

# **CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

**“ADVANCING THE PROGRESSIVE FOREIGN POLICY  
AGENDA: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE.”**

## **MODERATOR:**

**GAYLE SMITH,  
SENIOR FELLOW,  
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

## **SPEAKERS:**

**THE HONORABLE ROBIN COOK,  
MP, FORMER BRITISH FOREIGN SECRETARY,  
FORMER LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS**

**THE HONORABLE ANTONIO OLIVEIRA GUTERRES,  
FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF PORTUGAL**

**THE HONORABLE POUL NYRUP RASMUSSEN,  
FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF DENMARK**

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30<sup>TH</sup>, 2004**

**Transcript provided by  
DC Transcription & Media Repurposing**

GAYLE SMITH: If you could take your seats, we'll get started in just a couple of minutes. We've got a few more seats up front and there's some seats over on this side if people are looking for places to sit. It's amazing.

Good morning everyone and thank you for joining us. I am Gayle Smith, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress. I am delighted to be here this morning with an esteemed panel of good friends of the Center. I will introduce them. Before I do, let me just say a couple of words about how this panel will run. I will pose a couple of questions to each of our panelists; we will then open up to, first, questions from the press and then questions from any of you. We'll finish at 11:30.

The gentlemen to my right need very little in the way of introduction, but let me go ahead and introduce them. On my far right – and I mean that as a geographic term, not as a political term – (laughter) –

POUL RASMUSSEN: Thank you very much. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: – is Poul Rasmussen from Denmark. He served as the prime minister of the Danish – excuse me, Danish Social Democratic-led government from January, 1993, to November, 2001, and as leader of the Danish Social Democratic Party from April, 1992, to December, 2002.

In the middle we have our friend Antonio Guterres from Portugal. He served as prime minister of Portugal from October, 1995, through April of 2002.

To my immediate right is Robin Cook, currently the MP for Livingston in Great Britain; the former foreign secretary, as you know, of the United Kingdom and leader of the House of Commons.

These gentlemen are joining us here this week along with other colleagues as part of our Global Alliances project, which is a project that the Center for American Progress is involved in which aims at uniting progressives around the world behind the common agenda for global peace and security.

As well, our guests this morning have all been intimately and intensively involved in efforts to bring together progressive viewpoints within Europe. And, Poul, as the current leader of that effort, I would like to start with you. I would ask the three of you to answer an initial question. You may have noticed that we had an election in the United States earlier this month and one of the issues that came up in the discussion before and after the elections was that of values. And I think it would be interesting if you could share with us your views from an international perspective on how values are expressed by the United States and perceived by people outside the United States when it comes to global policy, international affairs, and the quest for peace and security.

And, Poul, if I might start with you and then we'll move right down the row. Thank you.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Thanks a lot, Gayle, and good morning to everyone. I'm having a nice tie this morning as you can see. Let me just show it to you. (Laughter.) Can you see the colors?

It's a signal also today to tell people in Ukraine that we care about them and to tell people in U.S. that we respect that you are across the parties. Can I say that? Across the Democrats and across Republicans, you share the common value that we need freedom, we need democracy, we need security, and we need prospects and prosperity for every human being.

And we intend from the Nordic Scandinavian side and from the European side to insist on that. Negotiations are going on in Ukraine right now in Kiev and, as you know, our common foreign political spokesman, Javier Solana, is really pressing the partners over there to understand that it's serious now; that we will not accept violence in the streets; we will never accept that police or soldiers are sent on the street to fight civilians; that we have to find a democratic, open, and free solution.

Dear audience, I am starting with these few remarks just to underline for you that I think that there has been a sort of misunderstanding – can I say that? – between the Americans and the Europeans. I think that some Americans think that these Europeans are some soft people. Hmm? That when it comes to democracy and freedom we can talk about it another day if it's about fighting for it. Can I say this is a misunderstanding? We don't compromise about freedom, democracy, and security and prosperity for everybody. We don't compromise on these values. These are fundamental for us. We can have in periods of history actually also different tools and different ways of activating these tools and (range of order ?), but that's not – that's not the issue when it comes to the values. We share values.

And that leads me to my fundamental point about what's going on among ordinary people in Europe when it comes to the perception of America and American values. When I was a young boy and received pictures – I'm born in, let me say, 1943 and have seen pictures and of course also my parents told me about the American soldiers coming to Europe and freeing us from tyranny and basically ensuring Europe that we can live in democracy and peace. This is still there. Can I tell you, this is in the soul of Europeans? Don't misunderstand it. It's there.

And therefore the perception of America is that we belong together and the worst thing that could happen for the moment would be that those who are in power right now in U.S. believe that they can avoid or they can manage without Europe. Can I say they can't, and Europe cannot manage without America. We have a shared destiny. We've had it in the past and we're going to have it in the future.

Let me just make three arguments for that shared destiny. Point number one: it's about economics, stupid. Can I say that without – someone, perhaps everybody has remarked it, we are in Europe from the first of May this year the largest economy in the world. The single market consists now of 25 free, democratic countries. The potential buying power is the biggest in the world. The production level is the biggest in the world. We are a very, very strong partner to United States – American economy.

On the other side, we have an American economy and we have an exchange rate between the dollar and the euro which are in a very dangerous position and we need to go together to solve this to the benefit of American citizens and European ones.

Second point is we are going to decide, dear colleagues and friends, that in a very few months we are implementing our rapid reaction force from European side. We are making a rapid reaction military force. We do intend to take upon us responsibility when it comes to Africa. Together with the African Union, the newborn thing if I can underline that, and we are together in Afghanistan and we are dealing with Iran and I think that the new approach to Iran is a good example that we have to try these tools and beforehand – before we go to the military approach.

I cannot guarantee you that this agreement with Iran will be respected in all details. I cannot guarantee you, but I can guarantee you that it's a wise try and that in the case of success we have a good learning lesson here. We have made more or less also a kind of agreement with Russia which shows the way Europeans think. If you take the Putin (assignment ?) of the Kyoto protocol, to tell you the truth this is not because Mr. Putin became an environmental militant or idealist; it's because he understood the language of power – because we said Russia belongs to the World Trade Organization, but Russia also belongs to an environmental world, and that was a part of the deal.

