



WITH US OR AGAINST US

4. The Problems of Success

MONTAGE: MEYER: Load of balls. Complete Rubbish. There is no canine diplomacy over here. // **ARMITAGE:** We are often accused of being unilateralist, particularly by our

European friends, and then when one asks the follow-up question to please point out the area in which we were being unilateralist, the conversation comes to a screeching halt

ED: The war is won but success will bring its own problems. Afghanistan lies like a fabled land – it has been endlessly written about and analysed for so many weeks – and suddenly the borders are open. The Great Game is afoot – everyone scrambling for a presence in the newly liberated capital.

ED ON TODAY PROGRAMME: We drove into Kabul from the East from Pakistan and the journey from the Khyber pass in an instructive lesson in this country's recent history. Almost immediately the hulks of some long abandoned Russian tanks mark what used to be the front line during the Soviet occupation. The local Mujahadeen commander in those days was we were told one Osama bin Laden.

ED: The caretaker unlocks the gates of the British embassy in Kabul, and on November 19th a British envoy touches down at Bagram airport aboard an RAF Hercules. Stephen Evans, who's been running the Afghanistan crisis unit in the Foreign Office, has been picked for the job.

EVANS: I think actually the Iranians got there first. I'm pretty sure that there were Iranian diplomats or revolutionary guards or perhaps a mixture of the two, in Kabul probably within a day or two of the Northern Alliance moving in. The Russians got there twenty-four hours before us, although they didn't have an embassy to move into. And they actually took up residence in a hotel. Jim Dobbins who was the senior US diplomat would claim to have beaten me by an hour, because his aircraft certainly landed at Bagram one hour before our C-one-thirty got in. But having said that he, Bagram isn't actually in Kabul. So I think we can claim to have been the first western embassy to open.

ED: No one knows what the post war settlement will look like – who'll fill the power vacuum left as the last of the Taleban scurry south to Kandahar. It is an anxious time for Pakistan. The Northern Alliance is sweeping all before it, and relations between the Alliance and the government of General Pervez Musharraf are far from easy.

MUSHARRAF: That was the time when there were apprehensions because the political strategy was not in really place, it was not in place, and I thought if it keeps going at the speed that it is going, and if the northern alliance spreads all over Afghanistan, we are in for some kind of trouble.

ED: The key lies as much outside Afghanistan's borders as it does in Kabul. Each of Afghanistan's six neighbours has its own agenda – the United Nations now has the task of persuading them to work together. The Secretary General, Kofi Annan.

ANNAN: If the countries had not co-operated it would have been difficult, because right from the beginning we said we should get the neighbours to stop backing different horses and work with us in moving everyone in the same direction and establish an interim administration, and miraculously it worked.

ED: Events in Afghanistan are being closely watched in coalition capitals. History is already being written by the victors. The alliances America has built in central Asia were knocked up in a hurry in the rush to war – now comes the task of building something more enduring. Paul Wolfowitz is Donald Rumsfeld's number two at the Pentagon.

WOLFOWITZ: One of the questions that we encountered was sometimes I think occasionally explicit - more often than not implied in some way - but well when the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan you withdrew your interests from this part of the world, is that going to happen when al-Qaeda is defeated because we still live here and we can't live with that kind of thing so they need some sense of long-term certainty. At the same time we don't want to exaggerate what our future role should be. We don't want to get a whole new set of players concerned that we're going back to playing the great game of central Asia of the 19th century - we're certainly not interested in that.

ED: In London, Tony Blair's communications director Alastair Campbell is celebrating a war well spun. At the heart of the strategy, a co-operation with Washington so close that at times the White House and Downing Street seem like different arms of the same government.

CAMPBELL: The prime minister was due to be in parliament and you know the news was coming through that the Taliban were just you know falling and falling and falling and falling. And we had sent through - through Tucker Eskew, the guy from the White House who was working here - we had given him a copy of what the prime minister intended to say and the word came back that the Americans felt, we weren't yet in a position to say that the Taliban had, you know had fallen as it were. So we changed it, we changed the tone, so that kind of discussion was happening all the time. (Trans-Atlantic editing almost?) Well it was just, you know, we were very open about that kind of thing and the lines that we were taking. Tucker was at every single morning meeting that I chair.

