

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

EXEMPLAIRE

COPY

N° 213

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH
5th July 1990

VERBATIM RECORD
C-VR(90)36
PART I

VERBATIM RECORD

of the

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL MEETING WITH THE PARTICIPATION
OF HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT

held on

THURSDAY, 5TH JULY 1990

at

LANCASTER HOUSE
LONDON

COMPTE RENDU

de la

REUNION DU CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
AVEC LA PARTICIPATION DES CHEFS D'ETAT
ET DE GOUVERNEMENT

tenue le

JEUDI 5 JUILLET 1990

à

LANCASTER HOUSE
LONDRES

NATO/OTAN,
1110 Brussels.

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

Mr. WÖRNER

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, the cold war belongs to history, our Alliance is moving from confrontation to co-operation. We are building a new Europe, a Europe drawn together by the unfettered aspiration for freedom, democracy and prosperity. Never before has Europe had such a tangible opportunity to overcome the cycle of war and peace that has so bedevilled its past. We have a clear vision of Europe's future, we set it out in our 40th Anniversary Summit Declaration just one year ago. Today at our meeting, we must chart the further course towards that vision of a Europe whole and free. Our objective is not only the preservation of peace, but the building of peace. In the past few weeks a series of ministerial meetings have drawn up the basis for this Alliance's contribution to the new Europe. Already we are responding to change, with change and with initiative, we are adapting our Alliance reaching out to all who wish to build the same Europe as we do. Today we will renew our offer of co-operation and give it concrete form. We look at the Soviet Union and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe as potential partners and friends. The policy of co-operation is the logical extension of our Harmel doctrine. The Alliance is now realising its full potential as a framework of stability and an instigator of peaceful change.

Mais l'Europe n'est pas encore à l'abri de tout danger. L'Alliance qui a tant contribué à l'effacement de la douloureuse division de l'Europe doit assumer toutes ses responsabilités aux côtés d'autres institutions occidentales pour faire profiter chaque nation européenne de la stabilité et de la sécurité dont bénéficient ses propres membres. L'OTAN exercera une influence déterminante dans quatre domaines. Il s'agira premièrement de liquider l'héritage de la guerre froide par la conclusion d'un accord sur les forces conventionnelles en Europe et de poursuivre le processus de maîtrise des armements. Il nous incombe en effet d'adapter la situation militaire aux nouvelles réalités politiques européennes. Deuxièmement, d'aider à la mise en place d'une nouvelle architecture européenne qui unisse toutes les nations d'Europe et de l'Amérique du Nord. Troisièmement, de maintenir la pression en faveur d'un règlement des aspects extérieurs de l'unité allemande qui soit satisfaisant pour toutes les parties intéressées. L'appartenance pleine et entière de l'Allemagne à notre Alliance est un gage de stabilité pour l'Europe entière. Enfin, notre Alliance continuera à prévenir la guerre, car il subsiste de nombreux risques et des facteurs d'instabilité, tant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur du continent et il nous faut aujourd'hui nous prémunir contre les dangers si nous ne voulons pas en être demain les victimes.

Our Alliance cannot be successful in its new tasks if it fails to fulfil the oldest and a most fundamental one; the preservation of peace. We must retain a secure defence. Such a secure defence is

Mr. WÖRNER (Cont'd)

not an obstacle to change but the very precondition for change and our weapons never were and never will be a threat to anyone. Neither North America nor Europe can be secure and successful unless they stay together. Now that Europe is stronger and more integrated it can provide for an ever closer and more successful Transatlantic partnership by assuming its share of global responsibilities. United there is no challenge this Alliance cannot meet.

Finally, Prime Minister, allow me on behalf of all the Allies to express our appreciation for the hospitality and warm welcome that your Majesty's Government under you, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, is extending to us here in London. So would you kindly take the floor.

Mrs. THATCHER

May I briefly join the Secretary General in welcoming you to the NATO Summit in London. We are at a turning point in Europe's history, a turning point which is as full of promise as was 1919 and 1945, and we know that its the existence of NATO and its sure defence which have helped to change the direction of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union from the Diktat of Government towards the democracy of the people. NATO has defended peace with freedom and justice but it's never threatened anyone. The cornerstones of that sure defence must remain, for we don't know what the future holds; but its architecture may change in the new situation. Recently I was reading two books. Rereading them in preparation for this Summit. One was Cap Weinberger's "Fighting for Peace" and we owe him so much for his stewardship of the Ministry of Defence of the United States. And he told us of the unpreparedness when he was called to serve his country at the beginning of the last war. That must never happen again. Our signal from this meeting must continue to be one of resolve in defence, resolve and unity in defence coupled with willingness to extend the hand of friendship to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. In the last 24 hours I have received a message from President Gorbachev and President Havel who are interested in the results of this Summit as we are here who attend it. This century has been marked by war and suffering on an unparalleled scale. Nevertheless, in its closing decade, we are seeing new hope and new aspirations about the world. The other book which I looked at was one called "Barbarosea" telling of one of the most terrible and lengthy battles in history. But at the beginning, the author prefaced his work with this short verse. "Two things have altered not since first the world began, the beauty of the wild green earth and the bravery of man." It is our task to see that that bravery be turned to the purposes of peace and not to the battles of war. I bid you welcome and wish us all success in the message we shall give to the waiting world. Thank you.

Mr. WÖRNER

Thank you very much

Heads of State and Government Ministers: before we start the substantive discussion let me make a procedural suggestion to you. Let me first thank President Bush warmly for his initiative to provide a draft text for the declaration.

In preliminary sessions in Council, governments have expressed their appreciation for the draft and have unanimously indicated that they would be happy to work further on the basis of this text and so they also accepted that the drafting work should be reserved for our very gathering.

Let me suggest to you how this work be most usefully handled. There is a consensus that Foreign Ministers should personally take charge. I would suggest that they convene in the adjacent room with their principal collaborators immediately after today's luncheon while the meeting at the level of Heads of State and Government continues as planned. May I also propose that as a kind of punishment for his good achievement in the past, Minister Van den Broek chair the ministerial group. Hans you had that coming after your expert chairmanship of the Ministers Group that completed the comprehensive concept at the Summit Meeting last year. If you all agree, I will ask Minister Van den Broek to take up his task and to give us, later, a report - if possible, at the end of the afternoon, which we would greatly enjoy, of course, but this is perhaps being a little bit too strong an optimist.

While much of the text seems to pose no difficulties, there are certainly some areas which deserve a closer look and I indicated at preliminary discussion we had, some of them. How NATO's future political rôle should be reflected in the framework of more cooperative order in Europe. What form an eventual non-aggression pledge by members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact should take; what we should say about future conventional force pledges, our strategy review, our nuclear issues should be dealt with; how we express our readiness to continue the conventional arms control forces and how we treat German unification, Europe's new rôle.

Those are the major areas where I think some discussion is needed. So do you agree with my proposals? Thank you. This seems to be the case so I call now on our first speaker, President Mitterrand

Monsieur MITTERRAND

Monsieur le Secrétaire général, et vous Madame et Messieurs, nous serons tous d'accord, je le pense, pour dire que cette réunion au sommet de l'Organisation du Traité de l'Atlantique Nord, l'Alliance atlantique, intervient à un moment que nous savons crucial.

L'Alliance, on peut le dire, a remarquablement assuré notre sécurité depuis 41 ans. Elle a su saisir ces dernières années les premières occasions de désarmement équilibré qui se sont présentées à nous. Eh bien! il faut maintenant qu'elle s'adapte à la nouvelle situation en Europe.

Comme je l'avais déclaré à Key Largo, où je me trouvais grâce à l'aimable invitation du Président Bush, le 19 avril dernier, notre Alliance doit d'abord maintenir sa cohésion, par exemple comme elle l'a montré en réaffirmant la nécessité de la présence de forces américaines en Europe et en soutenant l'appartenance de l'Allemagne unifiée à l'OTAN.

Mais nous devons maintenant convaincre nos opinions, nos voisins et amis directs, ceux que l'on pourrait appeler nos anciens adversaires de ces quarante dernières années, que nous entendons renforcer la nature défensive de l'Alliance et le caractère dissuasif, réellement dissuasif, de notre stratégie. Ce qui veut dire que nous devons tenir compte des intérêts de tous les pays d'Europe, y compris de ceux qui sont encore aujourd'hui membres du Pacte de Varsovie, bien qu'on ne sache pas exactement lesquels, et notamment, je n'hésite pas à le dire, de l'Union soviétique. Notre attitude sur ce point est naturellement très attendue et, là comme ailleurs, nous devons être très clairs. La clarté de nos décisions est un devoir qui s'impose. Le projet de déclaration qui nous a été adressé par le Président Bush va largement dans ce sens et j'en approuve l'esprit. Je pense en effet que l'heure est venue d'établir en Europe, où tous et chacun sont intéressés à la sécurité de notre continent, je pense que l'heure est venue d'établir de nouvelles relations. Il me semble que l'OTAN, en s'adaptant, peut jouer un rôle déterminant dans cette évolution. Je remarquerai à cet égard que l'Alliance a affiché depuis longtemps une double vocation de sécurité et de coopération. Restons fidèles à cet objectif.

Parmi les évolutions que je souhaite sans réserve figurent tous les progrès envisagés dans le processus de désarmement. Nous avons eu l'occasion d'en parler ces derniers temps. Poursuivons notre route dans cette direction, étant entendu que je souhaite qu'en ce qui

Monsieur MITTERRAND (Suite)

concerne le désarmement conventionnel, nous préservons l'objectif de parachever ultérieurement, avec l'ensemble des 35 membres de la CSCE, les négociations menées actuellement à 23. Je ne serais pas, en effet, favorable à ce qui perpétuerait artificiellement des relations de bloc à bloc, alors que cela ne correspond déjà plus à la réalité.

Je partage ainsi la réticence du Président des Etats-Unis d'Amérique à l'égard d'une déclaration commune OTAN-Pacte de Varsovie et je préférerais une déclaration solennelle de non-agression ou de non-recours à la force qui pourrait être adoptée dans le cadre du futur sommet des 35 et entérinée par tous les participants.

Vous connaissez la position particulière de la France au regard du commandement intégré de l'OTAN et de sa stratégie. Nous n'entendons pas en changer; cela signifie que nous ne sommes pas directement concernés par la stratégie nucléaire qu'adoptent et que mettent en oeuvre de leur côté les Etats membres des organes militaires intégrés, ni par la façon dont ils s'organisent entre eux. Je souhaite cependant que le concept stratégique qu'adoptera l'OTAN dans ce domaine à l'avenir, compte tenu des armes conventionnelles ou nucléaires qu'elle conservera une fois mené à son terme le processus de désarmement actuel, je souhaite que ce concept soit vraiment un concept de dissuasion, c'est-à-dire qu'il ait sans ambiguïté pour objet d'étouffer la guerre dans l'oeuf, de l'empêcher d'éclater - d'empêcher la guerre, et non pas de vouloir seulement la gagner. Je ne pense pas qu'un conflit ouvert puisse échapper à sa logique, qui sera d'aller toujours plus loin, plus haut, plus cruellement dans l'usage des armes, et que nul n'arrêterait artificiellement ce conflit avant l'ultime étape de l'arme nucléaire, et j'ai déjà eu l'occasion de dire que cette stratégie-là n'était pas celle de mon pays. Je vous confirme que la France participera cependant à toute réflexion en vue d'adapter l'Alliance aux exigences à venir. Aucun aspect des problèmes de sécurité relatif à l'équilibre européen n'est exclu de notre compétence et de notre discussion, et je désire que les idées cheminent et que, le moment venu, un autre sommet du même type puisse tirer les conclusions que les événements imposeront.

Ma dernière remarque - je ne ferai qu'une déclaration brève pour commencer - ma dernière remarque portera sur la complémentarité qu'il convient à mon sens de renforcer entre les différentes instances où les Alliés se retrouvent, où les Alliés se retrouvent en Europe; je citerai en premier la Communauté économique européenne, et je pense qu'il serait sage et utile, toujours pour l'avenir, que les Européens se préparent au sein de l'Alliance à jouer un rôle accru pour leur propre défense. Nous aurons l'occasion d'en reparler, cela ne fait pas le

Monsieur MITTERRAND (Suite)

moindre doute. Je citerai ensuite la CSCE, car je suis tout à fait favorable à ce que les 16 pays alliés ici réunis définissent leurs objectifs, formulent leurs propositions pour la nouvelle réunion du Sommet à 35, comme les 12 de la CEE viennent de le faire récemment à Dublin. Une bonne coordination entre nous dans la préparation de ce sommet fort important, et prochaine échéance - me paraît désirable, et je crois prudent à cet égard de ne pas en préjuger les résultats et de laisser se dérouler normalement le processus de préparation prévu avec l'ensemble des 35 pays de la CSCE. Nous sommes, à l'instant où je parle, en train de gravir une haute montagne, à moins que l'image ne soit fautive et que nous ne soyons en train d'en descendre la pente du côté d'une plaine heureuse. Pensons toujours à l'objectif, si l'on veut fixer les étapes - et je pense que cette réunion a lieu au moment qui convient - munis des documents de travail nécessaires pour que ce soit décidé dans l'idée de la prospective c'est-à-dire des autres rendez-vous fixés en 1990 et la suite, bref que nous nous installions à l'intérieur d'un dispositif dont ce Sommet de Londres sera le point de départ, je vous remercie.

Mr. WÖRNER

The American President.

Mr. BUSH

I would begin by just adding our vote of thanks to Prime Minister Thatcher for hosting the gathering, and certainly to our Secretary-General Mr. Wörner, as once again we feel he has done a wonderful job of organising these discussions.

The Europe that we all hope for is really here, it's upon us, and some ask whether NATO is still necessary, and our answer is unequivocally yes, because free nations must stand together in an uncertain world, and yes because collective security is better than national rivalry, and yes because the pursuit of our common ideals has never been more relevant or more hopeful. But NATO has got to change and we must build a transformed Alliance for the new Europe of the 21st century.

All of you have seen the suggested draft already that we put together for a Summit declaration, and I appreciate the kind words and the helpful comments about the draft. It is a proposal made up of many of your ideas and some of ours and it is an outgrowth of the allied deliberations, especially during the last two months, including the

Mr. BUSH (Cont'd)

discussions among our Foreign and Defence Ministers, and numerous discussions among our Permanent Representatives at NATO. Now it is time for the political levels sitting at this table, all of us, to produce a declaration that will show our publics and the other countries who are watching these deliberations that our Alliance is intensely relevant in a new Europe. Our declarations suggest, you may recall, four Alliance tasks:

1. to reach out to all adversaries
2. to change the future character of NATO's conventional defence
3. to make nuclear forces weapons of last resort
4. to help establish through the CSCE a Europe whole and free.

Our first task therefore is reaching out to old adversaries. By reaching out I mean that we should set up structures for co-operation with the East. We suggest first that the NATO countries make a declaration of our commitment to peace and non-aggression and we would invite the individual Warsaw Pact countries to do the same thing. Beyond assurances of good intentions we can let the Soviets and the other members of the Warsaw Pact hear and see more for themselves about what we are doing at NATO and by inviting President Gorbachev to one of our meetings we would send a clear signal. The most important step that I've suggested for reaching out to old adversaries would be to let them set up a Liaison Mission at NATO. It's an ambitious idea but I think it makes sense. They would not have a seat at NATO's table, but they would feel closer to our work with a permanent presence and with a voice and it would signal change and a very different attitude to the Soviet Union and the other States in the Warsaw Pact. We will show that NATO has a new dimension of co-operation with the Soviet Union and the new democracies of Eastern Europe, and I am particularly concerned that the Eastern Europeans do not feel that they are doomed to an association only with the dying Warsaw Pact. Many of you read what the Hungarian Prime Minister Mr. Antall said in Budapest, "The Warsaw Pact cannot be modernized and it cannot be democratized", and the Liaison Mission idea gives the East Europeans a link to NATO but keeps them enough at arms' length to avoid alarming the Soviets, who would of course be invited also. Gorbachev has even publicly suggested Soviet membership in NATO. Now that is in our view out of the question but the Liaison Mission proposal could help him work to push aside the image of NATO as an enemy, an image so deeply ingrained in the mind of the Soviet public.

