Inuit plaintiffs, who were moved 75 miles to the north in 1953, sought \$38 million in compensation for their lost land, which included their hunting grounds.

But Denmark's highest court ruled Friday that it found no reason to increase the total compensation of \$80,645 that the Eastern High Court awarded in 1999 to a group representing the surviving descendants.

"I am disappointed by the Supreme Court's ruling," said Ussaaqqak Qujaukitsoq, a group spokesman who was 4 when his family was moved.

In 1951, Denmark, a member of NATO, signed a defense agreement with the United States to allow four American bases in Greenland, the world's largest island. Greenland is a semiautonomous Danish territory.

Initially, Denmark said the Inuits moved voluntarily, but eventually conceded that the families were forcibly moved.

Associated Press

### **Australia to Join Missile Defense Program**

By Peter O'Connor – 4 December 2003

CANBERRA, Australia - Australia will join a U.S. program to build a missile defense system, the government said Thursday, calling the threat of ballistic missiles too grave to ignore.

Foreign Minister Alexander Downer said several countries are developing ballistic missiles that could carry weapons of mass destruction, and joining the program would help protect Australia.

Joining the program will "allow us to make an important contribution to global and regional security," Downer said in a statement.

Washington hopes that developing a shield against ballistic missiles will protect it against potential threats from countries like North Korea. It wants allies such as Britain, Canada and Australia involved in the project, particularly for the use of satellite tracking stations in their countries.

Australia's decision to join the project was a "long term measure to counter potential threats to Australia's security and its interests from ballistic missile proliferation," Downer said.

Defense Minister Robert Hill said Australia will likely help research the multibillion dollar project and has no plans for a ground-based missile defense system on its own soil. Australia could incorporate missile defense systems into three planned air warfare destroyers for the navy.

"We have given that careful consideration and we think that we can play a part, obviously a small part in terms of the massive overall program," Hill told reporters.

U.S. Ambassador Tom Schieffer welcomed the decision, saying it will make Australia safer.

"We are talking about some terrorist organization or some rogue state launching a missile and trying to wreak havoc in the world," Schieffer said.

Schieffer said the United States was talking to "all our allies about being involved and we hope that they will be, but hopefully there will be some others that will participate."

Canada announced in May this year that it had entered formal talks with Washington about joining the program, but has yet to commit.

Critics says the technology for such shields is complex, unreliable and expensive, and that the plans could spark a new arms race.

Australia has been one of Washington's staunchest allies over the past several years, pledging troops to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and stating clearly that its relationship with the United States is central to nation's long term interest.

Separately Thursday, the new leader of Australia's opposition Labor Party, Mark Latham, met Schieffer to reaffirm the party's commitment to a U.S.-Australian alliance. Early this year, he had described President Bush as "the most incompetent and dangerous president in living memory."

Latham said those comments had been made during "passionate" debate on the Iraq war and it was now time to look to the future. He said he looked forward to a strong relationship with the United States.

"However, our alliance with the U.S. has never meant compliance." Latham said. "From time to time our interests will differ, as they did in Iraq."

## **VERENIGDE NATIES**

### Algemene Vergadering

#### **Stemmingen over resoluties**

8 december 2003

(Zie Facts and Reports nummer 30B voor de tekst van onderstaande resoluties)

A/C.1/58/L.39/Rev.1

Reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons

Sponsors: Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden (New Agenda Coalition)

Voting Result in the General Assembly: yes-128; no-4 (France, Russia, United Kingdom, United States);  
abtain-43 (ao Netherlands, all other NATO member states, India, Israel, Pakistan)

A/C.1/58/L.40/Rev.1

Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: a new agenda

Sponsors: Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden (New Agenda Coalition)

Voting Result in the General Assembly: yes-133 (ao Canada, China); no-6 (France, India, Israel, Pakistan,  
United Kingdom, United States); abstain-38 (ao Netherlands, all other NATO member States, Russia)

### Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

#### **The Shameful U.S. Record in 2003 - Disarmament Votes at the United Nations**

By John Burroughs – 9 December 2003

On December 8, 2003, the United Nations General Assembly voted on this year's resolutions on disarmament and security. The United States consistently voted against the most important resolutions on nuclear and space disarmament:

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: The United States cast the only vote against this resolution calling for bringing the CTBT into force. It was adopted by a vote of 173 to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons: The United States and India were the only countries to vote against this resolution. Sponsored by Japan, it calls for compliance with the program for transparent, verified, and irreversible reduction and elimination of nuclear forces agreed by all states (including the United States) participating in the 2000 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) review conference. It was adopted by a vote of 164 to 2, with 14 abstentions.