My point? Within those common values we have, and Europeans really respect Americans for insisting on these values, we may have from time to time different instruments we want to bring into force, but that should not disturb us. That should not be a misled signal to us that we have to go apart now. We belong to the same main road. We have the same co-responsibility for ensuring a better world, and we add that the only thing that the Europeans now are questioning – can I say that? – that is whether we will see in the next four years an American administration going on her own or an American administration sharing the fights, sharing dreams, sharing diplomacy, economic progress, cooperation with Europe.

Those who says in the U.S. that they can deal without Europe and referring to Russia or referring to India or referring to China – can I say this is not an either/or, but at least you cannot just say let's deal with the others and let's avoid the Europeans. Two examples: it's about economics once more. If you look at the Russian economy, it's of a size corresponding to the Netherlands right now and, yes, it's true that the Chinese and Indian economy is growing, but still – and if you look at the potential common interest, again here we share destiny. We share values, we share destiny, and we have point by point to use our tools which we have given before us in a wise way.

I think we can make progress when it comes to trade agreements, and I really, really – (unintelligible) – to you that the new elected commissioner of the European Union, which you know, when he comes to the U.S. to deal with the matters we disagree upon in trade, let's solve the problems as we have done in the past.

Secondly – that's my last remark – I cannot imagine that we can found a solution in the Middle East without doing it together. It's simply impossible. Even with the highest ambition level in the White House, the president cannot do it without the Europeans and the Europeans cannot do it without U.S.

And this is my final message to America: we can in the next four years, if we cooperate closely together, we can solve the very basis – the very root causes of terrorism by creating two independent states: an independent Palestinian one living in peace with the Israeli and guaranteed state. If we do that, we have perhaps within this short period implemented the essence of our common values.

Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Poul.

(Applause.)

Antonio?

ANTONIO GUTERRES: Well, I'm an engineer, but I have a very good friend that is a psychoanalyst and he always tells me that when two people meet, there are six people involved. What each of them is, what each of them thinks he is, and what each of one thinks the other is. And I think the same applies also to communities, to countries, to people in different parts of the world.

Of course, the American society is a very complex society. There are very different visions about America and about the role of the United States – very different values shared by different kinds of people. The same applies to Europe, to Africa, to any other continent. But if we look at what seems to be the winning view in the United States after the last elections and the winning view, for instance, in Europe taking into consideration what the average European public opinion is, I think it is rather easy to try to make a picture of these six entities.

It is clear from my point of view that in this winning view, the United States feels itself as the country that is struggling for democracy and for human rights everywhere, fighting for terrorism, facing the threats of today's world, and that Europeans tend to be soft and unable to assert themselves and having the hands tied in a kind of ineffective multilateralism that doesn't allow to take decisions and to act quickly.

And I think that from the average European and not only European, also I think the same applies to other continents in Africa, Latin America, even in Asia – average public opinion view there is the idea that we have a balanced view about what the threats to today's world are, both traditional security problems with the social, economic, and environmental problems and the mix that they make, and the need to a global response to those problems and we tend to look at the winning view in the United States as a view of domination and as a view of unilateralism to pursue the American interests, not the American values.

Well, these are four perceptions. Of course then there is the reality of the two countries that is quite complex, or the two sides. It is quite complex in my opinion. Now, it really doesn't matter to make an analysis if you don't try to do something to overcome this dysfunction between these six entities and try to bring them together and make two able to cooperate between themselves.

And what I think is essential today is to approach our common perception on what are the threats to the world in which we live and to approach our common perceptions on how to face these threats. And I would say that it is clear that there is a strong security threat in the strict point of view – terrorism, proliferation, weapons of mass destruction – and we have to face it and to face it efficiently. But it is also true that this is not the only threat we face. Climate change is probably more dangerous than this threat. The questions related to poverty. The questions related to – (unintelligible) – are extremely dangerous too, and everything is interrelated and the answer must be global and must face all these questions. We have to face the terror and the roots of terror with the same intensity if I want to simplify this rather complex vision.

And I do believe it's possible with common sense. Common sense is not a value, but it's a very important thing in life and if you have common sense I think it's very important to try to bring closer the perception about what the threats are, not to be soft at all against terror, weapons of mass destruction, proliferation, but recognizing the need to give an answer that takes into consideration the problems coming from the economic, social, and environmental imbalances in today's world.

And then I think it is obvious that unilateralism is not a solution for today's problems. No country is powerful enough to solve all problems by itself, but ineffective multilateralism is also not the solution. And in a certain way, the system we have today – the system formed after the Second World War – has many flaws and I think that we have to recognize those flaws. So the task we have is how to be able to shape an effective multilateralism able to deal with the threats and able to put together international community intervening whenever necessary to make sure that those threats do not translate into realities affecting our lives.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Antonio.

(Applause.)

Robin, if I could turn to you?

ROBIN COOK: Well, I think you just heard two very good tours of the horizon and I feel very humble by comparison and I have very little to add by way of a footnote and nothing to subtract to what has been said already.

I think the first thing to stress is that both Europe and the United States have an enormous number of values in common, and the key ones we all share. Democracy. And I think we should approach the debates around the world on democracy with a degree of confidence because what has been the most marked feature in this – during my lifetime is the tremendous growth in democracy and the number of countries that emerged from dictatorship and from tyranny into different forms of mass pluralist participation; notably, in the case of Europe, the way in which we have seen the map of Central and Eastern Europe transformed by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the new democracies.

We also have human rights in common and the United States has got a lot to be proud of in the way has championed human rights during eras in which we have not perhaps seen voices raised as universally as they now are. And we all signed up in 1948 to the Universal Charter of Human Rights. We must make sure that that Universal Charter is not simply there as a statement of rights, but as a campaigning tool to make sure those rights are honored.

And lastly, the rule of law we have in common as the basis of our societies. We all recognize that if people are to be free, are to be treated equally, they must have equal rights before the law and that we must make sure in our societies that we do not end up in any situation in which might is seen as right and powerful has more rights than those who are not powerful.

In the modern world we live in, we must make sure that those same principles of rule of law apply in our international relations. Now, that is tough and it's difficult; it's challenging. It will be painstaking. But it is one in which we must succeed if we are going to have an ordered and secure international community that matches the new global reality of an interdependent, interconnected world.

