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RECOMMENDATION 694

on Europe’s security confronted with international terrorism

The Assembly,

(i) Unequivocally condemning the acts of terrorism perpetrated in the United States on 11 September 2001 that killed thousands of innocent citizens of more than sixty nations, in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania;

(ii) Expressing its solidarity and determination to stand shoulder to shoulder with the United States in eliminating and rooting out, once and for all, both national and international terrorism in all its forms and bringing to justice all those who perpetrated and master-minded the 11 September attacks;

(iii) Drawing attention to the fundamental challenge this new and as yet imponderable international dimension to terrorism presents for Europe’s security and consequently welcoming the action plan to tackle that challenge agreed by the European Council at its extraordinary meeting on 21 September 2001;

(iv) Recalling that terrorist attacks such as those committed in the United States are international crimes, and demanding a coordinated international response involving *inter alia* cooperation between judicial, police and intelligence services, inclusive of any measures that may be required to prevent future funding of terrorist activity in any shape or form;

(v) Underlining, however, the absolute need also to take appropriate measures against states ruled by regimes which aid and abet terrorists, in particular by establishing and protecting training camps for planning and carrying out terrorist activities;

(vi) Recalling in this context the evidence provided by the United States according to which the 11 September terrorist attacks were planned and carried out by Al-Qâ’ida, an organisation directed by Osama bin Laden, based in Afghanistan and protected by the Taliban regime;

(vii) Recalling that UN Security Council Resolutions 1368 and 1373, which describe the acts committed on 11 September 2001 as a threat to international peace and security and recognise the right of individual or collective self-defence established under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, constitute the basis of the retaliatory military strikes by the United States which began on 7 October 2001 against the military capabilities of the Taliban regime and the Al-Qa’ida terrorist training camps;

(viii) Emphasising that this military action is not indicative of a clash of civilisations or religions and stressing therefore the urgent need to form a global coalition to combat the sources of hatred and fanaticism, such as injustice, poverty and the lack of democracy and human rights, that lead individuals and groups into terrorism or to lend their support to or sympathise with terrorists;

(ix) Considering that the use of biological and chemical substances threatening human life, and first and foremost that of civilians, constitutes a new type of terrorist action and is even stronger justification for the legitimate action taken in the wake of the attacks of 11 September 2001;

(x) Recalling NATO’s decision of 2 October 2001, pursuant to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, to consider the 11 September terrorist attacks as an armed attack on a member state that is to be treated as an attack against all allies;

(xi) Convinced that this decision by NATO will have a fundamental impact on the character of the Alliance and the scope of its activities including those guaranteeing Europe’s defence, the consequences of which remain to be seen;

(xii) Noting that the military operation which began on 7 October 2001 is not led by NATO but by the United States of America with the involvement of a coalition of the willing including a number of European allied nations;
Underlining its continuing attachment to the principle of the indivisibility of transatlantic security, in particular in the face of the mounting risk of future acts of terrorism which might affect Europe and WEU nations in particular;

Recalling that one of the fundamental objectives of the European defence commitment based on the modified Brussels Treaty and reaffirmed continually since the creation of WEU has been the establishment of an as yet indissoluble link between European and transatlantic defence and security through ever stronger cooperation with NATO and solidarity with the Atlantic Alliance;

Profoundly alarmed therefore that the WEU Council has not issued any public statement reaffirming its solidarity with the Alliance and supporting the decisions taken by NATO, and that the European Council also failed to express such solidarity in its conclusions of 21 September;

Alarmed too at the absence of any reaction on the part of the WEU Council to NATO’s decision to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, notwithstanding the fact that:

− Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty also uses the term “armed attack” and
− any decision on the part of the allied nations that they face an armed attack against them all must, of necessity, simultaneously lead to activation of Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty;

Seriously doubting therefore whether the modified Brussels Treaty and Article V thereof will continue to be of relevance in the event of a threat to the security of one or more WEU member countries;

Convinced that the events of 11 September 2001 have blurred the dividing lines between “internal” and “external” security and that the approaches used to date in responding to security threats are largely obsolete;

Recalling in this context Assembly Recommendation 685 on revising the European security concept – responding to new risks;

Concerned that the possibility of the European Union relying on NATO assets for missions conducted in the ESDP framework might be affected by the United States increasingly needing to use them for military operations against international terrorism;

Stressing the urgent need to examine to what extent the full range of “Petersberg” missions should be redefined to include appropriate countermeasures against international terrorism and, as necessary, accordingly to adapt the headline goal and the civilian aspects of crisis management, having particular regard to any financial implications,