Mr. BUSH (Cont'd)

The Soviet Union. As we talk about reaching out to old adversaries, I want to make a few special comments about my view on the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is undergoing rapid and certainly fundamental change and trying to find its way across a veritable minefield, economic chaos, ethnic strife, a political turmoil, and none of us can predict with confidence where that journey will end, but we must try to remember that the source of this great instability is a process of reform that I think everybody around this table supports and yet we know that the fate of reform in the Soviet Union is not really in our hands. The decisions that lie ahead for the Soviet leadership are harder than any of the remarkable ones that have taken place already. The choices they make will determine the future of the Soviet Union, and in order to take account of the uncertainties - something that we as responsible leaders must do - we must preserve our own enduring strengths and we must protect the institutions and the relationships with guaranteed peace and stability. I like the strong collective defence based on this Alliance of democracies.

And now a word on the rôle of the United States. I would like to add a brief comment on one of those enduring strengths of our Alliance and that is the overall place of the United States in Europe. As I said in December, the United States intends to remain a European power. We mean this in the broadest sense, politically, militarily, economically, and the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been and will continue to be this Alliance. I believe substantial U.S. nuclear and conventional forces must remain on this side of the Atlantic as long as our Allies want and need them. They are demonstration beyond mere words, beyond rhetoric, of the enduring political compact that binds America's fate with Europe's democracies.

Our second task is changing the way we think about defence. We need as an Alliance to alter profoundly the way we think about defence. I suggest this as the second task that we should set for ourselves at this Summit. We can begin with an understanding of our military requirements. These needs are likely to be redefined as a result of three developments: the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact as an effective military alliance, the prospective withdrawal of Soviet stationed forces to their homeland and the conclusion of the CFE Treaty. CFE is especially important. Conventional arms control is the best way to co-ordinate the changes in military posture in Europe in a stabilising way. We should finish the work in CFE and sign the Treaty at the CSCE Summit this year. The signature, however, of the CFE Treaty should not mean the end of our conventional arms control efforts. We should plan to continue the process in follow-on negotiations that will

Mr. BUSH (Cont'd)

begin with the same membership and mandate immediately after CFE 1 is signed. Our draft declaration talks about "further far-reaching reductions of offensive capability in conventional armed forces that will prevent any nation from maintaining disproportionate military power on the continent". Our language which talks about offensive capability without defining it leaves us a lot of room, considerable room for manoeuvre on the actual means for achieving reductions. I also used the phrase "in the 1990's", giving us considerable time to consider how to achieve this ultimate goal. We should promise to handle the future adjustments to our force strength in a stabilising way and with a goal that lets our publics know that meaningful conventional arms control will continue. Arms control is one way to change our military requirements, and as the Soviet military threat recedes our defence strategy should change. We will continue to defend all the territory of all of our members while we also move away from forward defence as we currently understand it. We also would like to emphasise the idea of a multinational corps which our Defence Ministers discussed in May.

The third task that I have mentioned is making nuclear forces weapons of last resort. Now, conventional armaments are only our first line of defence. For many years our defence plans have had to rely on the use of nuclear weapons early in a conflict to help deter sudden and overwhelming attack by larger Warsaw Pact forces. As Soviet troops leave Eastern Europe and the CFE Treaty is implemented I hope that we can use this opportunity to develop a different strategy, one that will truly make the Alliance's nuclear forces into weapons of last resort. And that is the third task that I propose for the Summit meeting. We should be careful in looking at changes in NATO's nuclear strategy but I worry that if we say nothing about the future of flexible response and about our strategy of deterrence we will just allow the advocates of no first use and denuclearisation to set the terms for the debate. Flexible response tended to presume the early use of nuclear arms in a conflict out of necessity in the face of overwhelming Warsaw Pact conventional superiority. After Soviet troops have returned to the homeland and CFE is implemented - given the collapse of the Warsaw Pact - the strategic situation will be transformed - it's going to be different.

If I am asked at the Press Conference tomorrow whether NATO will adapt its nuclear strategy in response to these changes I could say that we are studying it. But then we fail to offer leadership. If I say flexible response would continue unaffected by these new circumstances, then it will be much harder to maintain a consensus behind our essential NATO nuclear deterrent. If I say NATO strategy

Mr. BUSH (Cont'd)

will be different, then we have to say something to define this new direction, so the phrase "last resort", in our view, leaves a lot of room for specific elaboration of a new force posture and employment guidelines. It, of course, protects first use. But this term also signals a change in emphasis, moving away from reliance on using nuclear weapons soon after a conflict has begun - a move already blessed by the Defence Ministers at their May meeting in Canada. I am still strongly opposed to adopting a doctrine of no first use of nuclear weapons, but "last resort" keeps this flexibility that will leave any possible aggressor uncertain about the risks of escalation, if he is thinking about starting a conventional war. This uncertainty has helped keep the peace in Europe for nearly half a century.

One way we can demonstrate our readiness to adjust our nuclear posture to take account of new realities is by taking a look at these nuclear artillery shells. These weapons were there mainly to deal with the imminent threat of attack by Soviet forces stationed in the territory of East German and Czech Warsaw Pact allies. Circumstances clearly are different now. We should make it clear that once negotiations begin on short range nuclear forces, we are prepared to eliminate these nuclear artillery shells from Europe by the time all Soviet stationed forces in Europe have returned home.

We should also announce NATO efforts to begin preparations for US-Soviet negotiations on short range nuclear forces that will begin shortly after this CFE Agreement is signed. We should also agree that our new defence plans and force posture should be elaborated into a new NATO strategy.

Our Summit Declaration should give some direction to this review process. As I have already indicated, I think this review should move NATO away from forward defence towards a reduced forward presence. I believe the strategy review should report on its work as soon as possible next year at another NATO Summit. I wish to add one special point about this strategy review as it concerns those countries who are not members of NATO's integrated military command. Nothing in the approach that I have suggested is meant to challenge the traditional relationship of these countries to NATO. These countries would and should be totally free to consider their place in future defence arrangements in Europe, as well as the form of their essential contribution to this strategy review.

Mr. BUSH (Cont'd)

Lastly, our fourth task that I say is helping to establish a framework for a Europe that is whole and free. When we last met on December 4th I emphasized that NATO, the European Community and the CSCE will each have a vital part in shaping the new Europe. The fourth task for our Summit could be to establish the framework for a Europe whole and free by declaring our views on the future of the CSCE. We welcome the prospect of a CSCE Summit in Paris this November based on the signature of the CFE Agreement and highlighting the importance of the CSCE in providing a structure for Europe's continued political development. We hope the CSCE Summit will adopt new principles for the establishment and preservation of free societies providing clear standards for the new democracies of Eastern Europe.

I am pleased with the outcome of the Bonn meeting on the economic co-operation and the ideas we endorsed at the Copenhagen Conference on the human dimension. The CSCE Summit should describe guidelines for free and fair elections, upholding the rule of law and protecting economic liberty.

We also support the establishment of new institutions within the CSCE to help give life to these principles and provide a setting for a wider political dialogue. We have suggested six initiatives for institutional development of the CSCE. We have suggested that most of these new institutions be located in Eastern Europe because this region will be so vital to the CSCE's future efforts and because I want these new governments to see that they will be integral parts of the new European architecture.

Just a quick word, if I might, on Germany and the "2+4" conclusion. A few words about how this meeting here may influence the future of Germany. All of you know that we welcome the prospect of German unification in peace and freedom. In our view, the sooner the better, and we agree with Chancellor Kohl and everyone around this table that the united German state should remain a full member of NATO including its integrated military structures. I am also glad that NATO Foreign Ministers in Turnberry settled the Alliance's position on the application of the North Atlantic Treaty to all of the territory of unified Germany. When Germany is unified, it should be solid. All four power rights and responsibilities will pass into history. The job of the "2+4" is to arrange this passage. It should not decide Germany's ties to NATO, the position of Western stationed forces in the current FRG, the size of the German army, or place new discriminatory constraints on a sovereign German state. We know the Soviet Union has not agreed with this position, so we have tried to persuade the Soviet

Mr. BUSH (Cont'd)

leaders that German membership in NATO is actually in their best interests and will certainly cause them no harm.

In Scotland, Jim Baker listed nine ways that we have tried to reassure the Soviets that they are not going to be threatened by the changes in Europe. President Gorbachev told me that he was very interested in the outcome of this NATO Summit as he continues to consider the Soviet position. He is now, as we all know and read, in the middle of a very difficult Party Congress. When Minister Shevardnadze met Jim Baker in Berlin he told him no less than four times how important the NATO Summit would be in shaping Soviet attitudes on the vital questions Moscow has got to answer in the next few months. We must not let this opportunity slip by.

It may be our last chance to indicate the changing nature of our Alliance before the Soviets and Eastern Europeans and others make their decisions on German unity and CFE and for the CSCE summit. Our Summit declaration should demonstrate unmistakably that our Alliance will play a positive part in Europe's future; that the Alliance is adapting to new realities and really helping to shape a new Europe. Our Declaration should be a political document coming directly from us, the political leadership of this Alliance. In a Europe that has just experienced a peaceful revolution and witnessed a victory of our aspirations we can begin the renewal and transformation of our Atlantic community. Always liking to assign the work to somebody else, perhaps the Foreign Ministers could indeed get together and work on the text of this Summit, at any time you direct, we are enthusiastic about that concept. Thank you all very much.

Mr. WÖRNER

British Prime Minister.

Mrs. THATCHER

Of course I agree with a very great deal of what President Mitterrand and President Bush have said, and naturally the things we say will overlap, but there is something, there will be some things on which we seek further elucidation so we can get both that unity and resolve and signals which it's important that we give. We all realise the importance of the occasion; our predecessors set a course in 1948 for the post-war world. They didn't seek temporary safety; they sought long-term peace. And alongside their political declarations they saw to it that their military commanders and troops had the right

Mrs. THATCHER (Cont'd)

weapons to deter a war and if need be to defend the liberty we enjoyed against whosoever may attack with however many numbers. It is said that the wise man guards against the future as if it were the present. They did just that and so must we. Then, we knew we faced an expansionist ideology. Destructive, oppressive, confident, ruthless, dangerous and international. Now with the advent of Mr. Gorbachev that communist empire is cracking and freedom is breaking through. We are hopeful, because all enlargement of liberty is good; we are hesitant because we know the enormity of the task to change from servitude to the responsibilities of liberty under the rule of law. They have the same mixture, I believe, of hope for a new world and fear of the unknown, and some are preferring the stability of an authoritarian régime. So what is different now? In defence terms, things have changed. There is the restoration of independence in East Europe, the withdrawal of Soviet troops gradually, thus reducing their capacity for surprise attack, a singularly important difference in the whole military strategy. The loosening of the Warsaw Pact, the unification of Germany and the first stage of arms reductions on both sides about to be agreed and implemented. But that, having happened, is the easy part, and that's what people want to hear, they want to believe that the danger is over and it is plain sailing from now on, and I believe our duty as leaders is to put the other side of the balance as well, the need to keep our resolve to defend ourselves because you never know where the next threat may come from and we see the debate now going on in the USSR and we hear the voices of the military resenting their reduced prestige and strength. We don't know quite what will happen in the Soviet Union, how wide its powers will be dispersed from the centre, which Republics will stay and which seek to leave. Nor do we know what the consequences of ending the Soviet grip on Eastern Europe will be, particularly in those countries which have problems with their nationalities, and we must not forget the very considerable military forces which the Soviet Union continues to have, and not just to have, but is still building up and modernizing.

Last year they built 140 of the intercontinental ballistic missiles to the United States' 14; they build 6 tanks and 2 combat aircraft every day; 4 strategic ballistic missiles every week; over 100 tactical air-to-surface missiles every week since last year; 1 submarine every 6 weeks. Our intelligence tells us that there is a considerable increase in Soviet holding, east of the Urals, of equipment that would otherwise be limited by a CFE agreement - tanks, and artillery. I know that to remind people of these facts is to be in danger of being classed as a cold war warrior, but I remember that it was 2 years ago in Washington in an interview that when I said I thought provided

Mrs. THATCHER (Cont'd)

Mr. Gorbachev stayed there, the cold war was over, they blinked at me in amazement. So I can't be accused of being a cold war warrior, but I can be accused of being very cautious with defence to ensure our freedom and justice, that it continues. And I remember what President Truman said, with his characteristic clarity about NATO: "We hoped it would prevent World War III and it has". And we must continue along that same path to ensure that it prevents any other hostilities, and therefore I agree very much with President Mitterrand - its main purpose both in conventional but particularly in nuclear, is deterrence. The point of nuclear weapons, in particular, is to deter; and indeed they have been very satisfactory in that respect.

I think in this changing but uncertain world, one thing is very, very clear - NATO strategy was built around Germany; it will continue to be so. The unified Germany must be a member and we note know exactly how strongly Chancellor Kohl insists that it must be, and indeed it is the hub of NATO. And the second fundamental thing is the continued presence of American forces in Germany with their nuclear weapons. They used to say "no nukes, no troops" in the past. I would add to that there should also be some troops from Britain and other European nations, too, in Germany. These are absolute fundamentals of NATO strategy, and we are very grateful to both the United States and Canada for their continued presence here which is vital to our whole future.

Our starting point now should be the strategy and forces that we shall need for the near future. Not what we can discard, but what we shall need; and our Defence Ministers meeting in the Defence Planning Committee have already asked the Military Committee and others to start work. And when the results come back to us, I hope that our Defence Ministers will also be present to help us reach decisions, it is horrific to me if we take decisions without our Defence Ministers. I think it is vital that we take these, for the whole future, as far as we can see, with them alongside us, and I believe that's the only way to be sure that the politics and defence will add up. In the meantime, let me consider some defence matters first, and politics second. The way ahead on defence; we have a strategy of deterrence based upon a mix of nuclear and conventional weapons; we don't say precisely how and under what circumstances nuclear weapons would be used.

I entirely agree with President Bush that there must be no, we must never say, "no first use" of nuclear weapons because that would expose Europe, once again, to a conventional war. A potential aggressor would know, that he can get a very very long way, indeed

Mrs. THATCHER (Cont'd)

perhaps the whole way because we would never use our nuclear weapons and if we were ever to say "no first use", we would remove the flexibility and gravely weaken the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons. But of course, the numbers of weapons can be reduced and still keep their deterrent effect. By very substantially reducing conventional weapons through CFE negotiations, the short range nuclear weapons, one of the signals we can give at the Summit is our readiness to reduce the numbers of nuclear warheads in Europe to which President Bush has already referred. I confess that I am still worried about the expression that has been used: "weapons of last resort". Although a great deal of what President Bush says about nuclear weapons is very very welcome, I am concerned that we don't misinterpret the same words. To me the expression "weapons of last resort" is very clear. Last resort: last means last and nothing else and yet I am told that it is not so, that the expression is ambiguous. But I have often read confusing words in communiqués and found them very confusing; but to be told that clear words are confusing is, to me, a new dimension of diplomacy. Of course, as colleagues round this table will know, I never had much use for diplomacy anyway, and I've got on very well without it, but I do wonder if it might, on this occasion, be as well, if we are going to keep that phrase (and I know it means a great deal to the United States and others), but we might also have the other phrase, upon which we are all agreed, from the comprehensive concept which says this: "such strategic nuclear forces fulfill an essential rôle in overall Alliance deterrent strategy" by showing there are no circumstances in which a potential aggressor might discount nuclear retaliation in his response to military action. That obviously keeps the four deterrents and if people want to retain the one perhaps we can satisfy some of us about importing the other which is something on which we have already agreed in a comprehensive concept.