And here I just want to stress what I think is the compelling international dimension to our discussion, and that is that the world is shrinking in terms of communication, in terms of contact, in terms of mobility. The youngest person in this room has seen a faster growth in international trade in their lifetime than the entire growth between the Industrial Revolution and the Second World War. The pace of integration is enormous and accelerating and we need ourselves to try and rise above simply looking at the world through a national prism and look at it as members of an international community, recognizing that interdependence is now as important a concept as independence.

Now, you touched lightly here on our anxieties for the next four years. I think the point we want to say is that our anxiety does not relate to any difference in values. I think the values, as I have outlined, are common between us. Where there may be a concern on the European side is on issues of process. How do we approach making sure those values are spread and those values embedded? And as Antonio said, the best way to do it is not through a unilateralist approach, but to do it multilaterally, to do it together, to work together. And I think what we would want to hope for from the United States is that it brings its immense power and its immense leadership to work with others in achieving those values.

You cannot understate the significance of the United States in the world today. It's a quarter of the world's GDP. It's approaching half the world's entire military expenditure. It is a very substantial player on the world scene. We cannot – it's a simple statement of fact – succeed in any of our objectives without the United States being our partner and we want the United States to be a partner.

If I can just then conclude, Gayle, by looking at three issues where we need to work together to find a common way forward. The first of those – and I actually personally think strategically the most powerful, the most threatening, the most worrying – is how we handle climate change. It doesn't have to be through the Kyoto protocol, but we do have to find a way in which the United States is comfortable in working with us in halting a change to our environment, which even as we speak is causing enormous upheavals in those countries that are the victims of excessive flood, excessive drought, both extreme unpredictable results of the global climate change and which is causing far more loss of life than any other single factor in the world at the present time.

Secondly, we all signed up five years ago to the Millennium Goals. Next year there will be a review in the General Assembly of the Millennium Goals. We have no hope of meeting those Millennium Goals unless we work together and we all make a contribution to it. But tackling poverty, tackling the deprivation in the backstreets of so many of the countries of the third world is vital if we are going to drain the swamps of poverty in which fundamentalism takes root and which in turn becomes breeding grounds for terrorism.

And lastly, on a shorter time scale than that, this week we will get the report of the high level group and to the reform and the future of the United Nations. The United Nations is not some sort of 192<sup>nd</sup> country over there; something we found on the globe as you roll out the atlas. And the United Nations is us. The United Nations is the member states of the United Nations and if we're going to succeed in reforming and modernizing it, all of us – including the most powerful nation, the United States – need to be part of that process. And therefore I would hope that when that report comes out on Friday, whatever our individual concerns about it – and each one of us in this room could write an addendum to it to improve it – it is much more important that we take it together as a consensus statement and try and work together to make it succeed because you cannot have a rule of law governing international affairs if you do not have a respected institution providing the multilateral forum to decide the rules.



(Applause.)

MS. SMITH: Thank you all very much. I think you've very eloquently articulated the foundation of common values between the United States and Europe and particularly democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and the quest for peace and security, and I think laid out the fact that what we face today is as much an opportunity as it is a challenge to figure out how the United States and our European friends work together in pursuit of these values.

If I may, I would like to forward each of you a specific question and then we will open it up. And if I can again start with Poul, you spoke very eloquently about relations between the U.S. and Europe and some of the developments and initiatives that the EU has taken. As you know, President Bush will be traveling to Europe in February. This is something the administration has made clear he would do very promptly after his reelection. And I'm wondering if you could comment from your perspective on what the most important and immediate issues might be for that upcoming summit, particularly in light of the fact that many here I think have the perception that there has been a rift, if you will, between the U.S. and the EU. And I think most of us are hopeful that that can be repaired so that indeed we can pursue the common agenda that the three of you have outlined.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Yes, it's true, Gayle, that President Bush is coming to Europe and I think he's visiting the European parliament in Strasbourg in February I guess. And I'm a member of the European Parliament, so we'll make a good plenification (ph) for having a good meeting with President Bush.

Now, are you asking whether I should focus upon things I think would be possible or things I would like to see as realized? (Laughter.) Well, let me start with the first one. Even if I try – and I'm really good at that – even if I try to look upon things from the new elected president's side – President Bush's side – I would argue for four major issues upon which Europe and U.S. could cooperate. The first is about security and combating terrorism. And again I come back to my major issue: I think the Middle East – I think creation of two independent states – I think the solution on the territory question and creating new basic living conditions for the Palestinians is number one of several reasons.

Also the reason that after Yasser Arafat, we are in the new situation and it does create momentum, which we should not underestimate. And of the simple fact that in the two camps – in the Israeli one and in the Palestinian ones – there are really a readiness (of momentum ?). I've been there. I've talked with both of them. I can feel and I am sure that they will do a real effort, but they can't do it alone. They need us both. And that would be my point number one.

We have a roadmap. We have strong, strong, strong allies together with us. We have Russia. We have the United Nations. We have Europe. We have the United States.

I mean, this is an impressive coalition which we should take point of. But the fundamental actors are those.

The second issue is something which really, really goes to the heart of all hardworking American families and hardworking European families; that is, trade and outsourcing and out – and offshoring of jobs. It did play a role during the presidency campaign over here, and I can assure you that also in Europe it does play a very, very strong role. People are worried. Can my son or daughter manage in the future? Will I have a job in five year's term? Do I qualify to the new jobs they are talking about? There's a whole set of issues here where I feel that jobs, jobs, jobs, and the way we tackle the globalization and outsourcing and offshoring is important.

And here I would remark that the new administration is open to new trade negotiations, but I would add one thing: I think it's time to add that those workers out there in China, in India, who receive the old jobs in one way or another upon which we cannot compete anymore because their prices and costs and salaries are lower than ours. We have to think in a way which ensures that these workers out there are getting something out of it. What I'm thinking that if you take the textile, dear friends, and if you look at the textile outsourcing and offshoring to India, you will see Indian workers – (unintelligible) – workers running around in deadly, dangerous pools filled with stuff and things and chemicals which pollute them in 50 times as much as acceptable according to international standards.