ED: The British Prime Minister feels his strategy has been vindicated – that by enlisting so early in the American cause he has earned influence over American policy. The special relationship working as it should do.

BLAIR: I think what happened in Afghanistan was a good example. I think there was some reluctance in certain quarters to have a Security Force in Afghanistan. There were issues to whether America would remain committed in the long term for that. Those issues are resolved. You will always find in this relationship between Britain and America, there will be parts on the Left, because they are anti-American, who will oppose it, and there will be parts on

the Right who for very opportunistic reasons want to sow problems between a British Labour Prime Minister, and a Republican American President.

ED: But there is unfinished business. In early December coalition forces are engaged in the mountains of Tora Bora - a rump of al-Qaeda troops are holding out in caves in the white mountains that run along the border with Pakistan and Osama bin Laden is said to be among them.

BBC ARCHIVE NEWS VC31172: This was the last push - Afghan troops rolled into battle to finish off al-Qaeda from the ground. The Americans took care of the air. Today the blasts swept across these hilltops for miles. The top Afghan commander here told us al-Qaeda has been defeated. This is a big victory he said - we've killed two hundred men, we've captured all their bases, their caves, their ammunition and those who've escaped have nowhere left to hide.

ED: But of bin Laden, there is no sign. The National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice.

RICE: Well, I don't know if we know who did or did not escape at Tora Bora. (What's your instinct, though? Do you think he's still alive?) I don't know. I really don't. I think that he isn't commanding al Qaeda in the way that he once was. It may be that he's alive, it may be that he isn't. But our goal always was to break up this network, and to deny it the kinds of benefits that an organisation like this gets from being on the territory of a country. They, in a sense, the al Qaeda hijacked Afghanistan. And they had all the benefits of territoriality -- they had territory, they had training, they had financial networks, they had communication networks. Whatever they're doing, they're doing with far less efficiency.

ED: The Pentagon has been congratulating itself on a new model for making war but Tora Bora leaves its leaders sounding defensive. After all, back in the earliest days of the war on terrorism the President said Osama bin Laden was “wanted, dead or alive”. Paul Wolfowitz.

WOLFOWITZ: From the beginning Rumsfeld in one of the first meetings I remember with the President, Rumsfeld emphasised 'Don't make this about one man. It's not about one man and if we focus on just one man it will be a big mistake'. Obviously if there is any one man who deserves to be brought to justice he's the one but it's a long list - there are a lot of others.

ED: Washington's hawks and doves are already squaring up for a fight about the lessons of the campaign. Does it mean that America can now act alone, do as she pleases, wherever and whenever she pleases? In the months to come that argument will be at the heart of the debate about the next front in the war on terrorism – against Iraq. Richard Haass, the State Department's strategic thinker and Afghan crisis manager, has been publicly making the case for an America that listens to allies.

HAASS: I think no doubt there are those who were saying we can do things on our own, but I think that probably exaggerates the reality. Yes, when it comes to fighting wars, we can do a great deal on our own. We have both the quality and the quantity of weaponry and skill on the part of our soldiers that's unmatched. But for any sizeable engagement, we still need

bases in the area, we still need over-flight rights. And then even in a place like Afghanistan, even if you can largely carry out the military phase of the crisis on your own, what about the post-military phase -- the diplomacy, the economic reconstruction, the peacekeeping in Afghanistan? So I think the lesson that somehow we have -- the United States has enormous unilateral options is simply the wrong lesson to learn. I think it's actually just the opposite.

ED: It is December, and in the Middle East the Palestinians feel themselves the victims of a new mood in Washington. It is not so very long ago that they were being courted with talk of a Palestinian state. Now the phone isn't ringing. Nabil Sha'ath, is a senior member of Yasser Arafat's Cabinet.