In the changed circumstances of Eastern Europe and Germany, we certainly need, as President Bush has said, to look again at how forward defences are implemented in the Central Region and consider greater reliance on mobility, reinforcement and reserves and that obviously affects some of us who would have to reinforce across the sea back to the mainland and would need time to do so. From that new strategy, will flow decisions on the force levels and numbers and types of weapons which we shall need. I don't think myself that our focus should be on further reductions in equipment because the first CFE agreement gives us enormous reductions in equipment and I believe after that, the priorities should be to implement those rather than to press for further equipment cuts. Moreover, my strong impression from talking to Soviet military leaders recently, (which was quite an experience, both for me

Mrs. THATCHER (Cont'd)

and for them), was that they are not prepared to consider further substantial reductions in equipment. They are finding it difficult to cope with those to which they are already committed and more importantly, they don't want to see their own standing and influence further reduced. So I don't think we need worry too much about being pre-empted by new initiatives for conventional force reductions on the Soviet side. I believe that we should focus on the issue of reduced manpower that is what will give reassurance to the Russians. I know the Secretary General is worried that we shall reduce our forces in an unco-ordinated way. Obviously we shall all want to make some reductions when the situation warrants it, but it must be done in a way and on a scale which maintains the strategy and its credibility and may I say how vital it is that NATO should keep ahead on military technology, that is a very important part of overall deterrents. I believe that the technology developed in pursuing SDI was the factor that finally decided Mr. Gorbachev that the Soviet Union could not compete and that their whole system therefore would have to change.

On the political side we want NATO to increase its political activities. First it will help us keep NATO's cohesion and show public opinion that even with a reduced military threat, NATO remains very relevant. The North Atlantic Council should be the main forum for transatlantic political dialogue, underlining the inter-dependence of the two sides of the Atlantic. And second, I think we must show that NATO is moving with the times and demonstrate to the Soviet Union we are ready to take account of their sensitivities and concerns about their security in a Europe in which Germany is united and a full member of NATO. I think there are various ways in which we can do this. We can have more military-to-military contacts, we can strengthen NATO's rôle in confidence-building measures, we can have periodic meetings between NATO and individual East European and Soviet foreign ministers, we can keep open the possibility of a joint declaration between member states of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. I understand that is what President Gorbachev wanted. I have some doubts about calling any agreement a non-aggression pact.

The history of non-aggression pacts is not always that of non-aggression and I think we should bear that in mind. I think we should build up the CSE as a body within which political and security issues affecting Europe as a whole, can be discussed. But the CSE can never be a substitute as a defence guarantee which NATO provides. I agree very much with what President Bush and President Mitterand have said - you have to get the tone of our declaration right, we want to show that we are entering a new era, but not to give the impression that

Mrs. THATCHER (Cont'd)

there is no longer any danger. So Mr. Secretary General, our task is to demonstrate that NATO will continue to be our shield not as an alliance against anyone but as an alliance in defence of freedom, justice and democracy. We must give a clear signal that NATO is adapting to a changing world; it must be change which keeps the best from NATO's successful past by showing our Alliance is just as strong and instrumental in the new world as in the old. We must match the moment but not at the expense of our future defence and security. Thank you Secretary General.

Mr. WÖRNER

Thank you Prime Minister, may I call upon Chancellor Kohl.

Mr. KOHL

Mr. Chairman, dear colleagues, the Summit meeting is taking place at an historic moment, a historic moment and you will understand when I mention this falls at a historic moment for Germany, for Europe and for the North Atlantic Alliance as a whole. The great aims which the members of this Alliance have always pursued in a spirit of solidarity which was re-affirmed in Brussels last year, at the Summit meeting marking the 40th anniversary of the Alliance are today becoming reality.

- Only a year ago we used to say the Berlin Wall is an unacceptable symbol of the division of Europe and it is now being broken up.

- The unity of the German people a few days ago became a decisive step closer with the establishment of monetary, economic and social union.

- The political and ideological and economic divide in Europe is being overcome, can be overcome, by a forward-looking policy pursued by both sides and it is also true that confrontation and the cold war belong to the past now.

Mr. KOHL (Cont'd)

To us Germans, this historic transformation is an occasion for deep gratitude, especially to all our friends and allies who are here with us gathered around this table. They have stood by our side in times of tension and guaranteed our security in dangerous crises. They have made our pursuit of German unity, based on freedom and democracy, their own concern, and let me mention only these examples: upon our accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in 1955; in the Harmel Report of 1967; and not least in last year's Summit declaration on the occasion of NATO's anniversary. And as we proceed to German unity they are accompanying us with active and friendly support. I ask for your understanding when I wish to take this opportunity to thank in particular our American friends, our French friends and our British friends who bear special responsibility for Berlin and for Germany as a whole, and I would like to express our deep gratitude that they live up to that responsibility in exemplary fashion in the 2+4 negotiations. Mr. Bush has paid tribute to this path towards German unity in a particularly friendly way.

We Germans are proceeding towards unity clearly aware of our duty. We have learned the lessons of history and that means our unequivocal rejection of a nationalist or separate approach, and this is a precondition for everything else and this is why it is also clear that also a future united Germany will show unqualified commitment to a firm alliance with the free democracies of Europe and North America and to closer political and economic integration within the European community. With this commitment we are convinced we are respecting the legitimate security interests of all European countries in the best possible way. This I say not only to our Eastern neighbours, including the Soviet Union, but also to our Western neighbours, whose security depends not least on reliable partnership within the Alliance with a future united Germany. The future Germany within the Atlantic Alliance will be the reliable stability factor which Europe needs, also from a geopolitical viewpoint, at its center.

I am particularly glad - and this again shows a dramatic change within Europe - that our immediate neighbours in the East (Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary) share this view. Others - and we have already raised this issue - have yet to be convinced that a united Germany as a member of NATO, which we all desire, will also enhance their own stability and offer them a new opportunity for partnership.

Part of this process is that here today in London we are making clear how the North Atlantic Alliance of the 90's will determine

Mr. KOHL (Cont'd)

its future rôle and future course. We have a responsibility to continue to build on proven foundations and at the same time to promote the historic transformation with far-sightedness and creativity. Our Alliance and the solidarity of all the Allies are and will remain the pledge of our common security, precisely in view of continuing imponderables, and no-one should deny that. We have reason for hope but hope must be grounded on a realistic policy. Our Alliance is a manifestation of the security link between North America and Europe which will continue to be vital, also to us Germans. By generating strong impetus for disarmament and arms control, the Alliance has provided an exemplary contribution to stability, transparency and predictability on the continent.

We of the Federal Republic of Germany are ready and prepared to solemnly state in a joint declaration with the Warsaw Pact countries that we no longer regard one another as adversaries and that we endorse our commitment to a Pan-European renunciation of force in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the CSCE Final Act. I would like to support President Bush in what he has said here. The message to go out from the NATO Summit meeting here is of enormous importance for Central and Eastern Europe. It is particularly important for us, but please let me say this also again at the background of my meeting with Prime Minister Antall in Budapest, particularly for the reformist states in Central and Eastern Europe this is very important.

Our Alliance has proved that being itself capable of change it resolutely seizes the opportunities for change in Europe. We have the analysis of the risks by our military experts before us and these show that the threat of years past has considerably decreased and that it will continue to diminish in line with further force reductions. Today, therefore, we should take the necessary steps to modify our strategy in the light of the future. We need to adapt our new military structure to the new situation and we would like to give further stimulus for disarmament and arms control also in Central Europe. We propose now that permanent institutions be established within the framework of the CSCE so that it will become a pillar of the Pan-European security architecture, not as a substitute - and I would like to underline this - but as a complement to our proven Alliance.

Furthermore the Agenda for the European Council meeting in Dublin and the Economic Summit in Houston includes comprehensive economic co-operation with the nations of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, and especially with the Soviet Union. Reformist countries which opt for openness, pluralism, a market economy and

Mr. KOHL (Cont'd)

private initiative and particularly for respect for human rights and dignity can rest assured that we not only take note of their openness but that we also respond to it. The success of these reforms is also a success for us and we should use every European forum and every organization of which we are members - and here I have in mind, in addition to the Alliance, the CSCE, the Council of Europe and the European community - in order to make it clear to those countries our objective must be a Europe whole and free. And this Europe can also be a continent with substantially reduced forces.

Through the decisions it is taking today our Alliance is responding to this task as well. We are preparing the way for the conclusion of an initial agreement on conventional forces in Europe before the end of this year. In Vienna the Federal Government will be willing to negotiate on the level of forces to be maintained by a united Germany. With our revised strategy and our clear arms control concept we are establishing a basis for further drastic cuts also in sub-strategic systems. The Federal Government - and I would like to underline this - therefore would hope, would welcome that with the signing of an agreement on conventional forces also nuclear artillery warheads in Europe would be reduced to zero. That's on condition of Soviet reciprocity of course.

By his decision to renounce modernisation of short-range nuclear missiles and artillery shells, President Bush has made an important step in this direction.

I would also like to welcome the declared aim of President Bush and President Gorbachev to conclude a START Agreement before the end of 1990 on reducing strategic weapons on both sides. That agreement is in Europe's fundamental interest, for without stability in the field of strategic nuclear weapons at a lower level, no new stable security structures can be built in Europe.

We also welcome the agreement of President Bush and President Gorbachev for agreeing to stop immediately the production of chemical weapons. By this step they have provided a strong incentive for an overdue global ban on chemical weapons.

Mr. KOHL (Cont'd)

The withdrawal of all chemical weapons from the Federal Republic of Germany, an operation which is to begin in the next few weeks, represents another Western Alliance advance concession to which the other side should respond in like manner, and we should point this out time and again.

Dear colleagues, the message we intend to send out from London is:

- We are together building the firm foundations for a European security architecture which guarantees everyone's security through mutual co-operation, not opposition.
- We are strengthening the transatlantic bridge and at the same time constructing a new and strong archway across the division of Europe and the division of Germany.
- We are shaping Europe's future in a way that will guarantee everyone's freedom, security and human rights, a Europe whose doors will be finally open for peaceful exchange.

I think we are nearing the end of the century - a century which saw a lot of wars and distress and despair. I hope that our vision of a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe can now become reality - also by our sending out the necessary message here from this meeting.

Mr. WÖRNER

I call on the Portuguese Prime Minister CAVACO SILVA.

Mr. CAVACO SILVA

For the last forty years, the European Continent has enjoyed peace. This is an achievement of the West. It results from a clear assessment of the nature of the threat we were facing, and from the coherent and adequate set of security requirements that were formulated and implemented.

For half a century we lived in a world in which political and military equilibrium was based on the existence of two antagonistic blocks, profoundly wedged by ideological differences. This was a rigid but predictable setting.

Mr. CAVACO SILVA (Cont'd)

We are now at the end of the post-war era, and we are faced with a far more complex reality, in which co-operation, based on common ideals, is taking the place of confrontation.

Nevertheless, the framework of this new relationship is not yet clearly defined.

History is moving fast and each day we are getting closer to a new european order.

The building of this new Europe ought to be based on several elements, namely the new dynamics of the European Communities, the deepening of the North-South dialogue, and surely the definition of new concepts of security shared by all Europeans.

We should adapt and therefore reformulate our concept of security. Yet while developing a new security concept, we should preserve the structures that guaranteed peace for over 40 years.

The essential transatlantic link has been the basic element of our security and of our success. It must therefore continue to be the mainstay of our organization. On the other hand, a new relationship with Central and Eastern European Countries must now be built upon political and economical considerations. We should, therefore, pursue our contacts with the new democracies of the East, aiming at a closer and more cooperative relationship based on freedom, the respect of human rights and free market economy.

This must be one of the new aims of the Atlantic Alliance, although certainly not the only one.

NATO's rôle as a unique political forum where these issues can be discussed among North American and European Allies remains fundamental.

The transatlantic link it provides must continue to reflect our common choices.

Portugal welcomes the positive ideas put forward by the President of the United States in the letter addressed to the Allies.

Mr. CAVACO SILVA (Cont'd)

The Alliance is facing crucial decisions. Concrete steps must now be taken to define the basis upon which a new Europe will build its common future in peace and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, the common Declaration we shall adopt must convey a clear and direct message both to Western and Eastern public opinions. I believe that there are essential questions that should be stressed during this Summit. On the one hand, the presence in NATO of unified Germany, which is our common position. On the other hand, I believe that Atlantic cohesion implies the continued presence of North American forces in Europe. NATO remains fundamental for the preservation of stability and security in the whole of Europe. I think that an increased co-operation with Central and Eastern European countries is consistent with inter-ally cohesion.

By the way, I welcome the suggestion put forward by President Bush of inviting President Gorbachev to address the North Atlantic Council.

Of importance is the review of our military strategy. It is an urgent and substantial task. It will imply profound changes on issues that have been the backbone of this Alliance. We should not however prejudge the outcome of ongoing reviews.

When we started negotiating in Vienna the CFE mandate three years ago, our main goal was to achieve conventional stability between East and West, in what was then a rigid background.

Negotiations seem to be proceeding slowly in spite of our efforts. We must strive, nevertheless, to obtain the signature of a satisfactory CFE agreement by the Fall. I regard the CSCE process as one of the most important fora to discuss and further elaborate new relations in our Continent.

The Helsinki process must be given a stronger rôle. It is absolutely essential to preserve in the future its unique characteristics namely its flexibility and the concept of balance and complementarity between all its areas. This requires a thorough evaluation of the ideas now being put forward on this matter.

Mr. CAVACO SILVA (Cont'd)

Regarding the specific outcome of the Paris Summit, we consider that it should include the signature of a CFE agreement, and that new commitments on the rule of law, free elections and the development of market economies as agreed in the Copenhagen and Bonn Conferences must be endorsed and where possible, expanded.

I agree with the need and urgency of the institutionalisation of the CSCE process. Its implementation, however, requires a gradual and progressive approach and should bear in mind the important rôle of a number of existing organizations with significant experience in many of the CSCE areas, such as the Council of Europe and the OECD.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this London Summit is an historic landmark for the future of our peoples. Portugal is proud of being a founding member of NATO. And once again in a time of challenge, we are fully determined to bring our contribution to the Alliance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

M. WÖRNER

Je donne la parole au premier ministre d'Italie, M. Andreotti.

M. ANDREOTTI

Il s'agit d'adapter les objectifs de l'Alliance à la nouvelle réalité internationale. L'adaptation ne peut attendre, car les événements se succèdent rapidement et le phénomène central de la nouvelle organisation du continent, le processus de réunification de l'Allemagne, se développe avec une accélération constante et nécessite la création de structures capables de renforcer, comme vient de le dire le chancelier Kohl, la stabilité.

Le message devra définir le rôle que nous voulons jouer en Europe et les changements que nous nous préparons à introduire dans l'Alliance.