I'm not talking about lifting the whole world globally to ensure workers' rights. I'm only talking about doing something, and what I'm thinking about is that the ILO – International Labor Organization's core values. As you know, an organization within the United Nation's parachute, but a very important one. Talking about the right to organize yourself. Talking about the right to have some protection. Talking about the right to say no to child slavery and slavery works and these fundamentals. Why couldn't we combat?

Third point would be the Millennium Goals in Africa. We have, then, decided in Europe that Africa during the British presidency will have major importance and I really hope that here about Africa U.S. and we could meet. I know that across, again, the political spectrum, in the Democrats, among the Republicans in the administration we can make things together.

That's not only a question about AIDS/HIV; it is very important and we certainly engage, but it's much wider than that. Economic cooperation take off in real income-generating jobs in Africa. You should be aware, colleagues, that the African Union newborn now is a big, big progress. Did you know, for instance, that in the African Union – it's not older than a few months – here is a new high court unto which ordinary African citizens can make complaints and have tested their case if human rights are not respected? We've never had that before. Yes, it's on paper. Yes – and yes, it's not realized in real terms yet, but it's a political platform which U.S. and Europe have to support and strengthen.

Last point is a very fundamental question to the United States of America. U.S. is the strongest and biggest and most (paying ?) member of the United Nations. In a short while, there will be presented with a report from United Nations about strengthening the United Nations. The U.S. should make its choice now. You are the strongest one. You should decide either whether you would see United Nations as a old-fashioned body. It's there, but it will not any longer play the same role as it did in the past. Or you together with us could decide in common interest to make UN – United Nations – a stronger body.

Posing all the strong questions and respecting all the strong consequences, but in essence documenting through a newborn United Nations in a very pragmatic way that we – U.S. and Europe – share a common view on strengthening international law and strengthening United Nations. I think these are the four points I think, Gayle, and hope that we could make progress on and if President Bush would touch upon these four items and signalize when he comes to Europe that these items whose in the new administration's four-years' period working program, well, some Europeans may be astonished – also in France. (Laughter.) But I think we could live with that and it would be an enormous momentum and that would be my humble advice to the present administration.

Thank you very much.

MS. SMITH: Thank you very much. I think that's a very good agenda and I hope someone took detailed notes, but I think that would be spectacular.

Antonio, if I could turn to you, you talked about rendering a diverse perception of threats towards a more common perception of threats and significantly said that we need to figure out how to take a flawed system, by which I imagine you mean in part the United Nations, and transform it into a tool for effective multilateralism.

Now, as I'm sure you're aware, in this country I think there is some increasing skepticism about the merits of multilateralism, about the abilities of the United Nations, and I wonder with the high level panel's report coming out on Friday as several of you have referenced, and therefore the opportunity and the challenge to really reform the UN, if you could comment on whether UN reform is really feasible and why, in fact, to people who may be skeptical about the merits of multilateralism and see it as a weakness rather than as a strength that this is an objective we should really pursue together?

MR. GUTERRES: Well, difficult question. I start to answer your question, and then if you will allow me I'll make some complementary remarks which I think that need to go along with those issues.

MS. SMITH: Sure.

MR. GUTERRES: First, if one looks at what we need to reach at the global level to be effective in pursuing the objective of guaranteeing our own security in this broad sense, I would say that the first thing that we need today is a common definition on

terrorism. The European Union has a common definition on terrorism. I hope the panel will come with a common definition on terrorism and that all United Nations' countries will be bound by that common definition on terrorism and that the global strategy against terrorism can be defined. And one of the major tasks of today's world is to rebuild the coalition against terror that in my opinion was broken with the war in Iraq. Rebuild that coalition and to make it effective is absolutely crucial because terrorism is something we can only fight as a global phenomenon. We have not any longer national terrorism, or we have, but they are not so relevant. It's a global phenomenon. It must be fought globally with a common definition and a common strategy.

The second point is the strengthening and revitalization of the nonproliferation system. I think – I hope to see movement in order to reduce the flaws of the Nonproliferation Treaty in Nuclear Arms. I would very much support the idea of a global moratorium on uranium enrichment in the countries that do not do yet that kind of thing to reduce those flaws. It seems to be a very important key issue I'd like to see the panel address. And to strengthen the capacities of the international community to monitor and to act regarding fissile materials for instance, and the same of course – we have not time – should be said about biological, chemical weapons – the instruments needed for that, bombs, and things of the sort, but to strengthen and revitalize the nonproliferation system is crucial in my point of view in the present moment.

And third is to define clearly the criteria for intervention of the international community both in the so-called responsibility to protect, meaning the combination of the sovereignty of the state with the sovereignty of the human being when states are not able to guarantee the protection of their own citizens, and we have that in civil wars, we have that in failed states, we have that in those different kinds of situations. The need for the international community to intervene to assume these responsibilities to protect, that was supposed to be part of the sovereignty of the state, and also the duty to prevent in circumstances where there is a real threat to world peace – basically, for instance, based on the weapons of mass destruction and the risk of it to be used in a dangerous way.

Now, there was a very important report by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty that was promoted by the Canadian government. I fully agree with their conclusions. I think they define a set of criteria for the responsibility to protect. Gareth Evans, one of the co-presidents, made recently in Oxford a speech in which he tried to translate those principles to the so-called duty to prevent. I would very much like to see those criteria embodied in the doctrine of the United Nations and the Security Council because today, as a matter of fact, in many circumstances what we have in the decisions of the Security Council is an arbitrary decision of the different countries based on their national interests. I'd like to see it clearly stated as criteria in which an intervention, even when made impossible by the incapacity of the Security Council to decide, would at least be clear. It would be global public opinion where legitimacy is.

I have no doubt – let's make a comparison. In Kosovo, I'm fully convinced that there was not a legal instrument to intervene. I have no doubts about the legitimacy to

intervene. In Iraq, it is for me obvious that there was not a legal instrument to intervene and it's quite clear for me there was not a legitimacy to intervene. And those two things are relevant and those two things are important and the only way to judge them is based on criteria established by international community and agreed by all. And I hope the report will come with a proposal of these criteria.