SHA'ATH: Well, for a while there was no meetings, no contact whatsoever. Colin Powell stayed in touch with President Arafat once in a long while, usually making polite - he's a polite man - politely threatening statements for the need for Mr Arafat to do this and do that. For a while the contact became merely those of the American consul general in Jerusalem with Palestinian officials. And there was almost total ostracisation of President Arafat for a while.

ED: On the first suicide bomb attacks claim the lives of 25 Israelis in a 12 hour period. It is the beginning of one of the bloodiest chapters ever in the long conflict between Israel and the Palestinians.

BBC NEWS: It was just before midnight local time that the bombers struck. . .in the heart of Jerusalem

BBC NEWS: This has been one of the worst terrorist attacks ever

BBC NEWS: Witnesses said they saw bodies being hurled into the air and severed limbs on the ground .

BBC NEWS: As Israel was reeling from the shock of last night's triple bombing in Jerusalem another suicide bomber struck in the Northern City of Haifa.

ED: Since the earliest days after September 11th the Palestinian leadership has been struggling to escape any association with Al Quaeda's brand of terror. But Ariel Sharon, the Israeli Prime Minister, says Yasser Arafat is Israel's bin Laden, and now, in Washington, Mr Sharon's message is getting a sympathetic hearing.

SHA'ATH: The suicidal bombing in the Dolphinarium and later on in Jerusalem and Haifa gave him a lot of ammunition in saying to Mr Bush - "Look here is a case very much similar to that of New York." Once again what the Israeli tanks were doing in the occupied territory was suddenly forgotten and this became the focus. Together with here was what looked like a devastating easy victory for the Americans in Afghanistan. And therefore somehow the Americans felt that they don't need any more to try harder at making peace and justice in the Middle East or for that matter trying harder to get allies to be at their side and start going the unilateral way in Afghanistan. When the Americans go unilateral it spells trouble.

ED: There's even worse to come. January 3rd, and Israeli naval commandos board the cargo vessel Karine A in the Red Sea.

ARCHIVE: Loaded with 50 tonnes of weapons including anti-tank missiles and computer rockets. Israel says they've been supplied by Iran for Yasser Arafat's Palestinian authority. It is an embarrassment even a humiliation for Arafat whose denials of personal knowledge of the shipment may both be true and also another indication that he may not be in full control. His ministers say they too are in the dark.

ED: George Bush asks Yasser Arafat for an explanation, and the Palestinian leader protests his innocence. But all the intelligence information points the other way. Relations between the two will never recover. Shimon Peres, the Israeli foreign minister.

PERES: I think it has had a profound impact upon American thinking. Nobody took the explanation of the Palestinians as innocently as they wanted to be taken. A stain remained on his credibility.

BUSH STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS Jan 01: Some governments will be timid in the face of terror and make no mistake about it. If they do not act, America will. [applause dips under]

ED: January 29th. Washington now judges that the time is ripe to open another front in the war on terrorism. Sir Christopher Meyer, Britain's ever vigilant ambassador in Washington, is alerted by his contacts to a striking the President will use in his address to the joint houses of Congress.

BUSH 29/1/02: States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil . . .

MEYER: I knew he was going to use that phrase from about lunchtime that day,

BUSH 29/1/02:an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world.

MEYER: and it took me back immediately to a small and rather cramped kitchen in Moscow in the apartment in which I lived in 1983 - I think I've got the right year - when Reagan, President Reagan got up and made a speech about the evil empire.

BUSH 29/1/02: By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

MEYER: And I thought to myself this is kind of the son of evil empire, and at the time the evil empire phrase was loudly condemned by many people inside and outside the United States but with the benefit of hindsight, I think played quite a significant role in contributing to the downfall of the Soviet Union. And I remember my reaction to the axis of evil was, there are going to be an awful lot of people not going to like this, but let us not rush the judgement on this. There are, there could be some important and positive results coming from this phrase.

ED: But many of the allies America gathered in that remarkable coalition that brought together China, Russia and the nations of the Middle East fall away one by one.