Cela, bien entendu, ne signifie pas du tout renier ou jeter un regard critique sur le passé. Au contraire, il s'agit de redéfinir les tâches de l'OTAN de manière à ce qu'elle devienne le pivot du nouveau système de sécurité qui se dessine en Europe.

A mon avis, les deux piliers traditionnels de la doctrine Harmel, qui nous a si bien servi pendant les 23 années qui ont suivi sa

M. ANDREOTTI (Suite)

conception, devront être adaptés : "sécurité et dialogue" deviendront "sécurité et coopération". Je suis convaincu que, de cette manière, nous pourrons sauvegarder les tâches traditionnelles auxquelles l'OTAN ne doit pas renoncer, c'est-à-dire la garantie de notre sécurité et du lien transatlantique, tout en projetant l'Alliance dans une nouvelle réalité en tant qu'axe porteur d'un système d'institutions complémentaires qui garantiront la sécurité et la stabilité à une époque où la confrontation entre les blocs est dépassée.

Je crois aussi que, pour identifier la ligne directrice de notre action future, il suffit de relire l'article II de notre traité, dont je voudrais citer un extrait : "Les Parties contribueront au développement de relations internationales pacifiques et amicales, en renforçant leurs libres institutions, en assurant une meilleure compréhension des principes sur lesquels ces institutions sont fondées et en développant les conditions propres à assurer la stabilité et le bien-être."

Cette citation témoigne que ce ne sont pas seulement les intérêts liés à la sécurité qui nous ont unis jusqu'ici. Nous avons représenté et continuons à représenter une communauté solidaire aux niveaux politique, économique, culturel et scientifique. Si nous sommes aujourd'hui les points de référence des pays de l'Est, c'est aussi grâce à cette caractéristique, que nous devons jalousement sauvegarder.

Dans le cadre de l'article II, la troisième dimension acquiert une importance particulière, surtout en ce moment où nous sommes à la recherche de voies nouvelles pour l'Alliance. Il serait erroné de croire que la troisième dimension, preuve de notre solidarité et instrument de collaboration avec les pays de l'Est, perdrait de l'importance à la suite des changements dans les circonstances politiques générales. Bien au contraire, elle reste intacte et, à la lumière des nouvelles possibilités, doit être encouragée.

Des problèmes immenses troublent aujourd'hui la sensibilité de l'humanité tout entière. Nous devons favoriser un grand dessein, qui est celui de la science au service de l'homme. L'OTAN, dans le domaine de la collaboration scientifique, doit donner sa contribution aux recherches sur les grands problèmes qui, faute d'une solution, risquent de rendre notre planète invivable à une échéance rapprochée. Je pense, par exemple, aux conséquences des changements climatiques et au rétrécissement de la couche d'ozone. A cet égard, le Comité de l'OTAN sur les défis de la société moderne peut jouer un rôle très efficace.

M. ANDREOTTI (Suite)

Contribuer à créer une structure paneuropéenne et à lui servir de support constitue le contenu principal du rôle politique que l'OTAN est dorénavant appelée à jouer. Si nous admettons qu'il existe un véritable risque que l'Union soviétique, ainsi que les autres pays du Pacte de Varsovie, se sentent marginalisés, notre rôle consiste alors à les rassurer et à les intégrer dans un système de stabilité.

L'instrument le plus efficace à cette fin - et le terrain sur lequel l'OTAN est appelée à jouer son rôle politique le plus important - est représenté par le processus CSCE, dont les Etats-Unis et le Canada sont une partie essentielle. Depuis longtemps, nous sommes conscients de ce que la CSCE peut faire pour surmonter la division de l'Europe. Nous pouvons nous réjouir de notre prévoyance. Il s'agit à présent d'aller plus loin, d'exploiter toutes les potentialités, et de renforcer et rendre plus contraignants les principes d'Helsinki. La CSCE doit jouer un rôle complémentaire - mais pas du tout substitutif - à notre Alliance, un rôle analogue à celui des Communautés européennes et du Conseil de l'Europe, en tant que pierre angulaire du nouveau système européen. Il faut attribuer à ce processus un degré incisif d'institutionnalisation, afin d'en faire aussi un moyen efficace de liaison avec l'Union soviétique et les autres pays du Pacte de Varsovie. Dans cette perspective, nous souhaitons l'institution rapide de mécanismes de consultation politique et de solution des crises, ainsi que de systèmes de contrôle, de vérification et de transparence.

Dans ce même contexte, nous devons exprimer notre disponibilité à chercher des ententes entre l'OTAN et les pays membres du Pacte de Varsovie, y compris l'Union soviétique. Il sera certainement possible de trouver une formulation qui évite la légitimation du bloc de l'Est contre la volonté de ses membres actuels.

La stabilité de l'Europe dépendra dans une large mesure d'une solution satisfaisante des aspects de sécurité liés à l'unification allemande. La fin de la division de l'Allemagne a toujours été un des objectifs de notre Alliance, dès l'accession de Bonn au sein de l'OTAN et nous devons être satisfaits qu'elle soit désormais en train de se réaliser rapidement. Certes, nous avons parcouru une bonne partie du chemin. Je me souviens que, lors des Jeux Olympiques de Rome en 1960, nous avons obtenu la participation d'une seule équipe pour les deux Républiques allemandes. Cet épisode, dans le climat de l'époque, eut des répercussions considérables. Trente ans après, nous sommes à la veille de l'unification du pays dans un contexte européen et mondial tout à

M. ANDREOTTI (Suite)

fait différent. Nous sommes convaincus que l'appartenance de l'Allemagne à l'OTAN, à la CSCE et à la CEE constitue un facteur de stabilité essentiel. Aussi devons nous répéter que nous ne sommes pas à la recherche d'avantages unilatéraux et montrer une attitude ouverte pour un régime transitoire de sécurité des régions orientales de l'Allemagne, de nature à rassurer l'URSS et les autres pays de l'Europe du centre et de l'est.

Une des conditions essentielles, enfin, d'un nouveau système européen est de réaliser des progrès rapides dans le domaine du désarmement. Je suis convaincu qu'il faut faire les efforts nécessaires pour que la négociation CFE à Vienne aboutisse le plus tôt possible à un accord. Notre Sommet doit donner les impulsions et les orientations conceptuelles pour les étapes suivantes. Nous estimons qu'il faut prendre acte dès maintenant que la logique du processus de désarmement conventionnel, liée comme elle est aux développements du cadre politique européen, a subi des changements radicaux. Dans les prochaines étapes, il ne s'agira plus d'établir un équilibre entre blocs opposés. Il faudra au contraire promouvoir, avec la participation de tous les pays de la CSCE, y compris les neutres et non-alignés, une stabilité européenne mieux adaptée à l'esprit des temps. A notre avis, le Sommet CSCE de Paris devrait donner des indications claires sur les termes de référence d'une négociation de désarmement d'un type nouveau, destinée à inclure également des mesures de confiance et de transparence innovatrices et plus complexes. En attendant la définition du mandat de cette négociation à 35, ou plutôt à 34, les négociations nécessaires pour l'adaptation et le développement des acquis de l'accord de première phase devront continuer sans interruption sur la base du mandat actuel et avec la même participation. Quant aux SNF, nous estimons qu'il faut indiquer une disponibilité de l'OTAN à l'ouverture d'une négociation entre les Etats-Unis et l'Union soviétique dès qu'un premier accord CFE sera conclu. Nous devons aussi prévoir les mécanismes consultatifs interalliés pour définir la position américaine en vue de cette négociation. Le renforcement de la dimension politique, suivant les critères que je viens d'énoncer, devra être accompagné d'une indication précise de notre intention de réviser en même temps la stratégie militaire de l'OTAN.

Certains principes fondamentaux de notre sécurité, et en premier lieu celui d'un lien transatlantique solide, restent plus que jamais valables. A cet égard, il ne faut pas oublier que deux guerres mondiales ont éclaté principalement à cause d'une erreur de calcul quant à la crédibilité de l'engagement américain sur le continent. Il faut éviter à tout prix qu'une erreur de cette sorte puisse jamais se reproduire.

M. ANDREOTTI (Suite)

En même temps, nous ne pouvons pas nous soustraire à une révision courageuse et ouverte de notre doctrine militaire. La réflexion déjà engagée par nos ministres des Affaires étrangères et de la Défense devra indiquer clairement les adaptations que les nouvelles circonstances politiques et les développements de la maîtrise des armements imposent à la stratégie de la riposte flexible ainsi qu'à la défense de l'avant.

Une fois que le déséquilibre conventionnel aura été éliminé, le seuil du recours à l'arme nucléaire sera très considérablement relevé, et il éloignera également l'hypothèse du premier recours. De plus, les armes nucléaires, bien qu'indispensables pour le futur prévisible, seront limitées à la dimension stratégique et à celle de théâtre basée sur les avions, en devenant vraiment un instrument de dernier recours.

Ce réexamen doit être fait rapidement et dans un esprit de grande ouverture. Je suis sûr que nos ministres des Affaires étrangères seront à même de nous présenter, à notre prochain sommet, un rapport sur les conclusions de ce processus de révision.

Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Mr. WÖRNER

Merci, Monsieur le Ministre. And I call now on the Canadian Prime Minister, Mulroney.

Mr. MULRONEY

Mr. Chairman, I want first to thank Mrs. Thatcher for her generous hospitality, her contribution to the leadership of this Alliance over the last decade has been crucial. Our meeting today will signal to the leadership of the Soviet Union that our Alliance is a force for positive and co-operative change in Europe. We need to show our people and the publics of the Soviet Union and other countries that we are making a choice in favour of openness and confidence, and I believe that these publics now need and seek assurances that we are putting our energies into the design of the architecture of a dynamic and pluralistic Europe and Atlantic community. Clearly the principal changes in our world have emanated from President Gorbachev's Soviet Union, but our Summit is broader than how we respond to Mr. Gorbachev, it's about the foundations in Europe and North America for a just and a lasting peace. I think our chances will be stronger if the very

Mr. MULRONEY (Cont'd)

dramatic and difficult process of democratic and economic reform in the Soviet Union succeeds, but whatever eventually happens inside the Soviet Union, we must now respond in substance to their external security preoccupations without, of course, giving them any needless leverage over our own choices about our own security. So I think, Mr. Chairman, I share the view of the Prime Minister of Portugal, who has just indicated that, in his judgment, this Summit is historic, because it seeks a new partnership.

The respective conversations of many of us with President Gorbachev in the last several weeks all reveal that the Soviet leadership clearly resents appearing to be victims of a process of change that they themselves have ironically unleashed. In my own meeting with President Gorbachev, in his comments on a united Germany entering NATO, he kept referring to the risk that NATO would, with the presence of a united powerful Germany, become the only instrument of, and this is his word, of hegemony in Europe, and he referred to political, economic and military strength from the Atlantic to the Soviet Union and this was his constant refrain during his conversation. So I think that the Soviet Union has a serious problem about accepting an image, as I suppose we all would, as losers; and what concerns the Soviets is certainly not Germany as such. That was not my impression. It's really about the decline of the Soviet Union and about pointing the way to get out of that decline, which is going to be very very tough and about not making it tougher by the kinds of signals that we send out from this meeting. I thought that the German issue has much to do with the psychology of Soviet self-perception. In two and a half or three hours I had difficulty getting a word in edgewise with President Gorbachev, so intense was he on this question prior to his meeting with President Bush and I really thought that it had a lot to do with his own internal problems as is now becoming quite clear. So I think that we should assist them because the alternative is a Soviet Union in isolation, whoever the leaders, and that is asking for difficulty and unpredictability. I have sometimes wondered what would happen if fifteen years ago somebody had knocked on the door of NATO and said "By the way, we have a fellow here that we could bring on in the Soviet Union who is going to let the Empire go without a shot, who is going to sit idly by and watch the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, who is going to be engaged in constructive discussions with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the President of the United States and many others in terms of trade and development and there is going to be some cost for NATO. And what are you going to do about it? And my guess is that, fifteen years ago, the Prime Minister of Canada would have said "Well, how much do you want? Where do I sign?" because that would have saved

Mr. MULRONEY (Cont'd)

an enormous amount of money and saved us from a great deal of peril. So I think that because we see the Soviet Union apparently on its knees, it shouldn't diminish the importance of a mature and thoughtful response from NATO to what is clearly a very difficult situation. That's why I favour proposals that have been made by many of you to engage the Soviets in a process of dialogue with our Alliance as well as with our individual countries. By all means, let's invite the Soviet President to address NATO; let's accredit the Central and Eastern European countries to our Alliance. We should seek common political and security declarations with the Soviet Union and other countries, beginning a process which can in turn be enveloped later in the wider format of the CSCE. I agree with the view that the statement, Mr. Chairman, that emanates from here should be punchy, direct; it should have some sex appeal, it should make a statement to people who seek to understand what our response is going to be. Let's move on some of these things now. Our purpose here is eminently political. This is where the democracies of North America and Western Europe have, in the past, come together and shared interests. We have concerns and interests and viewpoints in common. And one of them is how to reach out in negotiation and in the building of new institutions. The years ahead will be unpredictable. One had only to watch on the BBC last night the reports from the Soviet Union about the problems that Mr. Gorbachev has with his Party Congress; I felt better already. When you see the enormous problems that he has, that made me feel better! But our need to consult those leaders and those governments will be greater and not less and our consultations should be genuine and that's why, Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, I think this is historic. Mrs. Thatcher referred to something that she had gone through before coming here today. For a very special reason I have gone through the memoirs of Lester Pearson because of Article 2 of this Charter. I have gone through it and I found this, that may interest you. This is Mr. Pearson talking about Dean Acheson and he said in his memoirs: "when I once suggested to Dean Acheson that the other members of the Atlantic Alliance should have been consulted before a certain American decision was made final since it was of great importance to them, Acheson exploded: "If you think, after the agonies of consultation that we have gone through here to get agreement on this matter, that we're going to start all over again with our NATO Allies, especially with you moralistic, interfering Canadians, then you're crazy." I read it and I said "thank God" for Jim Baker. Real consultation on security matters of great consequence is in itself a force for greater stability.

The Prime Minister of Italy has referred to Article 2 of our Charter; I won't read it again, but it's key to our discussions here

Mr. MULRONEY (Cont'd)

today. Article 2 was intended to give NATO a mandate which is broader than purely military and, if I may say so, it was in some substantial way a Canadian proposal. Mr. Pearson, Mr. Saint Laurent were in a large measure responsible for the inclusion of that in the Charter and I can tell you that that happened in an election year in Canada and so it became a public issue and received broad support. In his first speech to the House of Commons on this, Mr. Pearson said: "In the past, alliances and leagues have been formed to meet emergencies and have been dissolved as the emergency vanished. It must not be so this time with NATO. Our Atlantic union must have a deeper meaning and deeper roots. It must create conditions for a kind of co-operation which goes beyond the immediate emergency. Threats to peace may bring our Atlantic pact into existence; its contribution to welfare and progress may determine how long it is going to survive." That was the Canadian view about forty-one years ago and it's the Canadian view today. So we have to work to understand the political landscape which is shifting so dramatically under our feet every day.

In the context ahead of us today, great expectations are placed in the CSCE; perhaps the expectations are too great - I don't know. But I can tell you that in Canada the expectations are very considerable.