RECOMMENDS THAT THE COUNCIL

1. Proceed without delay with an assessment of the risk of WEU nations in future becoming the target of acts of terrorism similar to those perpetrated in the United States on 11 September, paying particular attention to the threat of terrorism involving nuclear, biological or chemical attack, and inform the Assembly of its conclusions;

2. Take the necessary action to reassure the citizens of WEU member countries, as well as the Assembly, that their security is still based on both the modified Brussels Treaty and the Washington Treaty and that there is no difference of interpretation as to what is understood by an “armed attack” under either treaty;

3. Make full use of Article IV of the modified Brussels Treaty to request information from the appropriate NATO military authorities as to what practical consequences may result from bringing terrorism countermeasures within the remit of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and how this may affect NATO’s commitment to guarantee the security of WEU member countries;

4. Take rapid action on Assembly Recommendation 685 on revising the European security concept – responding to new risks;
5. Request the European Union (a) to take the necessary steps to ensure that its remit for “Petersberg” missions is extended to include measures to counter international terrorism and to develop appropriate capabilities and resources to that end, (b) to revise the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in the light of the new threats posed by international terrorism using biological and chemical weapons in particular, while at the same time reaffirming the continuing validity of the transatlantic alliance and taking due note of Russia’s position, and (c) to inform the Assembly of action taken by the EU in this respect;

6. Ensure that all associate member and associate partner countries become fully involved in any activity the European Union undertakes to combat international terrorism;

7. Urge all WEU nations to implement the measures set out in UN Security Council Resolution 1373 without delay;

8. Place the capacities of the WEU Satellite Centre in Torrejón at the disposal of the international coalition against terrorism as a European contribution to the operations in Afghanistan.
EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

submitted by Mr Marshall, Chairman and Rapporteur

1. It is obvious that the horrifying events which took place on 11 September in the United States and their consequences have had an effect on the Assembly’s current programme of work. The Assembly accordingly decided to ask the Political Committee to present to the December session a comprehensive report on the impact of international terrorism on the ESDP and the development of European defence.

2. However, in view of the specific nature of the situation, the Assembly has decided to give its members an opportunity for an urgent debate on the matter before the plenary session and has asked the Political Committee to submit an operative text to the Standing Committee which is to meet on 18 October 2001 in Brussels.

3. The present text has been prepared on a provisional basis for an immediate assessment of the implications of this new threat for our security not only in Europe but also worldwide.
DRAFT RECOMMENDATION

on Europe’s security confronted with international terrorism

The Assembly,

(i) Unequivocally condemning the acts of terrorism perpetrated in the United States on 11 September 2001 that killed thousands of innocent citizens of more than sixty nations, in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania;

(ii) Expressing its solidarity and determination to stand shoulder to shoulder with the United States in eliminating and rooting out, once and for all, both national and international terrorism in all its forms and bringing to justice all those who perpetrated and master-minded the 11 September attacks;

(iii) Drawing attention to the fundamental challenge this new and as yet imponderable international dimension to terrorism presents for Europe’s security and consequently welcoming the action plan to tackle that challenge agreed by the European Council at its extraordinary meeting on 21 September 2001;

(iv) Recalling that terrorist attacks such as those committed in the United States are international crimes, and demanding a coordinated international response involving inter alia cooperation between judicial, police and intelligence services, inclusive of any measures that may be required to prevent future funding of terrorist activity in any shape or form;

(v) Underlining, however, the absolute need also to take appropriate measures against states ruled by regimes which aid and abet terrorists, in particular by establishing and protecting training camps for planning and carrying out terrorist activities;

(vi) Recalling in this context the evidence provided by the United States according to which the 11 September terrorist attacks were planned and carried out by Al-Qa’ida, an organisation directed by Osama bin Laden, based in Afghanistan and protected by the Taliban regime;

(vii) Recalling that UN Security Council Resolutions 1368 and 1373, which describe the acts committed on 11 September 2001 as a threat to international peace and security and recognise the right of individual or collective self-defence established under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, constitute the basis of the retaliatory military strikes by the United States which began on 7 October 2001 against the military capabilities of the Taliban regime and the Al-Qa’ida terrorist training camps;

(viii) Emphasising that this military action is not indicative of a clash of civilisations or religions and stressing therefore the urgent need to form a global coalition to combat the sources of hatred and fanaticism, such as injustice, poverty and the lack of democracy and human rights, that lead individuals and groups into terrorism or to lend their support to or sympathise with terrorists;

