

STRATEGIC OPTIONS FOR PNND ACTION AT THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

A note by Sen. Francesco Martone

October 2007

This short note explores some opportunities for PNND action within the NATO PA Assembly.

First of all, it should be stressed that the rules and procedures of the PA are pretty rigid and this means that it is very hard to initiate a discussion from scratch other than the items proposed by the Secretariat and then adopted by the National Heads of Delegation.

This means that we need to be opportunistic and try to grab the occasions provided by the ongoing and/or future areas of action of the NATO PA.

In my opinion PNND might have that chance, especially in consideration of the fact that the PA will be working on the new strategic concept for NATO, an exercise deemed proper by many, after the Washington 1999 strategic concept review. In that occasion, and in that process, we could try to generate discussion on the NATO Military Doctrine and the need to review the Nuclear Sharing Agreements.

The deadline for the Strategic Concept Review would be by 2008 to be adopted at the Bucharest Summit to mark the 60th Anniversary of NATO.

Indeed, as stressed above, there is still not much agreement among parties on the need to initiate such a review process, however the NATO PA, according to some officials I talked to, is starting this process.

The NATO PA working groups would therefore be asked to formulate their proposals for items to be included in the discussion on the new strategic concept. The texts then would be gathered in a report by the Secretariat.

The Vice-President of the NATO PA Assembly, Jan Petersen (Norway) from the Conservative Party and former Minister of Defense will be coordinating this process.

He would produce a first proposal at the The Hague session of the Permanent Commission of the NATO PA in March 2008. It might be worthwhile for PNND secretariat to contact Jan Petersen to scope the possibility of some discussion on nuclear policy within the Strategic Concept Review.

That this might become an issue and might require some work by PNND became clear after listening to a presentation held by a NATO expert (press release below). In that occasion it became clear that Iran might be used as a pretext to regenerate the need for nuclear deterrence. And to revamp the Sharing Agreements although at a direct question

the rapporteur admitted that there might not be a need for tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. However, as you can read from the statement below, it seems that NATO Might be opting for a restrictive interpretation of the NPT, discarding the disarmament pillar. (*“Reinterpreting NPT as a disarmament treaty is wrong”* .- quote) The same rapporteur answered to a question raised by myself And MEP Ana Gomes, by saying that to him the NPT had no grand deal and was only aimed at preventing Japan and Germany to acquire nuclear weapons and hence is all about non.-proliferation and not on disarmament. He said, that a nuclear Iran (and the domino effects of that) would make NATO Nuclear Policy more relevant as deterrent and as a means to strengthen non-proliferation” *If nuclear Iran should go ahead. Nuclear sharing would be back into the front*”, (quote). So NATO should *“be ready for a new Strategic concept whereas extended deterrence be rediscovered.”* No wonder then when NATO press officer titled a press release “ The Second Nuclear Age has come”.

Reading through the calendar of activities and report subjects for 2008 there is another crucial opportunity to provide input to the debate. As a matter of fact, the Political Committee might be discussing a report on NATO’s Future Political Agenda with a specific focus on Iran, while the Science and Technology Committee would prepare and discuss a report on “Reducing Global Nuclear Threats”. *This report would examine the safety and security status of the world’s largest stockpiles. The report would look at developments in the “official” and “unofficial” nuclear weapons states to assess the prospects for nuclear disarmament and arms control agreements”*.

While the Defence and Security Committee’s DSCTC (Subcommittee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Cooperation will be discussing another that might be a potentially interesting item for us in order to introduce the discussion on nuclear sharing. The item is “Sharing Enabling Capabilities” and we could try to figure out whether this would also apply to nuclear sharing. (the report would deal with *“current efforts n the sharing or pooling of scarce defence resources such as strategic lift, missile defence, logistics provision”*). However, my advise is that if we decide to pursue the NATO PA as a strategic opportunity then we would focus on the Strategic Concept Debate (that would also have a relevance at national Parliamentary Level) and on the working program on Global Nuclear Threats.

I also asked for some advise to Ana Gomes, and talked to other MPs with my party’s affiliates such as Die Linke and the Socialist Party of Netherlands. MP Paul Schaefer, (Die Linke) and PNND member as I understand , is willing to discuss the possibility for some parallel events in Berlin in occasion of the mid-year NATO PA meeting in May 2008. Then PNND might think about organizing a seminar at the Bundestag on nuclear policies, deterrence and disarmament in order to provide an input into the discussion.

All for now. I hope this note can help your discussion and please feel free to get back to me with any request for clarification or further advice.

All the best. Francesco Martone

6 October 2007 - WORLD IS ENTERING SECOND NUCLEAR AGE, SAYS NATO EXPERT

A NATO expert said today (Saturday) that the world had entered a “second nuclear age” in which many of the rules that applied in the days of the Cold War stand-off between East and West no longer applied.

“The end of the Cold War has removed a specific political and military context in which nuclear weapons contributed to mutual deterrence and mutual restraint,” Michael Rühle, Senior Policy Advisor to the NATO Secretary General, said.

Mr Rühle, who is also head of the speechwriting unit, was addressing a meeting of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly’s Political Committee on the subject of the implications of a nuclear Iran during the NATO Parliamentary Assembly’s annual session in Reykjavik, Iceland.

“The lack of new nuclear rules, together with an ever-accelerating process of globalisation, has sparked developments that put tremendous pressure on the traditional non-proliferation regime. Iran’s nuclear programme is one such development; the proliferation of ballistic missiles is another one,” he told parliamentarians.

Mr Rühle said, however, that despite the above problems there was no reason to be overly pessimistic.

“We can shape events, and don’t have to be their victims. Indeed, developments over the last years reveal the emergence of a new set of rules that might supplement the traditional non-proliferation regime,” he declared.

He said he believed the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which will evolve by way of UN Security Council resolutions, will remain the central framework for identifying unwelcome behaviour and initiating appropriate responses. But, “dealing with problem cases will increasingly follow individual approaches”, as developments in Libya and North Korea have demonstrated.

Coercive measures, such as fighting maritime smuggling or imposing economic sanctions against proliferators, will make the non-proliferation regime more effective. But, Mr. Rühle concluded, “nuclear deterrence, Alliance-wide ‘extended deterrence’ and ballistic missile defence will remain the last line of defence in case non-proliferation fails.”

The NATO PA brings together some 248 parliamentarians from 26 NATO member states, delegates from 16 associate countries, five Mediterranean associate countries, the European Parliament and parliamentary observers from several other countries, including Afghanistan and Pakistan.