MEDLEY: AMBASSADOR WANG YING-FAN not use such language. **AMBASSADOR SERGEI LAVROV** We don't believe that this is the way to fight terrorism. **CROWN PRINCE ADVISOR ADEL AL-JUBEIR:** That was the view of the United States, we don't share it.

ED: The new targets are Iran, Iraq and North Korea. There is surprise, shock even from the UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan – after all, Iran and America have been co-operating over Afghanistan, yet now the Iranians are part of an axis of evil.

ANNAN: We have been dealing with Washington and all these countries, and I had not had an inkling that some of the countries, apart from Iraq, that one hears a lot about in Washington, that one was going to brand Iran for example as an axis of evil and so the, the statement came out of the blue from my point of view, although I knew the US position towards those three countries, but then when countries get branded that way, it does complicate relationship and also the possibility of influencing them.

ED: For a moment it had looked as if a new relationship between Iran and the west was in the making – not so now. Javed Zarif is the deputy Iranian foreign minister.

ZARIF: There is no justification for the United States to make the allegations against Iran that it has and it is in fact tragic, the second tragedy after September the 11th has been the approach of the United States, because September 11th had the promise to be able to unite the entire international community in concert against a very serious evil.

ED: But George Bush's first ally remains his firmest. Tony Blair shows no sign of wavering in his enthusiasm for Anglo-American intimacy, despite cat-calls of European derision about the idea that an axis of evil can describe three such disparate nations.

Iraq of course stands out on the President's list – George Bush's speech has put military action firmly on the agenda.

BLAIR: I mean this echoed something I said literally three days after 11 September when I made my first Statement to the House of Commons. I said the next issue on the agenda is weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt about that in my mind at all. This is a wake up call. We knew that al-Qaeda was operating out of Afghanistan for years. We had had a series of events in which people had been killed, in reasonably large numbers, nothing like 11 September, by the al-Qaeda terrorists. We knew also that there had been attempts in Germany and France, foiled recently, that could have had very serious loss of life. And we knew Afghanistan was a failed state. We didn't act. We didn't act for perfectly understandable reasons. Public opinion wouldn't have understood it if we had acted. They would have said why are you suddenly going off and doing this. But after 11 September I think we have got to take that as a wake up call to us to say if there is a real threat and danger, don't wait, deal with it before it becomes a threat that has materialised in the form of some devastating attack.

ED: And viewed through the robust eyes of the number two at the American State Department, Richard Armitage – the implied threat is working wonders.

ARMITAGE: We were actually quite surprised that the words "axis of evil" brought forth some sturm und drang it seemed so patently obvious to the naked eye as to not be worthy of much comment. But having said that, I'll note that the three members of the "axis of evil" club in recent months have all made some rather interesting gestures: the Iranians turned over certain al-Qaeda members to the Afghan Interim Authority; the North Koreans returned a two-year hostage, a Japanese reporter, to the Governor of Japan, and has indicated a willingness to talk to the United States; and the Iraqis have desperately sought to engage the United Nations in some sort of way to work themselves out of the cul de sac they put themselves in regarding UN inspectors. So it seems to me that the "axis of evil" comment worked.

ED: But this is not just one of those rows among friends which will dissipate in the glow of the next successful adventure in diplomatic co-operation. It touches a raw nerve – opens a wound that will stay unhealed all summer long.

In a newspaper interview published on February 9th the EU External Relations Commissioner Chris Patten accuses America of an “absolutist and simplistic” stand towards the rest of the world – Europe, he says has a duty to stop Washington going into “unilateralist overdrive”.

PATTEN: My remark was perhaps saltier than it would have been in other circumstances because a very nice, very competent journalist from the Guardian came in to interview me just after a senior official in the State Department had criticised Europe's attempts to begin to develop a relationship with the moderates in Iran and I thought that was a pretty silly bit of criticism so I wasn't in the most mellow of moods and it just didn't seem to me that whatever the different problems posed to the international community by North Korea, by Iraq, by Iran, that there was in any sense a sort of conspiracy between them. There are after all other governments which are probably bigger weapons proliferators and there are some others who have perhaps been as involved or more involved with terrorism. So I didn't think that as a statement of policy it was the best remark I had ever heard, though I recognise that sometimes things are said for rhetorical effect.