L'OTAN et la CSCE sont des organes qui se complètent tout à fait naturellement, bien qu'ils répondent chacun à des faits et à des besoins tout à fait particuliers. La CSCE engage la participation de la totalité des Etats en Europe et s'intéresse à toutes les questions qui définissent le concept de sécurité, et peut par conséquent oeuvrer pour la sécurité dans toutes ses formes. Nous recommandons d'entreprendre dès maintenant la négociation de certaines initiatives afin qu'elles puissent être adoptées au sommet de la CSCE en novembre ou décembre prochain, par exemple, le Président des Etats-Unis et d'autres, comme le Président de la République, ont mentionné un Centre pour la prévention et le règlement des conflits, un Centre pour la coordination des techniques de vérification, une entente sur la tenue de réunions régulières de la CSCE au niveau politique, une structure exécutive permanente de la CSCE, un mécanisme de surveillance des élections, et un mécanisme d'échanges interparlementaires. Notre déclaration, Monsieur le Président, devrait entériner des idées qui soient de nature à donner un élan au processus.

Mr. MULRONEY (Suite)

We would also stress our wish to rely in the CSCE on the G24 the OECD and the EDRD among others, not just for their expertise but for their membership which, Mr. Chairman, includes the Japanese. The Japanese want to be engaged in international peace and security, they send out signals in this regard and we share the view of others that this readiness should be reinforced in some measure by our welcome. At its base NATO was a military alliance. Even if we no longer appear to have an aggressive adversary, as Mrs. Thatcher has pointed out we still have to remain extremely vigilant. Alliance security will continue to depend on maintaining an appropriate mix of conventional and nuclear forces in Europe. We can, however, decide now to remove nuclear artillery from Europe on the departure of Soviet Forces from Eastern Europe which should occur soon thereafter. We should confirm our willingness to negotiate the reduction, even the elimination, of NATO's land-based SNF weapons upon signature of a CFE Agreement. As to nuclear strategy, I agree with President Bush on the issue of last resort. Of course nuclear weapons are a last resort and we should say so, with some emphasis. We can do this now that there is a balance emerging in conventional force deployment, although I acknowledge that there are arguments about the extent and reality of that true balance. That is another reason we want a CFE agreement this year. As regards troop levels in central Europe, NATO's commitment to reduce those levels without singularising Germany should be made clear as soon as possible. This is particularly important in order to wrap up the issue of German unification. The unification of Germany will have an enormous and beneficial impact on the European scene. This is one of the great achievements of modern history and Chancellor Kohl and his colleagues deserve genuine commendation for what they have brought about.

Finally, since we are speaking of confidence, I hope you won't forget the good work that many of the Foreign Ministers around this table began on "Open Skies" in Ottawa. The process is underway to move us towards an agreement this autumn. Our Declaration should make clear our commitment in this regard.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our central message is outward-looking. In principle, the Soviet Union should be able to view our Alliance of countries in the same positive spirit that it now apparently views each of us. There should be no losers in the statement that will emanate from here, but only winners in the new partnership that we are beginning to forge. This message needs to be unequivocal and clear in its transmission. How we deliver is in many ways as important as the

Mr. MULRONEY (Suite)

substance it contains. This is not the time for triumphalism; it is the time for constructive change. NATO itself is the triumph of free nations with democratic institutions seeking peace with the strength and resolve to protect our fundamental values. But this meeting in London can send out the clear message that one era has indeed ended and that another perhaps more promising has just begun and that our fundamental values endure, together with the need to advance them together as we have done so successfully now over 40 years.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WÖRNER

Thank you very much. I heard you quote all the qualifications which our Declaration should have, especially sex appeal. I saw some faces of the Foreign Ministers knowing that they have a task in front of them.

Mr. MULRONEY

Mr. Chairman I just meant political sex appeal.

Mr. WÖRNER

May I call on the Spanish Prime Minister Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. GONZALEZ

Everyone's eyes are focussed on our meeting and we have to answer this tremendous concern with a message which will demonstrate our confidence that this Summit will signal the end of 50 years of confrontation. We should also strive to retain security. In the Summit we had one year ago our goal was to have balance at the lowest possible level; now after the democratic revolution in the East, which was strengthened by Perestroïka, this resolution is not enough. We foresee the true possibility of constructing a new framework for security based on co-operation. Political events on our continent are moving faster than the military changes of the cold war. The tremendous radical changes that have taken place are undermining the credibility of some of these structures, and we must reach the proper conclusions with a view to the future. The situation in Europe, the slow recovery their sovereignty and freedom by the countries of Eastern and Central Europe now providing the basis for the peaceful and durable situation which we in NATO have been hoping for the past 40 years. The menace which the

Mr. GONZALEZ (Cont'd)

Warsaw Pact represented is beginning to disappear, and at the same time we have a growth of security and stability in Europe. This process will be strengthened after the meeting in Vienna on Conventional Forces which we hope will convene very soon.

We have a vision of an undivided continent in which armed forces exist only to avoid war and to guarantee legitimate defence. In this context all European countries, including the Soviet Union, together with the United States and Canada must contribute to a new peaceful order; for there to be a lasting peace we must all work together, no-one should remain on the fringes. All legitimate interests should be kept in mind - this is the only way in which we will be able to create a stable framework. In view of these changes we have decided to change our strategy; we have new ideas such as proportional response, reducing forward defence, reducing nuclear weapons to the maximum extent possible. However, we must ask ourselves if this is really enough. Are we going to meet the needs of a new peace in Europe if our Alliance talks only about changing its forces? Our Alliance is a defensive one but it was born during the cold war. I believe that while the Warsaw Pact has begun a process of dismantlement, the Atlantic Alliance should begin a process of recomposition; of course this means a deep-seated change. We must avoid being seen by Moscow as increasing Soviet feelings of isolation. We must be seen as acting for stability. The Soviet Union is going to continue to be an overpowering continental mass, but we cannot criticise her for this; nor should this be a reason to perpetuate our present defensive structures without having the proper type of change. It is up to the CSCE to create the new framework for stability in progress.

Unless we have a pan-European structure it is up to the CSCE to fill this void and to have the proper mechanisms which must be decided upon by common accord. Obviously it is up to the CSCE to create objective conditions for peace and stability in Europe and which will guarantee the stability and peace of those countries. We will only have a consolidation of democracy and respect of human rights, mutual confidence and well-being of their people. In the recent Dublin declaration 11 of the 16 countries present at this meeting agreed that in a time when Europe is trying to overcome its divisions, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is a framework for security and also a way of strengthening the changes and the reforms which have been started. We also stress the overall process of the CSCE and the link which exists between the countries of Europe, the United States and Canada. If the Conference on Security and Co-operation cannot replace NATO, at the same time we cannot in NATO assume the rôle of

Mr. GONZALEZ (Cont'd)

guaranteeing stability on the entire continent; the remaining European countries will continue to see NATO as a military alliance. NATO must evolve and it must look back to its origins. It is a defensive alliance of free and democratic nations on both sides of the Atlantic which is adapting to new European reality.

We also have to study the Washington Treaty and give it its full significance. We must ask ourselves if those structures which were created after 1949 and which were the proper response to the conditions at that time are still in force and which are still compatible to a radically different Europe.

We must anticipate what looks like is going to happen. We expect that there will be a reduction in the presence of the United States and Canada in Europe although their presence is still crucial, and we also must strengthen the Alliance on this side of the Atlantic, shouldering greater responsibilities. In this scene the European Community has a decisive rôle, both with regard to the security and trade and it is a privileged spokesman for all our allies on the other side of the Atlantic. We have to strengthen our debates within the NATO framework. However, we must be on guard so that no-one will see these debates, these conferences, as an increase of threat; NATO is a formidable military machine and it is seen as such; its responsibilities are clearly limited. We must strengthen our talks within this framework and we must have as a guideline a transmission of serenity and peace.

The German Unification has been a catalyser for the creation of Europe. We have new challenges in Europe which should help us to have a new European scheme with transatlantic dialogue which will help us shape the new situation which has evolved and which should tend at all times to co-operation. I think our German friend said that it has always been difficult to put a straightjacket on history. We should not fall into this trap, which obviously is going to fail. We should, on the other hand, face a new chapter of our common history which should be marked by flexibility and innovation. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WÖRNER

I pass the floor now to the Greek Prime Minister, Mr. Mitsotakis, and welcome him with all my heart because it is the first time he is participating in the NATO Summit of Heads of State and Government.

M. MITSOTAKIS

Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le président. La réunion au sommet de notre Alliance n'aurait pas pu se tenir à un moment plus approprié. En effet, devant une situation qui évolue très rapidement dans une Europe dont l'image actuelle aurait été impensable il y a à peine un an, nous sommes appelés à préciser notre concept de ce que sera l'OTAN dans l'avenir. En même temps, nous devons établir nos priorités face au nouvel environnement européen qui voit la coopération se substituer à la confrontation. Nous avons maintenant tous besoin d'une Europe unie, d'une Europe fondée sur des valeurs politiques, économiques et morales que nous avons partagées et défendues durant les 40 dernières années.

Plusieurs facteurs seront décisifs dans l'établissement du nouvel ordre européen de paix et de sécurité, notamment l'intégration économique et politique de la Communauté européenne, la réussite des réformes en Union soviétique, avec toutes les incertitudes que ce processus comporte, le succès des mesures adoptées par les pays d'Europe centrale et orientale pour aboutir à un pluralisme politique et économique, et, bien entendu, l'unification de l'Allemagne.

Dans ce nouvel ordre, l'Alliance restera le noyau de notre sécurité. Tout en se renouvelant pour s'adapter aux réalités de l'Europe d'aujourd'hui, l'OTAN devra coopérer avec d'autres institutions européennes.

C'est ainsi que l'Alliance évolue dans le temps et avec le temps. C'est ainsi qu'elle peut faire preuve de son habileté à gérer les changements. Dans la recherche d'un cadre valable pour le maintien de la paix et de la sécurité, nous devons nous assurer que tous les pays, grands ou petits, se sentent à l'abri d'une menace ou d'un conflit. Tandis que les dangers du passé sont en train de disparaître, nous devons tourner notre attention du côté des défis qui pourraient émaner de l'instabilité potentielle et des inconnues découlant des changements politiques, militaires, économiques et sociaux en Europe centrale et orientale.

L'unification allemande est au centre des événements qui amènent à redéfinir l'architecture politique de l'Europe. Elle scelle la fin de la division de l'Europe de l'après-guerre. En effet, comme le Rapport Harmel le soulignait en son temps, aucun règlement définitif et stable en Europe n'aurait été possible sans une solution de la question allemande. Je voudrais souligner une fois encore que mon gouvernement suit de très près les efforts de la République fédérale - et plus particulièrement l'attachement personnel du chancelier Helmut Kohl et du ministre des affaires étrangères Hans-Dietrich Genscher au processus de

M. MITSOTAKIS (Suite)

la réunification. A plusieurs reprises nous avons exprimé notre conviction qu'une Allemagne unie, dont la souveraineté ne saurait connaître aucune limitation, doit être membre de l'OTAN. Ceci en tenant compte des intérêts légitimes de l'Union soviétique qui doit obtenir des garanties valables de sécurité.

Le processus de la CSCE offre le cadre dans lequel une nouvelle structure de paix et de sécurité européenne peut trouver son expression. Au sein de la CSCE on peut créer la confiance et promouvoir la coopération; mais celle-ci ne pourrait pas se substituer à l'Alliance atlantique qui garantit les liens transatlantiques avec les démocraties de l'Amérique du Nord, le rôle de la CSCE n'étant que complémentaire. Le Sommet de la CSCE vers la fin de l'année, sommet qui se trouve lié au succès d'un accord sur les forces conventionnelles en Europe ainsi qu'à la conclusion des pourparlers "2+4" relatifs à l'unification de l'Allemagne, définira le rôle de la CSCE dans l'établissement du nouvel ordre européen. En même temps, le Sommet consacrera à nouveau les principes qui régissent les relations entre les Etats, ce qui, à son tour, doit avoir une incidence positive sur la résolution des problèmes internationaux qui sont depuis longtemps en suspens dans notre région.

Nous sommes favorables à ce que la CSCE puisse acquérir des structures institutionnelles, tout en soulignant que l'introduction de telles structures ne doit pas priver la CSCE de la flexibilité qui a toujours été un des grands mérites du processus d'Helsinki. Nous sommes d'avis qu'une procédure de consultation permanente entre les 35 Etats permettra à la CSCE d'aborder tous les problèmes qui affectent ses Etats membres. Un Centre pour la prévention des conflits peut apporter une contribution très valable au maintien du nouvel ordre de paix et de sécurité que nous nous proposons de créer. La dimension parlementaire, au sein de la CSCE, mérite aussi notre attention. Ce qu'à notre avis nous devons éviter, c'est la prolifération d'institutions à double emploi. La tâche historique qui nous incombe exige la clarté. L'Europe restructurée doit s'appuyer sur des fondements solides.

En ce qui concerne la réduction des armes conventionnelles, la Grèce estime que le traité FCE doit préserver et raffermir la stabilité et maintenir une sécurité non diminuée pour tous et chacun de nous, grâce à l'établissement d'un équilibre des forces au niveau le plus bas dans toutes les régions. En effet, la vraie et durable sécurité en Europe sera mieux assurée à travers une reconnaissance et une compréhension mutuelles des intérêts légitimes de sécurité de tous et de chacun des Etats. La conclusion du traité FCE ouvrira la voie, dans un stade ultérieur, à l'élaboration du mandat et des objectifs pour la

M. MITSOTAKIS (Cont'd)

continuation à 35 des négociations sur le désarmement conventionnel et les mesures de confiance.

Monsieur le Président, la proposition des Etats-Unis concernant la déclaration mutuelle de non-agression entre les pays membres de l'OTAN et ceux du Pacte de Varsovie, ainsi que celle destinée à inviter le Président de l'Union soviétique à s'adresser au Conseil de l'Atlantique Nord ont toute notre approbation. Comment pourrions-nous prouver d'une manière plus convaincante à nos peuples notre volonté de redéfinir le rôle de l'Alliance?

Quant à nous, Monsieur le Président, nous sommes prêts à participer à tout effort et à jouer une part active pour qu'un climat de sécurité et de confiance puisse être établi dans une Europe entière et libre.

Merci Monsieur le Président

Mr. WÖRNER

I think we have one more to speak before I break for lunch and I call on the Icelandic Prime Minister Mr. Hermannsson.

Mr. HERMANSSON

Mr. President, we can certainly look back over 41 years of NATO success and there might be every reason to celebrate. NATO has had a very important hand in the development in Europe. But I do not believe that the people in our countries are expecting such a message. I agree with those who have spoken around this table and stressed that our people are looking for a message illustrating that NATO is with this development and leading this development in many respects. You, Mr. President, spoke of a new Europe and you are quite right, we have a new Europe. We must have a new NATO. We must have a NATO taking leadership in development in Europe. We must have a NATO showing initiative in the many important fields taking part in Europe. We want a NATO building confidence among the people who are now meeting so freely across the borders, across the walls that before existed. We want a NATO with a strategy for peace. I believe that our people are looking for such a message, a forward-looking and a progressive message.

Mr. HERMANSSON (Cont'd)

I want to thank President BUSH for the draft that we have received. I find that draft actually in most respects in agreement with the vision that I have tried to illustrate.

I also want to thank Prime Minister Andreotti for his letter which I similarly found most encouraging. I agree with Prime Minister Andreotti we should indeed give a helping hand to a development taking place in Eastern Europe. I believe we can do it through co-operation in many different fields, in fields like science and technology, and I want to take this opportunity and remind all of us of the tremendous difficulties that we are all faced with in the field of environment. Possibly environment and the deterioration of our environment is the greatest threat that mankind is faced with today. Definitely we should offer co-operation to our foreign adversaries in this respect.

I do agree with the four concepts outlined by President Bush. I think it is very important to stress nuclear weapons as a last resort and certainly, in my mind, that does not diminish the deterrent force of NATO.