And to create instruments to support peace-building, state-building, or nation-building – whatever you want to call it – it's necessary to put the UN system together with the Bretton Woods institutions together with other different international organizations helping not only to solve the problems of countries that have faced problems and that have peacekeeping interventions, but even a preventive action – both diplomatic, economic, political – in order to avoid these kinds of situations emerge in the future. It's always cheaper and easier and the cost in human lives is much smaller if you do it before than after.

But for all these to be credible – and here I wouldn't like to speak as a European but as someone that tries to see the scenes from a global perspective. If you look at the large majority of humanity, the large majority of humanity is not in Europe, is not in the United States, is not in Japan. It is in the South, and for them the international community has not delivered. There are crucial scenes in which this delivery is absolutely essential. The Doha round of negotiation was supposed to be a development round. That means that 2005 must be the year in which we reach an agreement. But let's be clear: to reach an agreement, both Europe and the United States are the bad guys that have not been able to accept changes in their farm subsidies, for instance, to allow for an agreement – a balanced agreement to be possible. We cannot accuse China of social dumping if we have our own agricultural dumping. If we want a global deal, we must be fair. Free trade has to be fair trade.

I'm very much concerned with the problems Poul related, but let's see things from both sides and try to find a common way. And the same could be said about intellectual property rights that's acting in a very unbalanced way between North and South. And the same can be said about the way to dismantle tariffs, which is now – the demands are much more radical facing the South than facing the North. So we really need to make concessions for this agreement to be possible.

And the same to other areas, which are crucial for what Poul said about the Millennium Development Goals, the Doha round of negotiations, the Monterrey Consensus on finance and development, and the Johannesburg summit. (What is that ?) to the poorest countries? The poorest countries have been submitted in the last few years to the mixture of the so-called Highly (sic) Indebted Poor Countries Initiative to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, which represent the most hard form of conditionality ever imposed by the Bretton Woods system to any country. It's too complicated, too slow, and too difficult, and of course we need to do something, and I do believe the British presidency of the G8 will be a good opportunity to look at the cancellation of debt of the poorest countries as an effective instrument.

And I'd like to underline what Poul said about Africa. Africa is a priority for the world community. In the *Financial Times*, which is not supposed to be a very left-wing newspaper, last week an article about Ghana. Ghana is supposed to be the dream country of the international institutions. For the last 20 years they have been wonderful people, making everything that was told to them as the right strategy to reach development. And the analysis – I will read the *Financial Times*:

By this criteria, Ghana should be a model. It has had ethnic clashes but nothing to compare to the conflicts that have ravaged the countries to its west: Ivory Coast, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. Its government is one of the best in Africa. It was the first volunteer for NEPAD's innovative peer review process in which a country's political and economic governance is vetted by teams from other countries. It has strong institutions, respect for the rule of law, and a free press. Its government is at least nominally committed to private enterprise. Along with most African countries, it makes use of both U.S. and European preferential trade arrangements, although it is not poor enough to get the maximum EU concessions.

It has just qualified for debt relief, roughly halving its outstanding debt. Well, with all these conditions, the fact is that Ghana has not been able to get out of the trap of poverty to get to really manage to have a development process to solve the problems of extreme poverty in its country. So if, as it says, the country that has been a model people as far as market reforms are concerned, but the policies it has formed have not taken it up to the next level of growth, which means something really relevant must be done by the international community to help Africa. Build upon what the Africans are doing by themselves, but understanding that the present level of support is not enough.

Just to give you an example, my country, Portugal, received in 2003 from the European Union, within the scope of the Structural and Cohesion Funds, more money than the whole of the African continent received from the European Union in (public aid ?) to its development. So we have to be serious when we speak about these issues. If you go on doing small actions, trying to, in a sense, appease our conscience with some nice gestures, we won't deliver. And if we don't deliver, solving so dramatic problems as the ones – the political problems of the Middle East or the exclusion, poverty, and disease problems in Africa, we will not create a safe world even if we spend all the money we can against terrorism or in nonproliferation or fighting whatever kind of military threat we face wherever in the world. If we don't combine these two approaches, we will fail.

And I think it's very important for us to take the opportunity of the next presidency of the G8 and the European Union by Britain to try to put these two things together and to move in the right direction.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Antonio. As somebody who has spent 20 years of my life in Africa, I cannot tell you how delightful it is to hear men of your stature put Africa at the top of the priority list. I think it's where it needs to be and I think, significantly,

you have underscored that while there is a security imperative, there is also a moral imperative and a fundamental need for fairness and I think that's something we need to bear in mind across the broad range of policies we're discussing.

If I could throw the last question to Robin with the caveat that you're free to divert in any direction you would like, and that is in this country – and I think this is true in many countries around the world – nothing has more dramatically defined international relations or foreign policy over the last three or four years than has the events of September 11<sup>th</sup> and the war on terrorism. And as we face, in a world that I think you all have described very effectively, a long-term struggle against extremism and an ideology based on exclusion rather than cooperation, I think the challenges are enormous and growing and I think it's critical that we take into account the points that Antonio just made. But I wonder if you could, from your perspective, give us a bit of a diagnosis or reflection on how you think we're doing and where, in fact, we need to do better if indeed we are to prevail.

MR. COOK: You were kind enough, Gayle, to invite me to divert, so –

MS. SMITH: Yes; you outrank me significantly.

MR. COOK: Can I just begin by responding to part of the question you put to Antonio? Antonio will not mind; he is not possessive about the question that was put to him.

MR. GUTERRES: No.

(Cross talk.)

MS. SMITH: International cooperation in action.

(Cross talk.)

MR. GUTERRES: And the oldest alliance in the world. (Laughter.)

MR. COOK: Absolutely. Very good – fifteenth century.

And I do fear that there is a danger here, Gayle, that we are illustrating one of the fundamental differences between American and European politics in that we do talk an awful lot longer. (Laughter.) It is not for nothing that our parliaments are called from the French word *parlez*, meaning to talk.

You asked Antonio about whether multilateralism really is important, or is crucial, and my answer to that is if you were to lay out the kind of issues that we have discussed on this platform in the last hour as serious challenges to the world, they are proliferation of weapons technology, the threat of international terrorism, the dramatic and worrying changes of the climate. All those are international phenomenon which

cannot possibly be resolved by unilateral action by any one state, however powerful. They are all major challenges to each and every one of us, but they can only be resolved if we work together to find the common solution.