ARMITAGE: We are often accused of being unilateralist, particularly by our European friends, and then when one asks the follow-up question to please point out the area in which we were being unilateralist, the conversation comes to a screeching halt, because it's very difficult. I could ask you the same question. (Just -- well --) It came to a screeching halt again, too. Let the record show.

ED: The Bush administration is relentless in pursuit of its agenda. The state department now has a senior official charged with public diplomacy in the Arab world, and Christopher Ross is sent on a tour of the Middle East. The message he comes back with is unambiguous – but it goes unheard in Washington.

ROSS: Virtually every person, every group we talked to used the opportunity of meeting with us to communicate through us to Washington that there was great unhappiness in the Arab world over the way in which we were handling particularly the Palestinian-Israeli crisis and

what in the Arab world is seen - and I think what everywhere is seen - as the very real plight of the Palestinian people. (What was your response here when you brought that message back?) It confirmed the impression that people had. It did not result in a change of policy, but then we did not expect it to.

ARAB LEAGUE SUMMIT: [ARABIC + APPLAUSE DIPS]

ED: March 27th leaders of the Arab world gather for a summit in Beirut. On the table a peace plan drawn up by Saudi Arabia. It is the brain child of Crown Prince Abdullah, and it is born of frustration with America's attitude. Adel al-Jubeir is the Crown Prince's advisor.

AL-JUBEIR: The.. United States is the only country that can move the process forward: whenever the US is engaged it moves forward, whenever the US is disengaged, it slides back. Whenever it slides back, violence increases and emotions increase and resentment towards America in the Arab world increases and so our view has always been that the US must be engaged. . . . and frankly when we recognised that the process is not going anywhere, and that there was not much effort given by the United States, Crown Prince Abdullah put force his vision for a peaceful settlement in order to refocus people on the peace process, hopefully to re-energise the peace camp in Israel and in the United States and to provide open doors that may provide an opportunity to extract the region from, from the situation that it was in.

ED: The plan is rejected by Israel and soon fades from view amid the headlined horrors of what's happening there and in the Palestinian territories. The American Secretary of State Colin Powell visits the region in April but it is not until the summer that George Bush outlines his master plan for the Middle East. The speech he gives on the 24th of June is much delayed and eagerly awaited.

By the time the President gets to his feet in the Rose Garden at the White House in Washington his text has gone through 26 drafts – and in the final phases someone has slipped in an explosive demand. Yasser Arafat must go.

BUSH: Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership so that a Palestinian state can be born . I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror. I call on them to build a practising democracy based on tolerance and liberty.

ED: President's National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice.

RICE: The world should want for the Palestinian people what we want for all people, which is that they have a leadership that is constrained in its arbitrariness by institutions -- by a legal structure that matters, by a judiciary that matters, by a legislature that matters; by ministers who are actually real ministers; by transparent financial obligations and activities, so that money that goes in is really for the benefit of the people (But isn't it up to the Palestinians to decide who they want to lead them?) Of course it's up to the Palestinians to decide who they want to lead them. It is up to the Palestinians to understand, too, that there are consequences to leadership that is in bed with terrorists

ED: Britain urges a different course of action – but this time it doesn't work. The coin forged through transatlantic co-operation cannot always buy the president's ear. The Foreign Secretary Jack Straw.

STRAW: I made it clear at the time that there was a difference of view between us and the US administration. We will continue to deal with Arafat as we deal with many heads of government. Arafat is head of an organisation but many people in as it were equivalent positions, we don't choose them. We have to deal with the reality.

ED: The rumours of war with Iraq are everywhere now. And America's eyes are fixed on Baghdad, not Jerusalem.

Washington August 1st, and King Abdullah of Jordan joins the now noisy chorus urging George Bush to think again. Middle East peace, not war with Iraq, he argues, should be the focus for American attention.