I must, on the other hand, mention one area in which we in Iceland find missing in the US tract: there is no mention of naval forces. We strongly agree that we should continue immediately with CFE 2, but we do not agree this should be based on the same and unchanged mandate. We have often at these meetings, both myself and foreign ministers, spoken of the necessity of extending arms control to the naval forces. We have been told that this was not wise in this first stage in CFE 1 but we cannot frankly understand why this should not be included in CFE 2. It's a lack of confidence on our behalf. Shall we continue the arms race on the seas? I trust that no-one has that idea. We therefore very strongly urge that naval forces should be included in CFE 2. I trust that from this meeting will be coming a forward-looking message, a message that proves to our people that NATO shall continue to be a force for peace and freedom. Thank you Mr. President.

Mr. WÖRNER

I was indeed very much impressed and encouraged by the common spirit which dominated all contributions which I heard so far. We are confronted with high expectations as you all know, so we all hope that our foreign ministers, in their work, can meet the challenge ahead and with that in mind I will give you some technical indications.

Mr. WÖRNER (Cont'd)

I suggest we resume our discussion and hear other speakers at three o'clock this afternoon. Foreign ministers will meet at that time or if they decide even earlier, it is up to them, in the Music Room (which is also symbolic), to discuss the Summit declaration. You should be aware that there is limited space available in that room. We have been able to make arrangements for one plus four, one plus four, minister plus four per delegation, but unfortunately we are limited to that number.

Now before we go to lunch, I would like to ask the heads of State and Government to join me for the usual family portrait. Now due to bad weather the family portrait must be at the foot of the main staircase. Would all delegation leaders now please go to that point and may I ask all others to remain at the top of the staircase for a few minutes until the picture of all our beauties has been taken. Thank you and please join me going to the staircase.

* * *

Mr. WÖRNER

May I resume our meeting continuing our discussion of this morning and the next speaker on my list is the Danish Prime Minister, Mr. Schlüter. You have the floor:

Mr. SCHLÜTER

Thank you, Secretary General. We are all agreed that we have reached a historic moment for Europe and, of course, also for our Atlantic Alliance. The values we stand for and have defended have proven to be worth fighting for. Today everybody expects us to reconfirm these values and give a clear statement that we are ready to share these values with others.

A few days ago the process towards German unity reached a highlight. The economic, monetary and social union between the two German states entered into force. My country and my people welcomes and supports this development. A Germany unified in a democratic and peaceful way will play an important rôle in our common effort to bring about a just and stable order in Europe, whole and free.

The great changes in Eastern and Central Europe, the end of the cold war and the quick process towards German unity - these are all challenges to our Alliance. Also, under the changed conditions, we must convince the Soviet Union that we do not intend to neglect legitimate Soviet security interests. The Soviet Union will, one way or the other,

Mr. SCHLÜTER (Cont'd)

remain a great power whatever may happen, the Soviet Union must have an adequate rôle to play in a future European security structure and we must avoid that the Soviet Union feels marginalized. Vis-à-vis the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe the Alliance must be an element of stability and continue to support the reform process.

We must prove to our populations that the Alliance is needed also at a time when traditional enemy and threat perceptions are getting out of date. We must show that we have the will and the ability to make radical changes from confrontation to co-operation. Political solidarity based on the democratic values laid down in the North Atlantic Treaty, common efforts to maintain an adequate military defence and a constant readiness to enter into dialogue - those are the basic elements upon which the partnership in the Alliance between Europe and North America has worked.

All this background leads me to say we must send some very clear messages from this meeting. Firstly, to underline the comprehensive character of the assurances offered to the Soviet Union to make her accept continued German membership of the Alliance, be it in the form of a declaration between the member states of the Alliance and those of the Warsaw Pact or any other appropriate way. Secondly, to demonstrate our firm determination to conclude a comprehensive CFE Agreement later this year. Thirdly, to manifest our willingness to continue negotiations on confidence building and arms control leading to further agreements of mutual benefit.

Referring to the statement of my Icelandic colleague I wish to state that we also hope that there will be a possibility to expand the scope of future negotiations on confidence building and arms control to the maritime area. I would also like to stress that we welcome a development towards the reduction of our reliance on nuclear weapons. We also welcome reductions of the nuclear stockpiles in Europe and the prospects for negotiations on short-range nuclear weapons. We attach importance to the review of our strategy and its underlying concepts and doctrines, political and military developments call for such a review.

Finally, we wish to underline the great importance of the proposals to create new European security and co-operation mechanisms. We look forward to the CSCE Summit as an important event in the history of Europe. In this perspective the Paris Summit should confirm the momentous changes which have taken place in the situation in some CSCE states, as well as in the relations among all of those states. We look forward to the establishment of a comprehensive system of political

Mr. SCHLÜTER (Cont'd)

consultations on several levels serviced by an administrative secretariat. We have also an open mind on other proposals which are likely to strengthen security and co-operation in Europe as discussed at the European Council meeting in Dublin last week.

Mr. Secretary General, we have carefully studied the message we received from President Bush a few days ago. I also listened - we all did - with great interest to the interventions this morning by George Bush. We appreciate the initiatives to present us new ideas on the way ahead of the Alliance. We share the basic views expressed by President Bush and we hope to see many of the ideas incorporated into our Final Declaration.

In conclusion, I want to reconfirm to all our Allies that Denmark remains committed to close Alliance co-operation and consultation. The Alliance is a unique forum for transatlantic dialogue, a dialogue that has been and will remain vital to all of us. We feel confident that the message from this summit will demonstrate our openness and political vision with due regard to our common security. Thank you.

Mr. WÖRNER

Let me call now on the Belgian Prime Minister. Vous avez la parole, M. le Premier Ministre Martens.

M. MARTENS

Monsieur le Secrétaire général, mes chers collègues, tout d'abord je voudrais remercier Madame Thatcher pour l'accueil ici, à Londres, et pour le rôle qu'elle a joué avec son gouvernement dans l'Alliance pendant dix ans déjà.

Nous nous sommes réunis, mes chers collègues, il y a plus d'un an, pour adopter le Concept global et une déclaration dans laquelle l'Alliance se fixait comme objectif de prévenir la guerre et toute forme d'intimidation et d'établir un nouveau type de relations entre les pays de l'Est et de l'Ouest, dans lequel l'antagonisme idéologique et militaire céderait la place à la coopération, à la confiance et à l'émulation pacifique. Il est heureux de constater que nous avons réussi au-delà de tout espoir.

L'Europe s'est résolument engagée dans la voie de l'entente, et la démocratie s'est imposée par ses vertus même, malgré quelques

M. MARTENS (Suite)

zones d'ombre en Roumanie notamment. Ce que l'on appelait hier encore l'Europe de l'Est s'est résolument tournée vers celle de l'Ouest, dans laquelle elle voit un pôle naturel de stabilité et de développement. En Union soviétique les réformes sont engagées mais le poids des incertitudes se fait plus pesant. L'économie n'est plus que chaos et les forces centrifuges menacent directement l'Union. Monsieur Gorbatchev est confronté à une crise majeure et sa crédibilité est atteinte. L'Ouest veut sans aucun doute le succès de son entreprise mais l'aide que nous pouvons et que nous devons lui offrir a des limites; en l'octroyant, nous devons le savoir. Je crois que Monsieur Gorbatchev réussira ou perdra avant tout pour des raisons internes sur lesquelles nous n'avons individuellement et collectivement que peu de prise. Nous devons donc l'aider dans la mesure de nos moyens en défendant nos intérêts propres et en nous prémunissant contre les incertitudes. C'est finalement en assurant la stabilité en Europe que nous améliorerons les chances de la paix et celles des réformes, y compris en Union soviétique. Et dans cette phase critique que nous traversons ensemble, quelle doit être notre démarche?

C'est tout d'abord construire l'Europe, lui rendre son unité géographique, historique et culturelle. Le processus est en bonne voie, les résultats positifs de la réunion de Copenhague le démontrent.

Construire l'Europe c'est, avant tout, pour ceux qui sont engagés dans le processus d'intégration, aller vers une union européenne dotée aussi de compétences propres dans le domaine politique et en matière de sécurité. Construire la nouvelle Europe, c'est aussi assurer la place de l'Allemagne unifiée dans cette communauté et dans l'Alliance atlantique. Il n'y a pas d'autres solutions de stabilité, ni pour l'Europe, ni pour l'Union soviétique elle-même. Encore faudra-t-il veiller à maintenir les équilibres stratégiques en limitant les niveaux de forces en Europe sans pour autant singulariser qui que ce soit.

Construire l'Europe, c'est enfin garantir la sécurité de tous. Il faut jeter les bases d'une nouvelle stabilité politique et militaire. Il faut donc conclure, en vue du sommet de Paris, le traité CFE sur les forces conventionnelles. Ce traité est réellement le point de passage obligé de tout nouvel ordre de paix en Europe.

Mais il faut regarder déjà au-delà d'un traité CFE et préparer la poursuite du processus de désarmement en Europe en y associant cette fois tous les 35, selon des modalités à définir. Certes il ne s'agit pas, sans plus, de tourner la page du bloc à bloc dont, quoiqu'on veuille, l'accord CFE est toujours une émanation. Cette réalité est dans

M. MARTENS (Suite)

une certaine mesure appelée à se survivre lorsqu'il s'agira d'exécuter et si nécessaire d'adapter le traité conclu entre les 23. Mais ce n'est plus dans ce contexte que nous devons penser l'avenir, même s'il ne nous appartient pas de prononcer le décès du Pacte de Varsovie. Les intéressés s'en chargeront eux-mêmes d'autant plus qu'ils ont leurs doutes quant à la capacité du Pacte d'opérer une mutation politique.

Il n'y a évidemment, en dehors du contexte CFE, aucune symétrie possible entre le Pacte et l'Alliance atlantique, d'où les réticences que nous éprouvons vis-à-vis de tout dialogue institutionnalisé entre ces deux instances, à plus forte raison s'il devait être fondé sur une déclaration commune qui, d'une manière ou de l'autre, ne ferait pas partie de l'accord CFE.

Nous devons je crois, s'agissant de l'Union soviétique, dire clairement qu'elle a sa place dans le concert européen. Elle restera quoiqu'on veuille la principale puissance militaire du continent. Il n'est ni souhaitable ni raisonnable, ni même pensable de la maintenir dans une situation marginale. Ceci ne veut évidemment pas dire que l'Union soviétique, facteur important de la sécurité en Europe, doive aussi devenir un facteur inhérent du processus d'intégration en Europe. Elle ne pourrait y participer sans le dénaturer.

Tout ceci fait que le processus de la CSCE n'est déjà plus ce qu'il était. Il faut désormais jeter les bases d'une entente coopérative. C'est ce que nous ferons à Paris. Nous sommes d'ores et déjà d'accord sur un certain nombre de propositions à faire : réunions régulières des chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement, réunions régulières des ministres des affaires étrangères et de hauts fonctionnaires. Nous sommes mêmes d'accord de créer un secrétariat administratif léger.

Il faudra aussi mettre en place les mécanismes qui devront fonctionner dès 1991. Je songe en particulier à des procédures de règlement des conflits, en commençant par la conciliation. Je songe aussi à des mécanismes qui, dans le domaine de la sécurité, devraient selon nous être issus des propositions que nous avons faites dans le cadre des CSBM et des CFE. Ces mécanismes pourraient être rapidement opérationnels à Vienne, en ayant recours, ne fut-ce qu'à titre transitoire, à nos négociateurs sur place. Ceux-ci ont l'avantage d'être disponibles et experts dans les matières à traiter. De la sorte on pourrait éviter la prolifération des centres et donc des sièges. Il y aurait une localisation de fait à Vienne en attendant des décisions mieux informées à Helsinki en 1992.

M. MARTENS (Suite)

Je crois que l'Alliance est appelée à jouer à l'avenir un rôle important et nouveau, vu les changements profonds de l'environnement politico-militaire en Europe. Les Ministres des affaires étrangères, à Turnberry, ont lancé un processus de réévaluation touchant aux aspects externes et internes. Il est important que nous puissions confirmer maintenant que des changements profonds auront lieu et que nous ne les craignons pas. La défense de l'avant n'a déjà plus tout son sens; elle n'en aura plus aucun lorsque les forces de l'Union soviétique auront quitté l'Allemagne. De même dans le domaine de la stratégie nucléaire, la riposte flexible ne peut plus se résumer à une forme d'escalade, quand bien même dirait-on qu'elle est contrôlée.

Nous allons donc devoir progressivement développer de nouveaux concepts qui s'apparentent sans doute à la notion de dissuasion.

L'exercice est politique autant que militaire. Nous allons aussi devoir nous préparer sans tarder à la négociation SNF en chargeant un groupe d'étudier les modalités d'une négociation qui ne peut négliger les exigences d'une dissuasion crédible fondée sur une combinaison adéquate de moyens nucléaires et conventionnels, étant entendu qu'il y a place pour des réductions substantielles et, selon nous, pour l'élimination non seulement de l'artillerie nucléaire mais sans doute aussi des missiles SNF terrestres.

M. le Président, l'Alliance n'est pas seule à contribuer à l'avenir de l'Europe. Conformément au principe de la complémentarité, qui a déjà été expliqué ce matin, entre autres par le Président de la République française, l'évolution vers une union politique européenne et, partant, l'évolution vers une identité européenne en matière de sécurité et de défense, qui en fait partie intégrante, contribuera elle aussi à renforcer la solidarité atlantique et à établir une situation de paix et de sécurité durable sur notre continent.

Dans ce contexte, il importe de souligner que cette union politique européenne que les membres de la Communauté des Douze se sont engagés à réaliser - et le Conseil européen de Dublin en est un témoignage récent -, loin d'être un substitut, constitue au contraire un élément-clé de la solidarité atlantique.

Telle est, Monsieur le Président, la politique que la Belgique a constamment suivie et qu'elle est déterminée à défendre à l'avenir. Voici donc quelques considérations qui nous tiennent à coeur et dont je ne doute pas qu'elles occuperont nos délibérations dans les mois à venir, dans la perspective du Sommet de Paris et au-delà.

M. MARTENS (Suite)

Je vous remercie.

M. WÖRNER

Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Premier ministre.

Je passe la parole au Premier ministre du Luxembourg, Monsieur Santer.

M. SANTER

Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Permettez-moi tout d'abord de m'associer à mes collègues qui ont exprimé au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté, et en particulier à son Premier ministre, leur profonde reconnaissance pour le très chaleureux accueil qui nous a été réservé aujourd'hui.

La carte politique de l'Europe ne cesse de changer à une allure de plus en plus rapide. Depuis notre dernière rencontre à Bruxelles, il y a seulement treize mois, où nous avons adopté un document essentiel, à savoir notre "concept global" pour l'avenir, il nous faut remettre ce dernier sur le métier pour l'adapter aux circonstances nouvelles.

Notre doctrine militaire et la stratégie qui en est le support, nos méthodes de travail, bref les certitudes et habitudes qui furent les nôtres jusqu'à présent, doivent désormais être repensées. Dès aujourd'hui nous sommes engagés dans cet exercice de rénovation de notre Alliance. Ce faisant, nous gardons l'initiative dans la conduite des questions de sécurité en même temps que nous faisons preuve de notre dynamisme comme de notre disponibilité à innover.

Conçu avec discernement aux yeux de mon gouvernement, cet "aggiornamento" doit se faire à l'abri de toute pression, de toute idée préconçue. Comme toujours en pareille circonstance, c'est à partir de nos intérêts de sécurité que cette démarche sera entreprise. Mais, et c'est là l'élément novateur, en prenant aussi en compte les intérêts de sécurité de l'Europe centrale et de l'Est, et de l'URSS en particulier.