But turning to the question you put to me about terrorism, I would say that if we want to successfully defeat terrorism, then you need to have powerful, strong, dynamic cooperation between nations on all the common issues we need to address, like sharing intelligence, making sure that we track the money laundering, making sure also we track the movement of the terrorists and those who are suspect. And if you are going to do that – if you're going to do that successfully, you need to have a healthy international community, you need strong international institutions, and you need an agreed respect for the rule of law in international relations. In other words, if you are going to succeed in preventing the terrorists and defeating the terrorists, then you do have to have an enormous degree of international cooperation.

And I would just here strongly second what Antonio said about the global coalition that sprang into being after 9/11. You should not underrate the massive degree of sympathy and sense of common grief with America after 9/11. The *Le Monde*, the day after, ran as its front-page headline, "We are all Americans now." And I was impressed, as a foreign minister, the countries then who were willing to sign up to a global coalition against terrorism, embracing the third world and the Muslim world, embracing also the countries which sometimes are difficult to get on board, like China and Russia. NATO declared 9/11 as an attack on a member of NATO and invoked Article VI in self defense – the first time we ever invoked Article VI in the entire history of NATO.

And I do hear Antonio's regret that rather than building on the consensus, the common ground that was there in that global coalition, we have diverted energy and effort into a project, particularly in Iraq, which has not had that consensus, and has resulted in the global coalition not having the dynamism, the force, the energy it otherwise might have.

Well, if we are to beat the terrorists, it is very important that we make the terrorists themselves marginalized. In Britain we had a long period of terrorism related to the troubles in Northern Ireland. There was a spell in the 1970s in which those of us in London, as I was during the week as a member of Parliament, would never see a week go by without some bomb atrocity taking place in London associated with the terrorist activities from Northern Ireland.

We have achieved a position of stability. We've not yet got the position of a final and just peace, but we have achieved a position of stability and a ceasefire by pursuing a strategy of reaching out to the rest of the population and making the terrorists themselves feel that if they wanted to gain any kind of tolerance from their community, they had to be seen to be working for peace. They were marginalized within their own community.

If we want to marginalize the current threat of international terrorism, then we have got to address those issues that their host population regard as legitimate grievances.



And here I bring up what has already been said by Poul on the Middle East peace process. Do not underrate the immense sense of grievance across the Arab world at what they perceive as the double standards of a West that insists on the last paragraph of every resolution on Iraq, even to the point of committing a quarter of a million fighting men to invasion, but then turns a blind eye to the resolutions that exist requiring Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories and to withdraw its settlements. There is no single issue that is a bigger barrier between the West and the Arab world than the fact that we appear uncommitted to carrying out U.N. commitments on the Middle East and are not making progress to address what are perceived as the legitimate grievances of the Palestinian people. If you want to marginalize the terrorists, then you have to deprive them of the propaganda on which they feed.

I think the second thing I would then stress is that we also have to recognize that we are engaged here not just in the search for a military solution; we are engaged also in a war of ideas. Islam is an enormously varied, diverse religion with a large number of traditions and trends within it. It is in our interest that those are the trends from the Sufi spiritualists, from the Tohan (ph) Ismaili school, the scholarly school that was associated with many of the traditional Arab centers of learning. It is in our interest that those become and remain dominant within the world of Islam.

It is not in our interest that the Wahhabi militant, aggressive fundamentalist version of Islam becomes dominant in the overall community, and it is unfortunate for us that the Wahhabi's home is in Saudi Arabia where there's a large amount of money to be raised in order to proselytize and act as missionaries for that particularly militant impression of Islam.

I sometimes worry that the way we have behaved in the last two or three years has cut the ground from under the feet of those within the world of Islam who would want to argue for the more tolerant, spiritualist, scholarly approach to Islam and to other communities.

Osama bin Laden desperately wants to convince the Arab and Muslim world that the only possible relationship between the West and Islam is one of violent confrontation. We'll never convince Osama bin Laden to adopt any other approach so there is no point in even contemplating it, but we can convince the great mass of Muslims that he's wrong, that it's a poisonous message, that we want to live in peace and tolerance and respect for the Muslim world and have common ground with them.

I think the really important project for us if we want to beat terrorism is to make sure that over the next decade we pursue what the Arabs describe as mustarrat (ph), the common ground, finding where it is that we can show respect for each other's great cultures, tolerance for each other's diversity, and cooperate together on those areas where we can work together and it's in our interest to work together on common security, perhaps most of all on common prosperity to tackle the problems of poverty.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. You may speak at length but it's entirely worth listening.

MR. COOK: That's another difference: Americans are so much more polite than we are. (Laughter.)

MS. SMITH: On that note, I would like to thank all of our panelists, and I think you can see why it's been so important to us at the Center for American Progress to be able to work with these and other colleagues on this Global Alliances project, which, by way of commercial, there's more information about the Global Alliances project on our website, AmericanProgress.org. We've issued a report on nonproliferation; we will have other reports forthcoming.

I'd now like to open up to questions. I'd like to, if I may, if there are members of the press who may need to move quickly, start with them. I see a hand way in the back that at least is pretending it's press – if you'd like to go ahead.

Q: I'm not pretending; I really am. (Laughter.)

MS. SMITH: If you could identify yourself and please stand.

Q: Sure, I'm Barry Schweid of Associated Press. Your overarching description of unilateralism existing in the United States – I was wondering if you gentlemen – you are all described, or at least the organization is described, as progressive. I wondered if you would tell us whether you think this is a temporary condition. I mean, you've been careful – although I guess none of you is in office now – you've been careful not to throw any bombs at the White House directly, but do you think this is a temporary attitude, a temporary stance, a temporary – and of course, you don't like the attitude – or do you think it goes deeper than that and it's become part of the American fabric to see Europe as somehow a problem, a nuisance, not getting enough attention?

I would go on to the Middle East but I would restrain myself. Why you all take the same position and why you think that – you don't seem to credit the administration with trying to bring about a Palestinian state, which apparently you all hold extremely dearly.