ABDULLAH: We all know that the crux of the matter is the Israeli Palestinian problem and the Israeli Arab one, and to be able to push the blame, as some people are doing, or convincing people in America that Iraq should be sought first when really the core of tragedy in the Middle East for the past forty, fifty years has been the Israeli Arab, Israeli Palestinian problem, and so to sort of push it off onto other countries I think is very irresponsible.

ED: One of the King's critical meetings on this day is with Condoleezza Rice. Dr Rice is not one of those who engages in the megaphone diplomacy of public speeches – her power lies in her discretion and her unique access to the President when foreign policy is in play. And on the question of military action against Saddam Hussein, her understanding of the presidential mind is startlingly clear.

RICE: He has developed biological weapons, and lied to the U.N. repeatedly about the stockpiles and the numbers and the volume of that. He has used chemical weapons against his own people and against his neighbours. He has invaded his neighbours. He has killed thousands of his own people. He shoots at our planes in the no-fly zone, where we're trying to enforce U.N. security resolutions. And despite the fact that he lost this war -- a war, by the way, which he started -- he negotiates with the United Nations as if he won the war. I think it's a very stunning indictment. And so the moral case -- that this is an evil man who, left to his own devices, will wreak havoc again, on his own population, his neighbours, and, if he gets weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, on all of us -- is a very powerful moral case for regime change (There were people right back in the first week after September the 11th who thought action should be taken against Iraq then. How urgent do you think it is now, given what you've just said?) We certainly do not have the luxury of doing nothing.

ABDULLAH: Well I mean can you imagine a very large country the size of Iraq disintegrating into, into.. chaos as three factions of Iraqi society have a go at each other, Shia Kurds and Sunis.. obviously there is, Iran is a Shia country, there's Shias in the Gulf, .. Kurds have their own problems with other countries on their borders, Sunis being sort of outnumbered by, by the other two factions, you could, you could see this very easily spilling out of the borders of Iraq into elsewhere in the middle east, and millions of people having a go at each other inside Iraq is, is going to be catastrophic for the whole region. (Do you feel

threatened by Saddam Hussein I mean do you believe.. he has weapons of mass destruction.) Well no I don't, I don't feel threatened by anybody but I don't, he, well we do know that he's had chemical weapons, he's used those before on, in his war between Iraq and Iran and on, on the Kurds. Nuclear capability I really don't know, I doubt it, to be quite honest at this stage.

ED: It is a fractious summer, and in the quiet of the holiday months each contribution to the debate rings loud around the world. Paul Wolfowitz at the Pentagon was one of those who began pushing the case for action against Iraq in the week immediately after September 11th.

WOLFOWITZ: One can never be happy here if there are problems with allies and yet there are always problems with allies. We get over a lot of them... But I am not surprised when issues are as big as the ones we're dealing with that they are going to be disagreements. However, the fact that we share very common perspectives about goals and what's desirable makes me much more optimistic. When the president talks about building a better world beyond the war in terrorism, he doesn't have a vision of the world that's radically different from what our European allies have so we are debating tactics and if one tactic is successful then everyone will come around and agree ok we are at the right end and if it is not successful then the . .we try it and it's not successful then I guess we'll go and try something else.

Ed: America still has apparently rock solid support from one quarter – and a new Bush-Blair doctrine is in the making – the concept of pre-emptive self defence.

BLAIR: What has changed in relation to Iraq or any other part of the world is the clear understanding that if there is a threat it has to be dealt with and cannot be ignored, and we shouldn't wait until that threat then materialises. (A lot has been said about the impact of 11 September and what has happened since on relations between Britain and the United States, which have obviously been very close - some as you know have said too slavish from our point of view. Leaving the rhetoric aside, can you give me an illustration of perhaps one occasion when you feel you have influenced American policy as a result of that closeness, and one when they have influenced our policy.) First of all, our relationship with America is not one of us pleading with America and America deciding whether to change its mind or not. It's just not like that at all. It is a strategic partnership based on shared co-operation and values. We share basically the same world perspective and values. For example, when we worked with America to deliver a new relationship between Russia and NATO, that was very much as a result of a close partnership and a shared sense of purpose. When we have recently, with America, co-operated on issues to do with Africa and the G8, it has been for the same reason, and it is really less a question of us going along and pleading with them, or them coming along pleading with us, than it is a sense of trying to make sure that we work in very, very close partnership with each other.