New Agenda for a nuclear-weapon-free world: Sponsored by Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden and South Africa, this resolution centers on a call for compliance with the 2000 NPT program and also addresses missile defenses, weaponization of outer space, and reduction of non-strategic weapons. It was adopted by a vote of 128 to 6, with 41 abstentions. The negative votes came from the United States, France, India, Israel, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom.



Obligation of nuclear disarmament: Paragraph one of the resolution on follow-up to the 1996 opinion of the International Court of Justice underlines the Court's unanimous conclusion that there is an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects. In a separate vote, the paragraph was approved by a vote of 165 to 4, with 3 abstentions. The four countries voting no were the United States, France, Israel, and Russia.

Prevention of an arms race in outer space: This resolution calling for negotiations to prevent the weaponization of space was overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 174 to zero. Four countries abstained: the United States, Israel, Micronesia, and the Marshall Islands.

## **NOORD-KOREA**

### Associated Press

#### **N Korea rejects U.S. nuke proposal**

15 December 2003

SEOUL, South Korea (AP) --North Korea has rejected a U.S. proposal to end a nuclear dispute and warned that Washington's "delaying tactics" would only prompt the communist government to step up development of atomic weapons.

The North's main state-run newspaper, Rodong Sinmun, said the U.S. offer, sent to Pyongyang last week, did not meet North Korea's demand for "a package solution based on the principle of simultaneous actions."

North Korea wants a deal that would trade aid and security guarantees for the dismantling of its nuclear program. The United States says North Korea must give up its nuclear weapons first.

"If the U.S. fully accepts the DPRK-proposed simultaneous package solution, though belatedly, the DPRK is ready to respond to it with the elimination of all its nuclear weapons," Rodong said, using the acronym of the North's official name, Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

"But the U.S. in its proposal sent through a channel did not mention the DPRK-proposed simultaneous package solution at all but only asserted that the DPRK should 'scrap nuclear weapons program first,'" Rodong said.

The United States and its allies sent their blueprint for resolving the nuclear dispute to Pyongyang last week. Officials did not divulge details of the plan, but news reports said it broadly seeks the verifiable and irrevocable dismantling of the North's atomic weapons program along with security assurances for Pyongyang.

North Korea last week suggested that it would join six-nation talks on the crisis and freeze its nuclear weapons activities if the United States agreed to remove the North from its list of terrorism-sponsoring countries and provided oil and economic aid. President Bush rejected the idea.

"As the U.S. urges the DPRK to dismantle its nuclear weapons completely, verifiably and irreversibly, the latter has the same right to demand the U.S., the dialogue partner, give it complete, verifiable and irreversible security assurances," Rodong said.

"Its delaying tactics would only result in compelling the DPRK to steadily increase its nuclear deterrent force," it said. North Korea refers to its nuclear program as a "deterrent force."

The United States wants to persuade North Korea to end its nuclear programs through talks involving South Korea, Japan, Russia and China. The first round, held in Beijing in August, ended without much progress.

The United States and its allies had hoped to resume a new round of six-nation talks by the year's end. But as the year draws to a close, officials have backed off that goal and now hope for a second round in mid-January.

On Monday, South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun said his government was committed to resolving the crisis "peacefully through dialogue." He said there were still "active contacts" among the six countries.

In the fall of 2002, U.S. officials said North Korea admitted running a new nuclear weapons program using enriched uranium in violation of international agreements.

Since then, North Korea has said it has restarted its nuclear facilities. It also expelled U.N. nuclear inspectors and quit the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

## **China Outlines Nonproliferation Plans**

By Ted Anthony – 3 December 2003

BEIJING - China revealed in unusual detail Wednesday its methods of preventing dangerous weapons from falling into the wrong hands, outlining its approach to nonproliferation just days before its premier visits Washington.

At the same time, the Beijing government chided the United States' actions to root out such weapons, saying "unilateralism and double standards must be abandoned" - an allusion to pre-emptive U.S. military action in Iraq earlier this year, which China opposed.

The comments, in a "white paper" on nonproliferation, dovetailed with a major theme of the Communist government's foreign policy in recent years, to establish China as a respectable, responsible country that will follow international rules.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, China said, benefit no one - particularly China itself.