MS. SMITH: Okay, so two questions there. The first one, is this temporary or long-term? We'll be most interested in your answers.

Go ahead.

MR. COOK: First of all, just very briefly on the Palestinian question. I mean, we're all agreed on the case for an independent Palestinian state. I think one of the points that has always got to be stressed and is always there in the European statements, notably in the statements by Tony Blair on this, it has to be a viable independent Palestinian state.

In other words, it has to have a respectful amount of contiguous territory in which it can achieve a viable independent state.

On the particular point you raise, I think there is no doubt that the policies pursued by elements within the Bush administration regarding it as important for the United States to adopt a unilateral approach to the international community and to resist international agreements is a breach from a longstanding, honorable tradition of American administrations of the past. I mean, America has done an enormous amount over history to create the very multilateral bodies we've been talking about. I mean, NATO would not exist if it had not been for the United States. The United States has been the prime moving hand within NATO. The United States was one of the main countries that pressed for the creation of the United Nations, took part in the foundation of the United Nations, provided the host for the territory of the United Nations within New York.

There's a long tradition of American presidents wanting to work with allies and build alliances and I think it's very important that we maintain the fact that having alliances is a sign of diplomatic strength. It must never become perceived as an indication of a military weakness.

Now, whether there will be a reversion to that long tradition at some point in the future, I suppose not to put too fine a point on it, four years from now, I could not predict, but I am encouraged that actually when you look at the opinion polls and the attitudes of the American public, there is still a very powerful sense there that they do want to be part of a wider world, don't like the idea of going it alone, and in particular, in cases like Iraq, did want to have – it really surprised some outsiders – the opinion polls were always quite clear they wanted to have a UN agreement in Iraq and they certainly wanted to have Britain's participation in what happened in Iraq.

MS. SMITH: If I may, with your permission, just stop there and take a few more questions and I'll try to spread them out among the panel.

Here in the front, please?

Q: Yes, Nick Berry, Foreign Policy Forum. You spoke about cooperation with the United States, but doesn't it appear that the European Union is really conducting a containment policy – a containment of the United States, what you see as negative foreign policies of Bush? Cases in point: not bailing out the United States in Iraq, which is draining U.S. resources; the sanctions over the Byrd Amendment; trying to deter the United States on Iran over making a deal with Iran on its nuclear program. We could go on – removing the arms embargo on China, the Boeing-Airbus conflict.

And isn't this because Bush recognizes European opposition? Isn't this therefore just feeding American unilateralism as a (remedy ?)?

MS. SMITH: Thank you. That's a good question. If I may ask, Poul, do you want to take a stab at that?

MR. RASMUSSEN: I can easily understand your sort of having this thinking as a basis for your question. Let me just say about the last point you mentioned about weapons embargo as far as China is concerned. I don't know if you know that or are aware of it, but in the European Parliament there's a very strong majority against, so there's a very strong majority, which I support myself and my party, too, to ensure that the arms embargo is still there. So, again, it is like U.S., you know. Europe is not just only one picture or one voice; there are many. And I think this one of the instances to try to understand each other.

Then let me come straight to your point. I don't look at it as a European effort of containment policy vis-à-vis the United States. I see it in the following way, and this is also part of the answer to the other gentleman's question. Let me mention why I think that the unilateralism is a temporary condition. May I just argue two sets of arguments?

The one is from European side. I think it's a temporary condition because Europe will realize its rapid reaction force, because Europe will engage in Africa together with U.S., because Europe would strengthen its foreign voices not only on trade, but also on foreign relations, because Europe you could say will now live up to its implementation of antiterrorism in practice. Because you're right in implicating that we are lagging behind in the implementation of sharing intelligence, of sharing police cooperation in effective combating terrorism in Europe together with you. And lastly, that our neighbor policy – regional policy will develop in the coming years very, very forcefully.

Of these four reasons, I think that any American administration will understand that this is not a containment policy. This is a really strong effort from European side to share (values ?) with you, but also to develop our own tools as a contribution to our common efforts.

The last point – let me come back to that – is about economics. Again, I'm sorry, as an old economist from one of the universities in Europe and a prime minister being – (telephone ringing in background) – now they are calling me to create my new government, but I say no. (Laughter.) But let me just finalize my point about economics. Let's be honest against each other. I don't think we can be honest with the risk of going apart. We don't need to do that. I mean, even if America was in its best shape as far as economics is concerned, it would not be capable of making a new war of the kind that we have in Iraq for the simple reason that the cost would be so high in human resources and in economic resources. You've seen it.

I mean, I respect 100 percent the homeland security construction and building up of this administration. I felt the effects of it yesterday when I passed your control when I flew into the Dulles airport. I can assure you being prime minister in Denmark former term doesn't matter. "What are you doing here, sir?"

“Yes, I’m having a business –”

“What type of business conference, sir?”

“Yes, it’s about international relations.”

“Sir, you have to answer quickly and directly to my questions. What sort of conference?”

“It’s about politics.”

“Why didn’t you tell me that beforehand, sir?”

So don’t come and say that you’re not precise in your control. I respect that. But I can also see, dear friends, that U.S. is in a temporary case in investing enormous resources in this area here. What we want to say – what I want to say is why don’t we make this common agenda now? We will combat terrorism in all its shapes, but we will also combat the root causes of terrorism – Middle East.

And one thing more: trying to establish a sort of new economic development combined with democracy and freedom with the Arab world which – (unintelligible). Can I just tell you, you know that 45 percent of the Arab young men are unemployed today. They don’t know what to do. Here you have the Koran schools shouting at them, come to us. Don’t leave them any future as far as jobs and social security and education and prospects is concerned.

The only choice they have in the Arab world for the moment is that they could go to the Koran school and some of the most extremist ones will teach them about how to come into paradise without going through the same sufferings as their parents have done. That’s what they are learning and that’s why we need, dear friends, to create this new momentum of economic, social, and development issues. It’s not because – only because we are kind guys and women, because we are moralistic. You know, it’s also in our own selfish interest you could say.

Last point would be, then, can I say I really fear for the moment that if we are not cooperating in economics between U.S. and Europe, we are having a backlash in economics at the world scene and if we are having an economic standstill, then you have a new situation, which combined with not delivering a coherent response to combating terrorism is really bringing us to a worsening situation.