ED: For some of the British papers there's a running gag; Tony Blair in the role of George Bush's poodle. To the British ambassador in Washington, Sir Christopher Meyer, that's just a failure to understand what is really good diplomatic practice.

MEYER: We do have extraordinary good access to administration and to Congress. And I do believe that we are always listened to. Are we listened to more closely? Do we have more influence now than we do in any other time? Very hard to say because I think if we come to the Americans with well thought-out positions, clear strategies and a willingness not only to

talk but to do then you get listened to. (What do you make of the poodle stories in the British Press?) Load of balls! Complete rubbish. You know, there is no canine diplomacy over here.

ED: As the summer draws to a close, the issue of Iraq dominates the diplomatic landscape – but look ahead and there are yet more battles to be fought in the service of the Bush Doctrine - that declaration of war on terrorism spelt made on the evening of September 11th itself. Iraq's neighbour Iran is also on the list of nations judged to be with the terrorists and not with America.

RICE: It is very clear that Iran is not on the side of peace. It can't say that it is worthy of trade and worthy of engagement and at the same time that a very large part and the most powerful part of its government is funding terrorism around the world. (I suppose the underlying question is does the Bush doctrine endure or was it something simply very effective, a rhetorical flourish if you like, that's very effective in dealing with Afghanistan but does it have a continuing relevance as a way of analysing international politics?) Well I think it has changed dramatically the way we think about terrorism and what it really says -- and this is really the enduring part -- is you are responsible, as a sovereign state, for what happens inside your borders. And you have to make a choice, if something is happening inside your borders that is supportive of terrorism, to stop that activity. If you have not the means to stop that activity, because of weak institutions or the lack of resources, then you deserve our help in doing that. But the responsibility rests with the sovereign state to make certain that terrorists cannot use their territory to attack others.

ED: The secretary general at the UN, Kofi Annan, has been pleading the case for a collective approach for months now.

ANNAN: You talked about the importance of continuing to work through the United Nations in the long term in the war against terrorism, do you think that that message is understood as you would like it to be in Washington at the moment.) Perhaps there's room for improvement, I think we can do better. Quite a lot of them understand it but we need to perhaps repeat it a bit more often. (And is Iraq one of the areas where you feel you could, they could as you say do better.) I think on Iraq they are hearing from so many people, from Europe from .. Middle East, and I myself have indicated that I think it would be unwise to bomb Iraq.

ED: And as the anniversary of September 11th passes, there are voices calling for a different way of defining this new world order.

MUSIC STARTS

MOUSSA: The agenda of the world, the old agenda has changed.

ED: Amr Moussa, secretary general of the Arab League.

MOUSSA: After 9/11, the world was presented with an agenda of one item - combating terrorism - which would take priority over everything else, and this is the change that so many countries do not accept that, poverty is as evil as, as terrorism. In the Arab world, we believe that foreign military occupation, Israeli military occupation is as evil as original terrorism. It cannot be, we cannot sweep all those important items under the carpet of international

terrorism. We are party to the work against terrorism, but we have other items that we have to cater to.

ED: Chris Patten is the EU's Commissioner for External Relations.

PATTEN: I have a view of America and of America's international leadership which presupposes that Americans understand the importance if you are the biggest kid on the block of establishing a moral consensus for what you want to do, and I think America is much mightier when it does that, much mightier when it shows that, I think, beguiling humility.

ED: America has terrorism on its mind – and Iraq in its sights.

BUSH AT UN: We cannot stand by and do nothing while dangers gather. We must stand up for our security, and for the permanent rights and the hopes of mankind. By heritage and by choice, the United States of America will make that stand. And, delegates to the United Nations, you have the power to make that stand, as well.

MUSIC ENDS