

# **BRIEFING BOOK ON JOHN BOLTON**



*By Jim Morin, The Miami Herald*

**ADMINISTRATION NOMINEE TO BE  
UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED  
NATIONS**

**April 2005**

## Table of Contents

Biography of John Bolton.....	page 3
Secretary Rice’s announcement of appointment.....	page 4
Talking points: Why John Bolton should not be confirmed.....	page 7
Arguments in favor of Bolton -- and responses.....	page 11
Letter from Retired Diplomats to Chairman Richard Lugar.....	page 15
Legislative history: 2001 nomination for Undersecretary of Arms Control..	page 20
John Bolton: Background and policy positions.....	page 23
John Bolton in his own words.....	page 39
What Senators have said about John Bolton.....	page 46
Editorials from around the country.....	page 51
Articles and OpEds of interest.....	page 55
"Boltonism" - New Yorker - Samantha Power	
"The Domestic Bolton" - American Prospect - Michael Tomasky	
"Bolton's Big Secret" - Nation Magazine - Ari Berman	
"Wrong Man for This U.N." - Peter Beinart OpEd	
"Kudos to Bolton for telling it like it is" - Mark Steyn, Chicago Sun-Times	
"Cheney Defends Bush Appointments" - Washington Post	
"Tough Love or Tough Luck?" - Susan E. Rice OpEd	
"Bush's Bomb Thrower" - Time Magazine - March 21, 2005	

## **Biography of John Bolton**

*(Source: Department of State web site, Bureau of Public Affairs)*

**John R. Bolton**  
**Under Secretary, Arms Control and International Security**  
**Term of Appointment: 05/11/2001 to present**

John R. Bolton was sworn in as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security on May 11, 2001.

Prior to his appointment, Mr. Bolton was Senior Vice President of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI). AEI is a nonprofit public policy center dedicated to preserving and strengthening the foundations of freedom through research education, and open debate.

Mr. Bolton has spent many years of his career in public service. Previous positions he has held are Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs at the Department of State, 1989-1993; Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, 1985-1989; Assistant Administrator for Program and Policy Coordination, U.S. Agency for International Development, 1982-1983; General Counsel, U.S. Agency for International Development, 1981-1982.

Mr. Bolton is also an attorney. From 1974-1981 he was an associate at the Washington office of Covington & Burling, where he returned as a member of the firm from 1983-1985, after public service at the U.S. Agency for International Development. From 1993 through 1999, he was a partner in the law firm of Lerner, Reed, Bolton & McManus.

Under Secretary Bolton was born in Baltimore on November 20, 1948. He graduated with a B.A., summa cum laude, from Yale University and received his J.D. from Yale Law School.

Released on May 22, 2001

**Announcement of Nomination of  
John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the UN**

March 7, 2005

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/43062.htm>

SECRETARY OF STATE CONDELEEZZA RICE: Good afternoon. This past September at the United Nations General Assembly, President Bush spoke of our nation's commitments to working in close partnership with the United Nations. The United States is committed to the success of the United Nations and we view the UN as an important component of our diplomacy. The American people respect the idealism that sparked the creation of the United Nations and we share the UN's unshakable support for human dignity.

At this time of great opportunity and great promise, the charge to the international community is clear: we who are on the right side of freedom's divide have an obligation to help those who were unlucky enough to be born on the wrong side of that divide. The hard work of freedom is a task of generations; yet, it is also urgent work that cannot be deferred.

We have watched in awe in Afghanistan, as men and women once suppressed by the Taliban walked miles and stood for hours in the snow just to cast a ballot for their first vote as a free people. We have watched as millions of Iraqi men and women defied terrorists and cast their free votes and began their nation's new history. We have seen determination in the faces of citizens in places like Ukraine and Georgia and the Palestinian territories, as they have stood firm for their freedom.

We are seeing political reforms begin to take place in Qatar and Jordan and Egypt and Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, and this very morning we applaud the courage of those on the frontlines of freedom in Lebanon who are seeking free and fair elections. In this era of expanding freedom, there is room for optimism but much hard work lies ahead. The international community has a challenging agenda before it, from the Middle East to Sudan to Haiti to the Balkans from Iran to the Korean Peninsula and on many other issues.

Now, more than ever, the UN must play a critical role as it strives to fulfill the dreams and hopes and aspirations of its original promise to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith and fundamental human rights and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. President Bush has sent our most skilled and experienced diplomats to represent the United States at the UN. Today, I am honored to continue that tradition by announcing that President Bush intends to nominate John Bolton to be our next Ambassador to the United Nations.

The President and I have asked John to do this work because he knows how to get things done. He is a tough-minded diplomat, he has a strong record of success and he has a proven track record of effective multilateralism. For the past four years John has served as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs. In that position, John has held primary responsibility for the issue that UN Secretary

General Kofi Annan has identified as one of our most crucial challenges to international peace and security: stemming the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

John helped build a coalition of more than 60 countries to help combat the spread of WMD through the President's Proliferation Security Initiative. John played a key diplomatic role in our sensitive negotiations with Libya when that nation made the wise choice to give up its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction. And John was the chief negotiator of the Treaty of Moscow, which was signed by Presidents Putin and Bush to reduce nuclear warheads by two-thirds.

In President George H.W. Bush's Administration, John served as Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations and worked on several key diplomatic initiatives with the UN, including work on UN reform and work on the repayment of arrearages and assessments. In 1991, John was the principal architect behind the initiative that finally led the United Nations General Assembly to repeal the notorious resolution that equated Zionism and racism.