(ix) Considering that the use of biological and chemical substances threatening human life, and first and foremost that of civilians, constitutes a new type of terrorist action and is even stronger justification for the legitimate action taken in the wake of the attacks of 11 September 2001

(x) Recalling NATO’s decision of 2 October 2001, pursuant to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, to consider the 11 September terrorist attacks as an armed attack on a member state that is to be treated as an attack against all allies;

(xi) Convinced that this decision by NATO will have a fundamental impact on the character of the Alliance and the scope of its activities including those guaranteeing Europe’s defence, the consequences of which remain to be seen;

(xii) Noting that the military operation which began on 7 October 2001 is not led by NATO but by the United States of America with the involvement of a coalition of the willing including a number of European allied nations;
Underlining its continuing attachment to the principle of the indivisibility of transatlantic security, in particular in the face of the mounting risk of future acts of terrorism which might affect Europe and WEU nations in particular;

Recalling that one of the fundamental objectives of the European defence commitment based on the modified Brussels Treaty and reaffirmed continually since the creation of WEU has been the establishment of an as yet indissoluble link between European and transatlantic defence and security through ever stronger cooperation with NATO and solidarity with the Atlantic Alliance;

Profundely alarmed therefore that the WEU Council has not issued any public statement reaffirming its solidarity with the Alliance and supporting the decisions taken by NATO, and that the European Council also failed to express such solidarity in its conclusions of 21 September;

Alarmed too at the absence of any reaction on the part of the WEU Council to NATO’s decision to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, notwithstanding the fact that:

- Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty also uses the term “armed attack” and
- any decision on the part of the allied nations that they face an armed attack against them all must, of necessity, simultaneously lead to activation of Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty;

Seriously doubting therefore whether the modified Brussels Treaty and Article V thereof will continue to be of relevance in the event of a threat to the security of one or more WEU member countries;

Convinced that the events of 11 September 2001 have blurred the dividing lines between “internal” and “external” security and that the approaches used to date in responding to security threats are largely obsolete;

Recalling in this context Assembly Recommendation 685 on revising the European security concept – responding to new risks;

Concerned that the possibility of the European Union relying on NATO assets for missions conducted in the ESDP framework might be affected by the United States increasingly needing to use them for military operations against international terrorism;

Stressing the urgent need to examine to what extent the full range of “Petersberg” missions should be redefined to include appropriate countermeasures against international terrorism and, as necessary, accordingly to adapt the headline goal and the civilian aspects of crisis management, having particular regard to any financial implications,

RECOMMENDS THAT THE COUNCIL

1. Proceed without delay with an assessment of the risk of WEU nations in future becoming the target of acts of terrorism similar to those perpetrated in the United States on 11 September, paying particular attention to the threat of terrorism involving nuclear, biological or chemical attack, and inform the Assembly of its conclusions;

2. Take the necessary action to reassure the citizens of WEU member countries, as well as the Assembly, that their security is still based on both the modified Brussels Treaty and the Washington Treaty and that there is no difference of interpretation as to what is understood by an “armed attack” under either treaty;

3. Make full use of Article IV of the modified Brussels Treaty to request information from the appropriate NATO military authorities as to what practical consequences may result from bringing terrorism countermeasures within the remit of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and how this may affect NATO’s commitment to guarantee the security of WEU member countries;

4. Take rapid action on Assembly Recommendation 685 on revising the European security concept – responding to new risks;
5. Request the European Union (a) to take the necessary steps to ensure that its remit for “Petersberg” missions is extended to include measures to counter international terrorism and to develop appropriate capabilities and resources to that end, (b) to revise the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in the light of the new threats posed by international terrorism using biological and chemical weapons in particular, while at the same time reaffirming the continuing validity of the transatlantic alliance and taking due note of Russia’s position, and (c) to inform the Assembly of action taken by the EU in this respect;

6. Ensure that all associate member and associate partner countries become fully involved in any activity the European Union undertakes to combat international terrorism;

7. Urge all WEU nations to implement the measures set out in UN Security Council Resolution 1373 without delay.
AMENDMENT 1\textsuperscript{1}

\textit{tabled by Mr de Puig}

1. At the end of the draft recommendation proper, add the following new paragraph:

“Place the capacities of the WEU Satellite Centre in Torrejón at the disposal of the international coalition against terrorism as a European contribution to the operations in Afghanistan”.

\textit{Signed: de Puig}

\textsuperscript{1} Adopted by the Standing Committee on 18 October 2001