So that’s why I think that we have to cooperate together and we’ll certainly, sir, be prepared to take upon us our share in Europe about this effort which we have together.

Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Yes, Antonio, I think, wanted to add and then –

MR. GUTERRES: I'd like to add one simple thing. Unilateralism is not an American problem. Unilateralism is a problem linked with power. There are many unilateralisms in today's world. The problem is that if the most powerful of the nations behaves unilaterally, all the others will try to be as unilateral as they can in their own sphere of influence. And Russians will turn to be unilateralists wherever they can. The Chinese will turn to be unilateralists wherever they can. And even Europeans will turn to be unilateralists wherever they can.

And we lose the opportunity – and that is what for me is the big lost opportunity of this decade is – (unintelligible) – as in '45 when United States is the really only (hyper ?) power. And with a certain number of values just in my opinion are extremely important; namely, values related to democracy, human rights, and to things of this sort.

The United States has the strength to lead the construction of a global governance system that becomes truly democratic – everything is global today except democracy – and shaped with the American values. Not only it is in a certain way a limitation to its unilateralism, it is true, but it will be a limitation to every other unilateralism around the world. And to create a system based on the rule of law and on international institutions in which American influence will be overwhelming in the next few years.

Now, if this opportunity is lost, we will have in the next 30 or 40 years less and less American unilateralism and more and more Chinese unilateralism. That's a fact of life. That is the fact of life we'll all have to live with depending on the balance of power and on the shifts of the balance of power.

I truly believe that there is a chance today, based on values in which I also believe, to shape a multilateral system in which you have the opportunity to do that – an opportunity that Britain has not done in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> century and even Portugal with our small capacity has not done anything in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. We have also some unilateralism around the world.

So unilateralism is in my opinion linked with the disproportionate power and the question is a question of vision. I would hope for a vision able to take profit of what is today real American capacity in today's world to shape a global democracy based essentially on the values of America's civilization, which we share basically.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. We have time for one more question. I will take from over here and I want to be able to bank Robin's comment that Americans are very polite, but I will ask our panelists to respond with some brevity so that we –

(Cross talk.)

Q: Thank you. I'm Bill Butrell (ph), an environmental consultant. I think Barry Schweitzer (sic) put his finger on something very important: this White House – your distracted by George Bush. The Republican working majorities and their staffs are

people who, it is said, have never been anywhere, do not want to go anywhere, and do not want to talk to anybody who has been somewhere. (Laughter.)

This White House profoundly gets along with the functioning Republican powers in both the House and the Senate, unlike Clinton, unlike his father, unlike Ford, unlike other presidents. This is a profoundly capable president in working with his party's majority, so forget about George Bush.

And incidentally, these representatives represent their constituencies. There are nine environmental treaties that are stalemated in the United States Senate. President Bush's White House endorsed ratification of the law of the sea and sent the chief of naval operations to testify in its favor and Frist, the Senate majority leader, refused to send it to the floor.

So now with that in mind, analyze this European-U.S. split that – (unintelligible) – elected majorities representing their constituencies are. What is at play here?

MS. SMITH: Uh. (Laughter.) (Inaudible.)

MR. COOK: I think that was an answer, not a question. None of us are going to argue with you. I mean, you set the case out very clearly, and actually personally I do try and avoid personalizing it as George Bush (as being the issue ?), and the administration as a whole has to be taken on board and I sometimes do put in a good word for George Bush as a moderate in his own administration. (Laughter.)

I also think that there's a degree of humility required of past European powers such as my own. The longest serving British foreign secretary was at the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, who actually lasted for 11 years, and for the first eight years never, ever went abroad on official business. Quite phenomenal when you think how often foreign ministers circle around the globe. The first time he went abroad on official business, ironically, was in 1914 to the so-called Paris Peace Conference, which was one month before the worst conflict Europe's ever seen.

Now, the only moral I draw from that of course is he didn't go abroad, he didn't travel in Europe, he didn't make contact, and we did end up with the First World War. And if you don't go out there and connect with the world, there is that danger the world will come and connect with you. And global warming is not going to go away. I will make a prediction: someday the American public will wake up to the dangers and damage of global warming. I only pray it's early enough for them to then avert its worst consequences.

And in politics it is very important that you are representative. It's very important, as you put it, that you speak for the people that send you there and speak for their prejudices, but it is also important to show leadership and to spell out to them where the dangers lie ahead.

MR. GUTERRES: I'll tell you a story and try to draw a conclusion based on that story. As you can imagine, I was prime minister of Portugal during the East Timor crisis, and for a certain number of weeks we had a frustrating impression that nothing was working in the world – that the people of East Timor was condemned to a kind of genocide after they expressed their free will in a referendum. The UN was totally paralyzed until one day President Bill Clinton said that something had to be done, and UN started functioning that same day.

So the question is not whether you have a multilateral effective system or whether you have a unilateralist expression of American power. The only way to make the UN operational – the only way to make the UN effective is with American involvement and American leadership and this is the crucial question that in my opinion needs to be understood in the United States.

As the dominant power in the world, you have the capacity to make the UN be reformed and work. Please do not lose this capacity in the present moment.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

Poul, I'll let you have the last word.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I don't think you can find any constituency here or in Europe where your electorate, be it Republicans or be it Democrats, will ask those they have elected about jobs and about security. And if you take these two points, jobs and security, the conclusion will be, yes, we can do something in the U.S. on jobs and security, but we cannot do everything to be sure that our electorate can look upon the future with (healthy minds ?) and good feelings that everything is under control.

So my point is again that I of course understand your point, but even taking this point I think that ordinary people in America, if they get a chance to think it through and instead of looking at all the frustrations in televisions telling them about how many thousands of jobs they have lost, the good question is what to do with it. What can we do with it? And here we can meet. And that goes for security also.

So why don't we? Thank you very much.

MS. SMITH: Thank you very much. (Applause.) I would like to thank all of – (applause). Thank you again for coming and if we still have members of the press here, if you are interested in speaking with any of our panelists, we can help to arrange that. You can contact me or Anna Soellner and –

(END)