La proposition qui nous est faite par le président Bush d'en finir définitivement avec la guerre froide devrait par ailleurs se traduire par un vocabulaire nouveau où les notions traditionnelles de menace, d'ennemi, de bloc, n'ont plus leur place.

M. SANTER (Suite)

Mon gouvernement approuve par conséquent l'idée de conclure ce Sommet par l'adoption d'une déclaration solennelle, à travers laquelle nous confirmons vouloir régler tous les conflits par la négociation et renoncer à l'emploi de la force. Quant au contenu d'une telle déclaration, je me permets de mettre en évidence quelques axes prioritaires.

Premièrement, s'il est vrai que beaucoup de choses ont changé ces derniers mois, il reste que la géographie qui sous-tend notre organisation reste la même. Nous sommes séparés de nos amis américains par un océan. Avec une intégration de plus en plus poussée de nos économies de part et d'autre de l'Atlantique, débouchant sur une interdépendance croissante, la maîtrise des mers reste une donnée d'une importance fondamentale pour notre sécurité.

En second lieu, une présence militaire américaine effective déployée en Europe demeure indispensable. L'idée d'une intégration dans les forces multinationales telles que l'Allied Mobile Force, à laquelle participe mon pays, nous paraît la voie indiquée.

Troisièmement, avec une réduction substantielle des effectifs militaires stationnés sur l'ensemble du continent, l'importance de la mobilité et du renforcement rapide de ces forces stationnées devraient être au centre de nos préoccupations.

Sans remettre en cause, dans les présentes circonstances, le binôme armes conventionnelles et armes nucléaires pour assurer notre sécurité, je salue l'initiative du président Bush d'éliminer à terme l'ensemble de l'artillerie nucléaire du théâtre européen dès lors que le retrait des troupes soviétiques de l'Europe centrale sera assuré.

Il serait en effet incompréhensible pour nos opinions publiques que le désarmement nucléaire ne se réalise pas de manière synchrone avec la réduction des armes et des forces conventionnelles.

Et enfin, la précision apportée par le président Bush, que l'arme nucléaire est une arme de dernier recours, trouve notre appréciation.

Au-delà de ces aspects de sécurité, l'oeuvre de rénovation de notre Alliance doit déboucher sur une prise en compte des nouvelles réalités politiques en Europe. A côté de la révision de sa stratégie, et notamment de la "défense de l'avant", il nous faut insérer notre organisation dans le foisonnement des relations pan-européennes dont les contours se dessinent d'ores et déjà.

M. SANTER (Suite)

Comme précédemment, cette démarche vers la mise en place de structures de coopération en matière de sécurité à l'échelle de notre continent dans le cadre de la CSCE devrait s'articuler autour de quelques prémisses.

Premièrement, les futures structures de sécurité ne sauraient nous dispenser de l'existence de notre Alliance.

Deuxièmement, dans la mesure où le Pacte de Varsovie s'avère obsolète, il ne nous appartient pas de lui conférer une légitimité qu'une partie de ses membres lui refusent à présent. Ceci est essentiel dans le libellé de notre message qui sera publié à l'issue de cette réunion.

Troisièmement, les 35 pays membres de la CSCE doivent bénéficier d'une sécurité égale. Il ne doit pas y avoir de zone grise. Voilà pourquoi, à partir d'une position coordonnée entre nous, la deuxième phase de négociation sur le désarmement conventionnel devrait réunir les 35 pays membres du processus CSCE.

Quatrièmement, l'unité allemande, qui apparaît aujourd'hui le véritable vecteur de la liquidation des clivages et des divisions d'antan, doit se faire dans le respect de la pleine souveraineté de cette Allemagne, fermement ancrée dans notre Alliance.

Et enfin, cinquièmement, les nouvelles institutions communes de la sécurité dont nous approuvons la création, comme le centre de prévention des conflits, le centre de vérification, devront rester des instruments souples et non pas déboucher sur de nouvelles bureaucraties.

Notre premier objectif est de signaler à l'Union soviétique et aux pays d'Europe centrale et orientale notre volonté d'adapter notre dispositif militaire aux nouvelles réalités et de leur proposer des perspectives concrètes d'intégration dans le tissu à la fois politique, économique, culturel et social européen.

Et pour conclure dans cette perspective, mon pays, membre fondateur de cette Alliance, est convaincu que la sauvegarde de ses intérêts de sécurité comme des libertés fondamentales de ses citoyens sera assurée dans l'avenir comme elle l'a été au cours de ces quarante dernières années.

En agissant ainsi, ensemble et solidairement, les conditions sont également remplies pour l'émergence progressive d'une union

M. SANTER (Suite)

politique européenne qui, dans le partage équitable des rôles et des charges, est en mesure de fournir à notre édifice commun une base encore plus solide et plus durable.

M. WÖRNER

Je vous remercie.

Le prochain orateur sur nos listes, est le Premier ministre de la Norvège.

Prime minister, you have the floor.

Mr. SYSE

Mr. Chairman, I have always thought that the best eloquence is the one which gets things done. We all agree that the Alliance must be one of the main elements in the new European architecture, then it must also play a leading rôle in putting that architecture together. A major contribution has to come from this meeting. The draft statement from President Bush forms a promising basis for that contribution. It contains the kind of eloquence that gets things done. As we proceed, unpredictability will be a constant companion. That applies in particular to the situation in the Soviet Union. We must make it clear that we do want the Soviet Union firmly integrated in common structures of security and co-operation. These basic considerations must now be translated into concrete steps. For our meeting that means the following:

First, the Alliance should provide greater transparency with regard to its own activities, which for Soviet and East European leaders and neutral and non-aligned leaders for that matter would be a valuable confidence-building measure. Liaison officers would be a useful instrument. Such measures as suggested by President Bush would convey the image of an Alliance determined to provide stability, not only for its 16 members but for Europe as a whole, and would contribute to wide European acceptance of that rôle.

Second, the Alliance must demonstrate its willingness to adjust its strategy to changing political and military realities. I stress the word "realities". We must make sure that we are responding to real and not to hoped-for changes, and we must make sure that such adjustments lead to more security for each and every Ally. I agree with President Bush that we should seek a shift of emphasis towards making nuclear weapons weapons of last resort.

M. SYSE (Cont'd)

Third, we must declare our readiness to transform the CSCE from a process to a permanent framework by creating the first institutions and the machinery required for regular political dialogue. Such measures would hopefully bring us closer to a Soviet acceptance of vital Allied objectives.

Fourth and foremost, the NATO membership of a united Germany. Let me here express my admiration and full support to Chancellor Kohl for his truly historic efforts.

Change is nothing new to the Alliance. NATO has constantly evolved and must continue to do so. Our approach is totally different from that of Mr. Ligachev who, according to the Daily Telegraph this week, said in the Soviet Congress, "Why is there a severe lack of agricultural produce in the country, when the Party's agrarian policies are absolutely correct?". We must, however, all the time remember that the produce of NATO has been a total success. So, when we change the Alliance, it is in order to preserve it, to paraphrase the words of Edmond Burke.

There is today broad agreement that the political dimension of the Alliance must be further developed. This should be clearly expressed in our statement from this meeting. I should add that much has already been done in this respect.

As the political co-operation of the European Community also grows, we must ensure that the two organizations do not act as competitors, but as partners, supplementing each other. NATO must remain the principal forum for the trans-Atlantic dialogue, as Prime Minister Thatcher also emphasised.

There is a tendency to talk about the political/military dimensions of the Alliance as if they could be considered separately from each other. Such a view is simply incorrect. Political and military activities are interwoven: if we neglect the military dimension, the result may in fact be that the political dimension gradually also becomes weaker.

The military developments have not been equally positive in all parts of Europe. Undoubtedly, Norway benefits from the improved situation in Central Europe, but the military situation in our own area remains basically unchanged. Our present arrangements for support and reinforcement have not become less relevant, less important. They must be maintained. Furthermore, while the concept of forward defence will

Mr. SYSE (Cont'd)

clearly have to be adapted to changing circumstances, it is vitally important from the Norwegian point of view that we remain dedicated to the collective defence of all the territory of all the Alliance members. We should also avoid a situation where a withdrawal of forces from Central Europe leads to build-up in the north or in the south. This is a particular challenge to our Vienna negotiators. From our point of view it is also important that land-based naval aircraft are included in a CFE Treaty. They pose a serious threat to our lines of reinforcement. Setting them aside would create a serious potential for circumvention. We have already seen graphic proof of this. Thus, 40 Soviet Air Force fighter bombers have recently been redeployed from Hungary to the Kola Peninsula near the Norwegian border. Acceptance of the Soviet demand that land-based naval aircraft be excluded from a CFE Treaty would create a dangerous loophole.

A declaration on the relations between the members of the two Alliances could be an important means of making German NATO membership more palatable to the Soviets, but we must avoid treating the two Alliances as if they were equals. We must make sure that such an arrangement corresponds to the interests of our new partners in Central and Eastern Europe and finally a declaration should be open to accession by the NNAs.

Mr. Chairman, building a new European architecture cannot be a matter for the two Alliances alone. The neutral and non-aligned countries of Europe have to be involved. The CSE provides the framework for this involvement. Of course, the CSE cannot carry the burden of European security in the full sense. That can only be done by NATO. But the CSE will be an important vehicle for the construction of a new and stable European order. We support the elements listed by President Bush but another element is required. Meeting the environmental challenge will be a crucial part of our search for stability. The recent opinion poll in the Federal Republic, published in the last issue of the Economist, confirms that environmental pollution is considered to be by far the most serious problem confronting us, a regional environmental strategy is urgently required. But we lack the proper tools. A framework has to be established for the negotiations and the implementation of that strategy. The CSE should be used for that purpose in close co-operation with the ECE and with the newly-created European Environmental Agency. We also need a binding environmental code of conduct with provisions for exchange of information and for monitoring of trans-boundary environmental risks. Again the CSE should provide the framework.

Mr. SYSE (Cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, during another conference recently one delegate said we do not expect you to be heroic. We only expect you to be bold. That could also be said about our meeting. It is my hope that agreement can be reached which allows this boldness to be reflected in the declaration from this meeting. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WÖRNER

Thank you Prime Minister, and I call now upon the Turkish Prime Minister Mr. Akbulut.

Mr. AKBULUT

Mr. Secretary General, I would like to thank her Majesty's Government for the excellent organization of this Summit meeting. We have entered into an irrevocable process whereby values we have struggled for throughout the years will now prevail. Europe is undergoing a political and strategic change. The Berlin wall has crumbled and the two Germanys are on the eve of unification with the free will of their people. This phenomenon which will terminate the division of Europe that has lasted for the last 40 years presents an opportunity for the creation of a new Europe by those free countries which have thus far shared common values and have upheld co-operation over confrontation. By the same token the East European countries have expressed, after a long interval, their will to adopt a new way of life that is shaped by the common denominators of the Atlantic Alliance such as pluralistic democratic administration, supremacy of law and free market economy.

The second aspect of change can be seen in strategic and military matters. During the cold war period such realities as a peace based on armaments and a balance of terror, the division of Europe and the existence of the two opposing Alliances were unfortunately the order of the day due to reasons beyond our control. However, today's facts indicate that we all are rapidly moving away from this phenomenon. Now it is possible to retain a nuclear balance at considerably lower levels and to redress conventional disparities at least numerically and the existence of the Warsaw Pact remains only on paper.

All these developments have brought us to a stage where we have to make certain assertions vis-à-vis, the future of European security. The adaptation of the Alliance to the present circumstances is our common responsibility for the future generation. It is of great importance to be realistic in our assessment, as well as to keep in mind the bitter experiences that past history has imposed on the people of Europe.

Mr. AKBULUT (Cont'd)

Periods of profound transformation bring to the fore the requirement for structural change deriving from the new and evolving conditions. In this view the need to establish a new European security order is on our agenda. Our goal should be to achieve a unique security setup which would be responsive to the concerns of the East European countries in the light of recent developments, which would safeguard Transatlantic ties, and bring together East European countries, above all the Soviet Union, on the basis of co-operation and not categorise countries as winners or losers.

The Atlantic Alliance will continue to be the essential element of the new order to be established and to safeguard the security of its members. I believe that the security of our countries is of such paramount importance, especially during a period of uncertainty that it cannot be entrusted solely to declarations of good will and to mechanisms of conciliation devoid of any sanctions. Taking into account the rightful security concerns of other countries should in no way be construed as concessions from our own collective defence, and this point should be the basis of our approach to a review of NATO's rôles, functions and strategy. Maintenance of such basic concepts as strategic and political integrity, and indivisibility of defence is not only important because of the message to be given to our publics anticipating a stable future, but also because of the credibility of the Alliance's contribution to the future of European security. We have reached a consensus on the review of NATO strategy so as to adapt to the changing strategic environment. We should unequivocally clarify that our approach is not to alter our strategy but to review its implementation with the proviso that its basic principles will be retained. We should also emphasise strongly the priority rôle of the Alliance which owes its 40 years of success to its credibility. The new co-operation environment that is emerging necessitates the tackling of Europe's future security on a wider scale. Within this framework, political solutions and developing economic co-operation models will carry more weight than military balance of power considerations. The Alliance therefore should seek to enhance its political dimension and should seek means of rapidly transforming the phase of co-ordinating policies rather than seeking diversifying subjects for consultation. In the same framework, the integration of Western and Soviet and East European economies, on the basis of economic co-operation models and to the mutual benefit of both East and West will not only contribute to the process of democratisation but also will lead those nations to reflect upon their foreign and security policies from different angles and on a

Mr. AKBULUT (Cont'd)

multi-dimensional basis. The new era ushered in by recent developments in Europe and in East-West relations, the future of which we anticipate enthusiastically, brings forth issues that we have to tackle together. Such issues include the CSCE process, which from its very inception fifteen years ago has been successful and is already playing a more important rôle in the future of Europe. A new CSCE summit is planned to take place at the end of this year, and it will be important to continue consultations within the framework of the Alliance on matters related to the preparations of that summit. The CSCE process, which has a rightful share in the current rapprochement in East-West relations, has also played an important rôle in the democratisation of East European countries. We are aware of the fact that recent historic developments mean that the CSCE will be faced with the problem of meeting new requirements. We follow closely and carefully the views and proposals being advocated by various countries on this matter. One point that needs to be emphasised initially is that the CSCE has a definite rôle to play in charting the future course of Europe. However, it is also a fact that the CSCE cannot replace NATO or undertake its tasks in the field of security. We agree that the issue of the institutionalisation of the CSCE should be carefully handled. While doing this we should, however, avoid ambitious and divisive projects that would in the long run be detrimental to the integrity and harmony of the CSCE process. While building new structures, we should advance with caution and consider their possible ramifications. In the enhancement of the CSCE process, it is necessary to benefit from the past experiences of other institutions. In this respect I would like to re-emphasise the great importance attached by Turkey to the maintenance of a balanced improvement in the three Baskets of the CSCE process to the preservation of the relationship between security and the human dimension.

The most striking symbol of the rapprochement in East-West relations and the process of change in Europe is the unification of the two Germanys and we look forward to that with great excitement. Unification, when achieved, will do away with an important symbol of the cold war in Europe. I would like to underline once more the importance of past and future comprehensive consultations within the Alliance on this matter. Furthermore, it would not be misleading to state that the membership of a unified Germany in NATO will be the basic element of peace and stability in Europe which we are all striving to establish. Our aim undoubtedly is neither to isolate the Soviet Union nor to alienate it from Europe in this respect; on the contrary, our goal should be to convince the Soviet Union that a new order that encompasses German membership in NATO is to the benefit of the Soviet Union as well as of everyone else.