"A developing China needs both an international and a peripheral environment of long-term peace and stability," the report said. "The proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery benefits neither world peace and stability nor China's own security."

It said it had made sure an array of procedures and penalties was in place to prevent companies from transferring technology or materials that could be made into chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. "No license, no exports," the report said.

China detailed government agencies responsible for monitoring technology exports that could be used for weapons. The agency-by-agency citations create a higher possibility of accountability in a government notorious for years for its administrative opacity.

The report made no specific mention of North Korea, China's neighbor and Communist ally, which is embroiled in a dispute with the United States over its nuclear program. China has acted as a mediator of sorts in hosting a six-nation meeting to resolve the disagreement, and another could take place later this month.

But, in a clear swipe at the U.S. approach in Iraq, China said many nations must work together through established channels to make sure that prevention of proliferation is "democratic."

"Unilateralism and double standards must be abandoned, and great importance should be attached and full play given to the role of the United Nations," it said.

China opposed the U.S. invasion of Iraq in March and said any punishment of a sovereign nation's leader should go through the U.N. Security Council, where China is a permanent member and wields veto power. The United States cited Saddam Hussein's purported weapons of mass destruction as justification for its military action.

The paper was released days before Premier Wen Jiabao travels to the United States for a meeting with President Bush and other officials from Dec. 7-13.

The United States said it was examining China's export policies as they related to weapons.

"We welcome efforts by China to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, missiles, conventional weapons and related materials and technologies through stricter export control regulations," the U.S. Embassy in Beijing said in a statement.

The white paper apparently sought to assure the international community, and particularly the United States, that China is not exporting missile or other weapons technology and has the apparatus in place to prevent such transfers.

The United States has complained that Chinese military support for Pakistan in the past has included ballistic missiles and help for its nuclear weapons program, charges China denies. Washington has imposed sanctions on several Chinese companies, accusing them of improperly exporting missile-related technologies.

On Wednesday, Pakistani officials said China, Islamabad's main arms supplier, will sell it a second nuclear power plant next year.

China also said it was working to transfer its export controls from its longtime planned-economy approach to one that fits its new "socialist market economy."

That means relying less on administrative procedures from government agencies, which were used when companies were government-owned, and more on laws instituted during recent years to govern the activities of newly private companies that are not run by the government.

## **Sweden to Fund New Blix-Led Weapons Body**

By Patrick McLoughlin - 11 December 2003

STOCKHOLM, Sweden (Reuters) - The Swedish government said Thursday it had decided to finance an independent international commission on weapons of mass destruction to be led by former chief U.N. weapons inspector Hans Blix.

Blix walked a diplomatic tight-rope earlier this year when his searches for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq were evidence central to the U.N. debate on the U.S. case for going to war.

The 75-year-old retired from his U.N. post earlier this year.

Sweden, which had been neutral during the Cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States, criticized the U.S.-led war on Iraq because it did not have United Nations' approval.

Sweden's contribution of 13 million crowns (\$1.76 million) will fund the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission until it reports its findings in 2005.

The body aims to bring a new impetus to international efforts to promote disarmament and nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles that carry them.

"I am convinced that the commission, under the capable leadership of Hans Blix, can help inject new energy into the global efforts aimed against weapons of mass destruction," Swedish Foreign Minister Laila Freivalds said in a statement.

"The existence of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons represent a serious threat to international peace and security and new initiatives are needed in the efforts for disarmament and nonproliferation," she added.

No further details on the commission were released. Blix was not available for comment. The Swedish government said he would name the commission's 14 members and present its work plans at a news conference on Dec. 16.

Blix, who writing a book, entitled "Weapons of Mass Destruction" has continued to be maintain his close contacts with the field.

Sunday he had dinner in Stockholm with Freivalds and the visiting head of the U.N. nuclear watchdog International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mohamed ElBaradei, who has proposed toughening the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Blix told Reuters last month that the new commission would comment on major events of the day concerning weapons of mass destruction, including worries about Iraq's neighbor Iran.

He also said he had doubts that Iran engaged in a civilian energy program aimed at making a nuclear bomb. The United States has long accused Iran of using a civilian nuclear energy program as a front to build a bomb.

Blix told Reuters that his new commission would tap the resources of major international research institutes and be headed by leaders in the field, including a prominent American.