Mr. AKBULUT (Cont'd)

Europe is entering a new phase of co-operation in this process; success in the fields of arms control will improve the security environment of the future Europe and will lead to enduring peace and stability. An early conclusion of the CFE Treaty, the banning of chemical weapons and the START Agreement all carry an important political function going beyond mere security dimensions. As for all Allies, the process of arms control is an important dimension of Turkey's security policy.

Turkey attaches great importance to the CFE which would resolve its concrete security problems by taking into consideration the regional characteristics of the balance of forces. In the final analysis, it is evident that the success of the negotiations will be based primarily on how these issues are solved. In this regard, the conclusion of a CFE Treaty in a manner to include the five categories of weapons now under negotiation, is vital for Turkey. The flexibility shown by the Alliance so far in the negotiations will enable us to obtain such a result by the end of this year. It is important to overcome the recent tendency on the part of the Soviet Union to slow down the negotiations. Hence, the Summit should clearly re-emphasise the importance we attach to the conclusion of the CFE negotiations during the course of this year. We welcome the accelerated momentum reached in the Conference on Security and Confidence Building Measures in parallel with the efforts on arms control. New measures introduced by the Alliance will make important contributions to efforts aimed at eliminating the risk of armed conflict in Europe. For this reason, the successful and rapid conclusion of CSBM is equally important for us. We still have a long way to go in finalising a comprehensive security order in Europe and while progressing towards new and more comprehensive security negotiations, we should avoid any approaches which might lead to divisions and regionalisations.

Mr. Secretary General, against the background of recent developments, I would like to conclude with a few brief remarks on Turkey's stance. Turkey, which has made important contributions to the Alliance's common defence effort and to the solidarity and security of the West since 1952, is determined, as a responsible Ally, to continue her constructive contributions during the changing security environment. The factors which compel Turkey to take her place in the Western world and to participate in its defence are not based solely on concern for a balance of power. Common values and ideals that we share with the West and our way of life are the underlying factors in this preference. Turkish public opinion views NATO not merely as a defence organization; it perceives our membership in the Alliance as a yardstick of our

Mr. AKBULUT (Cont'd)

country's integration with the West in all fields and of our equal partnership to the Western world. Turkey, with her democratic régime and her powerful economic potential, will continue to be a factor of stability in a considerably volatile region of the world. On this occasion I would like to stress that Turkey, whose aim is to instill the idea of integration with Western Europe in all domains, will not hesitate to continue to make constructive efforts for the establishment of a new European security order.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr. WÖRNER

Thank you. Last, but by no means least, I call on the Dutch Prime Minister, Minister Lubbers.

Mr. LUBBERS

Mr. Secretary General, thank you very much. It was a pleasure to listen to my colleagues but allow me first to thank the British Prime Minister for her hospitality. I must confess that I found her red wine today more dangerous than the Red Army! Allow me also to thank President Bush for his proposal and draft for the Declaration. We live in a period which could characterise as one of change, of transition when, of course, it is difficult for leaderships to formulate their policy; however I want to say that I found his proposals both bold and cautious and we, the Dutch, agree with them. Having said that, I fully agree with those who accentuated the aspect that whilst we need change and a new architecture and a new strategy, at the same time we have to be cautious because we have to watch realities and see what to do with facts. I think that this twofold task will go on for quite a period and therefore I consider the approach today in the Declaration as a step in a process which leaves open certain options for the future.

Mr. Secretary General, if I recall rightly, it was Chancellor Kohl who said this morning at a certain stage of his speech: "We have to look at working together in the Alliance as if it were a bridge on two sides of the Atlantic" and he used that to make clear that we need also to co-operate with the Central and Eastern part of Europe. I would like to dwell a little bit on that subject, also because President Mitterrand and the Italian Prime Minister and others spoke about co-operation, not only security but working together. I fully understand and agree that in future we need a good co-ordination between our NATO and a new CSCE mechanism. At the same time, we are discussing

Mr. LUBBERS (Cont'd)

the new military strategy; if I understand this well, a little less forward defence, changing to a certain extent; but my point now here is that, in any case, it is important that we keep our Alliance in good condition and that we work together on both sides of the ocean. It's a very good thing and as a European, I underline this point very much that in the architecture of Europe we need the CSCE process; yet at the same time I am convinced that it will function better the more the United States and Canada fulfill the same fundamental function in the future as they did until today. In the same connection I want to stress that I too see good reason for President Bush to propose a certain shift in our strategy; at the same time I want to underline to him and others that it is essential if you develop new strategies for the future that they are formulated in such a way that the function of the United States and Canada, as countries which are very interested in the future of Europe and of the Alliance as a whole, is very clear indeed.

Mr. Chairman, another point related to this is our ambition to go further with the CSCE and to give a place also, like the Prime Minister of Norway said rightly, to the neutral countries of Europe.

Still I want to put the question on the table, if we talk about the Conventional Force discussions in Vienna and the agreement we need in connection with starting up the CSCE in Paris, the discussion of how to go on after that, should that not be measured by the question and by the criterium: by what method are we the most successful in further arms limitation and arms reduction? That is my point of view at least. We should avoid the situation in which in our ambition to be more political in Europe, we forget maybe the good instrument to be effective in terms of arms limitation and arms reduction. It anyhow is essential for Europe as a whole and Mr. Chairman, I said that already, co-operating together in Europe and the Alliance.

I remember certain meetings in NATO that we discussed a lot about West/West relations and then we stressed the point that that was not only a military question but that we had to work together in many fields as a free democratic world, you remember those meetings? If we look now to the future and to the possibilities to work together with Central and Eastern Europe to make a new architecture, I am convinced of how important CSCE in its security aspect is. Also the other aspects are very important indeed. It will be a long way of course to come to forms of co-operation, working together with the Central European countries and the Soviet Union in several fields because the system is still very different there. But as we discussed in the past in the West/West relation, we need now also an East/West relation and more

Mr. LUBBERS (Cont'd)

especially with Eastern and Central European countries. I am referring there of course to the economic working together but also today to the environmental aspect. Because again the Norwegian Prime Minister will make some remarks on that and also the Italian Prime Minister and I add to that the related field of energy. I make a plea that we try to be specific, as specific as possible, in the coming period. If we discuss possibilities of the architecture of Europe, to work that out we need more details in several fields and I think here what President Mitterrand said about our old charter of NATO: that it is not only security but also working together, and the famous article 2, the third dimension relates now also, in a new situation, to Central and Eastern Europe. It is not today, of course, in this time of change to be very specific on that, Mr. Secretary General, but what I ask my colleagues, that we think about the relation of NATO on the one hand and the CSCE and how this has to be developed in the future, that we give due attention to the several fields in which we can work together more completely, more specifically, with the countries in Central and Eastern Europe, because my guess is if we were impressive for them as an Alliance and I may add here as a European Community, in the future it will prove to be essential that we give them chances to associate themselves with our free democratic systems and to a certain extent integrate also into our systems and this is rightly called the third dimension by Prime Minister Andreotti but we have to work out systems not to do that only as an organization for the members of the Alliance but also in relation with the countries in Central and Eastern Europe.

Thank you very much Mr. Secretary General.

Mr. WÖRNER

As much as I was happy and pleased with the discussion this morning, I was pleased to hear your contributions this afternoon because clearly they reflect a real consensus on the challenge ahead and how to react to it and it shows to me and I think to others, how strong and coherent our Alliance is and I just for a short moment, thought how the Soviet Leader of Government or State would react seeing the amount of consensus around this table, the spirit of this Alliance and looking at his own situation. Now all 16 nations have contributed.

We have tomorrow, the situation tomorrow morning that we are first to discuss and accept our common declaration and then there is time for what I consider to be a free debate, so with your permission I would like to call tomorrow morning (after deciding upon our declaration) on President Mitterrand to open such a free debate. Of

Mr. WÖRNER (Cont'd)

course, I would not now prevent a discussion, but I was told by some Heads of State and Government that they like to have a little bit of time for bilaterals and so on. So before asking you if anybody wants to speak now, I only want to raise one additional point with you, and Prime Minister Thatcher was so gracious to mention that this morning. It is one of the concerns that I have.

It is a particular issue and you are all aware of it, but I think you are the responsible ones in that you can take action: you are the heads of Government or State. Many Alliance members are now undertaking extensive reviews of their national defence programmes to take account of the changes that have taken place in Europe. Now I know the reasons and it is natural, somehow natural that it happens, and I know about the pressures being exercised by our publics and by our parliaments, but I would like to emphasize that any reductions in defence forces committed to NATO should only be made after proper consultation in order to safeguard the coherence of the Alliance and our defences. Because if everybody now does what he likes to do without consulting others, we might risk that at the end of such a process we are confronted with a situation where we have no more coherent defence, so knowing how the realities are, and I have been a long-time member of parliament, member of a Government, I have only one plea to you that you really try to consult inside this Alliance before taking decisions in order to give us a chance to make it an orderly process. Given the possible scale of the changes, we may need to adapt our consultation procedures to meet these new circumstances, and at the direction of Defence Ministers, we have set in motion the necessary work. But this is an eminently political issue and that is why I urge your personal attention to it and we have prepared some proposals.

I won't go into any details because it is not your matter to decide upon the specifics, but I only want you to help your Defence Ministers and help this Alliance to really give this process, which is inevitable, a kind of a directional leadership which enables us to maintain what is essential for this Alliance and that means a coherent defence.

Thank you very much, and now may I ask if anybody wants to take the floor. If not, I would adjourn and we will resume tomorrow morning at 9.30 a.m. with your permission. Um? O.K? If you agree, I would adjourn and thank you all very much and hoping that we get at the dinner a kind of an interim report, or perhaps even a final report of our working machinery. Thank you, I close the meeting.

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

EXEMPLAIRE
COPY

N° 0212

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH
18th July 1990

CORRIGENDUM to
VERBATIM RECORD
C-VR(90)36
PART I

Corrigendum to C-VR(90)36, Part I dated 5th July 1990

Page 34

Please replace the statement of Mr. GONZALEZ, by the attached text.

NATO,
1110 Brussels



* 1 9 0 0 1 2 2 9 7 *

C-VR(90)36
PART 1

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

Mr. GONZALEZ

This meeting is the focus of particular attention in Europe as well as beyond our continent. We must respond to this expectation with a message that bolsters confidence and meets hope, with imagination and political courage. This Summit should signal the end of 50 years of confrontation and the beginning of a new era of co-operation in Europe, doubtless preserving our security.

In the Summit we had one year ago, our goal was the search for a balance at the lowest possible level. Today, in the wake of the democratic revolution in the East, which has been favoured by Perestroïka, this resolution is not enough. We foresee now the true possibility of constructing a new framework for security based on co-operation.

The military structures imposed by the "cold war" lag behind the political events on our continent. The radical changes that have taken place are undermining in part the credibility of these structures. We must draw the consequences of those revolutionary changes, with a view to the future.

The overcoming of the division of Europe and particularly of Germany; the gradual recovery by Central and Eastern European States of their sovereignty and freedom are now providing the basis for the achievement of the lasting peaceful order that the Alliance has advocated since 1949.

Simultaneously, the military threat which the Warsaw Pact represented is fading, with a resulting increase of security and stability in Europe. This process will be strengthened after the conclusion of an agreement in Vienna on conventional forces, which we hope will be reached very soon. Taking shape is the vision of an undivided continent where military forces only exist to prevent war and to ensure self-defence, and thus should they be perceived.

In this context, all European countries, including the Soviet Union, together with the United States and Canada, must contribute to a new peaceful order. For it to be lasting, we must all work together. No one should be, or feel itself excluded or marginalised; all legitimate interests should be taken into account. This is the only way in which the new framework will be stable and lasting.

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

CORRIGENDUM to
C-VR(90)36
PART I

-2-

In view of these changes, we have decided to review our strategy. New concepts are called for, such as sufficient defence; proportionate response; minimal nuclear deterrence; abandonment of forward defence. Nevertheless, we must ask ourselves if this is really enough.

Will the Atlantic Alliance meet the needs - and adjust to them - of a new peaceful order in Europe by just reviewing its strategy, changing its military deployment and reducing its forces; an Alliance which, whatever its defensive nature, was born and developed in the "cold war" and its aftermath of confrontation?

I believe that, while the Warsaw Pact has entered into a process of dismantlement, the Atlantic Alliance should enter a dynamic of recomposition which means, of course, a profound transformation.

We must avoid that the new structures emerging in Europe be perceived by the Soviet Union as something increasing Soviet feelings of isolation, when these structures should play an important stabilising rôle. The Soviet Union is going to continue to be an imposing continental mass, but I think we should not penalise her for this; nor should this be a reason to perpetuate our present defensive structures without an adequate adjustment.

It is up to the CSCE to create the new framework for stability and progress in which the European countries find their place. For lack of a pan-European security structure, the CSCE must fill this void, with the proper mechanism which for that purpose must be decided upon by common accord. Who else, but the CSCE, will create the objective conditions ensuring peace and stability in Europe and guaranteeing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all those countries? This goal will only be attained through a deepened and consolidated democracy, the respect of human rights, mutual confidence and the well-being of their peoples.

In our recent Dublin declaration, eleven of the sixteen countries here present agreed that in a time when Europe is trying to overcome its divisions, CSCE is the necessary framework for stability, for an increased co-operation in Europe and also for the deepening of the reforms already under way. We have also stressed the overall nature of the CSCE process and the link which exists between the peoples and governments of Europe, the United States and Canada.

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

-3-

CORRIGENDUM to
C-VR(90)36
PART I

If the CSCE cannot replace NATO, it is also true that NATO, alone, cannot assume the rôle of guarantor of the stability on the entire continent. The remaining European countries will continue to see NATO as a military alliance. NATO must evolve and look back to its origins, to its original conception, that of a defensive Alliance of free and democratic nations on both sides of the Atlantic, which is adapting to the new European reality.

We also have to reflect upon the necessity to give the Washington Treaty its full significance. We must ask ourselves, in this context, if the structures which were created after 1949 - and which were the proper response to specific security conditions - are still in force and still compatible with a radically different Europe.

We will be shortsighted if we do not anticipate today what presumably looks like is going to happen. The foreseeable reduction of the military presence of the United States and Canada in Europe - which still will be indispensable - and our own European vocation, impose upon us, Europeans, the task of strengthening the pillar of a transformed Alliance on this side of the Atlantic, thus assuming greater quotas of responsibilities and efforts. In this scene the European Community has a decisive rôle, by giving herself a common foreign and security policy and becoming a privileged interlocutor, in all fields, of our North American allies.

The transatlantic dialogue should be improved. Political consultations within the Alliance can and should be improved. However, we must be on guard so that no one will perceive these consultations as projecting a threat. We should not forget that NATO is a formidable military machine and that it is seen as such. Its responsibilities are clearly defined. We have to deepen our consultations within this framework and, in this spirit, transmit tranquility and security.

In the same way that the process of German unification has been a catalyser for an accelerated European construction, the new challenges on our Continent should help us shape a new European pattern, with a transatlantic dialogue which responds to the new situation, one which has evolved from confrontation to balance and which should tend towards co-operation.

I think it is our German friends who have said that it has always been futile to put a straightjacket on history. Let us not fall into making this attempt, which is anyway doomed to failure. On the contrary, let us face with courage and determination a new chapter in our common history, which should be marked surely by open-mindedness, flexibility and innovation.

N A T O C O N F I D E N T I A L

2833/HH