And few may remember this, but John worked between 1997 and 2000 as an assistant to former Secretary James Baker in his capacity as the Secretary General's personal envoy to the Western Sahara. John did this work pro bono. If few Americans have direct experience working for the United Nations, I'm confident that fewer still have gained that experience on their own nickel. Through history, some of our best ambassadors have been those with the strongest voices, ambassadors like Jean Kirkpatrick and Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

John Bolton is personally committed to the future success of the United Nations and he will be a strong voice for reform at a time when the United Nations has begun to reform itself to help meet the challenging agenda before the international community. John will also help to build a broader base of support here in the United Nations for the UN -- in the United States for the UN and its mission. As Secretary General Annan has said, "U.S. support the UN is critical to the success of this institution." The United States will continue to do its part.

John, you have my confidence and that of the President. We thank you for the work you have done on behalf of our nation. To John's wife, Gretchen, and daughter Jennifer Sarah and other friends of John who are here with us today, we thank you for all that you do. But John, your most important work is yet to come. And I look forward to working closely with you on behalf of our nation and the international community in support of the United Nations.

**UNDER SECRETARY BOLTON:** Madame Secretary, you and the President have done me a great honor in nominating me to be the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations. If confirmed by the Senate, I will continue to work closely with members of Congress and our colleagues both in the Foreign Service and in the civil service to advance President Bush's policies.

As you know, Madame Secretary, I've worked in the government for many years, at the Agency for International Development, the Department of Justice and here at the Department of State. This work has afforded me the opportunity to learn from some of

our nation's finest public servants. It has been an honor and a privilege to represent the United States Government in crafting many multinational and bilateral agreements to further our National Security objectives.

Madame Secretary, my record over many years demonstrates clear support for effective multilateral diplomacy. Whether it be the Proliferation Security Initiative, the G-8 global partnership or adopting UN resolutions, working closely with others is essential to ensuring a safer world. We all agree that there are numerous challenges facing the United States and the security of our country and all freedom-loving peoples must be protected. Close cooperation and the time-honored tradition of frank communication is central to achieving our mutually-held objectives. The United Nations affords us the opportunity to move our policies forward together with unity of purpose.

As you know, I have over the years written critically about the UN. Indeed, one highlight of my professional career was the 1991 successful effort to repeal the General Assembly's 1975 resolution equating Zionism with racism, thus removing the greatest stain on the UN's reputation. I have consistently stressed in my writings that American leadership is critical to the success of the UN, an effective UN, one that is true to the original intent of its charter's framers.

This is a time of opportunity for the UN which, likewise, requires American leadership to achieve successful reform. I know you and the President will provide that leadership. If confirmed by the Senate, I will roll up my sleeves to join you in that effort which will require close, bipartisan Congressional support.

Finally a personal note, I'd like to thank two very special people who have been with me for many years, my wife Gretchen and our daughter Jennifer Sarah, who have endured my many foreign trips and long absences in the service of our country.

Madame Secretary, again, I want to thank you and the President for your confidence and for your support.

Released on March 7, 2005

*(Source: Department of State web site, Bureau of Public Affairs)*

## **Talking Points: Why John Bolton should not be U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.**

### **Bolton is the wrong man at the wrong time to represent the US at the U.N.**

Naming an ideologue with open disdain for the UN to be U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. sends the wrong signal to the international community at precisely the wrong time. As the United States confronts crises around the world, it also faces unprecedented hostility from abroad. Polling consistently show that even citizens of our strongest allies now hold an unfavorable view of the United States. These perceptions undermine our security because none of our nation's problems can be dealt with alone. President George W. Bush has said he is committed to "effective multilateralism" and global institutions that support transnational work. If President Bush and Secretary of State Rice are serious about reassuring our allies and rebuilding alliances, why pick Bolton?

In the wake of the Iraq war, we can no longer afford go-it-alone policies. The United States today faces a intimidating array of international crises: the global war on terror, nuclear weapons in Iran and North Korea, and post-war violence and reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition, other transnational problems that have received insufficient attention or resources during the past decade – including global warming, human rights, the spread of HIV/AIDS, and economic development – now pose grave risks.

None of these critical issues can be meaningfully and adequately addressed by the United States alone. Each requires the willing and full participation of allies and international institutions. Failing to engage these indispensable partners will make U.S. efforts less effective, and jeopardize the stability, security, prosperity, and health of Americans. John Bolton is the wrong man to forge the alliances and consensus needed to address these vital challenges. His nomination would only exacerbate America's global isolation at a time when it desperately needs allies.

The President will send the wrong message to his allies and friends if Bolton, an ardent isolationist, is appointed as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. This appointment could prove disastrous to U.S. national security interests.

### **Bolton's track record the past four years a disaster.**

Bolton's track record at State shows how dangerous this nomination is. As Undersecretary at State, he did nothing to resolve the potentially explosive North Korea and Iran situations, except to inflame them. In the midst of tense negotiations with North Korea about their weapons program, Bolton publicly called leader Kim Jong-Il a "tyrannical dictator," and said life in North Korea was a "hellish nightmare," putting the entire diplomatic mission in jeopardy. Bolton's comments so angered the North Korean government that officials refused to negotiate with him, calling him "human scum and bloodsucker." Bolton went home, and the State Department had to send a replacement representative on behalf of the U.S. He does not believe in carrots or multilateralism –

and he does not get results. Four years later, the situations in both countries are more unstable, the Non-Proliferation Treaty is in jeopardy and the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program is beset by bureaucratic hurdles, and the world and the U.S. are less safe as a result. The U.S. does not have a history of finger pointing and name-calling to get its way at the U.N.; we have one of dignity and diplomacy – and results.

**A more effective U.N. and a productive U.S.-U.N. relationship are essential for a successful American foreign policy.**

In today's global world, security threats do not recognize national boundaries and must be addressed at both the national and international levels. The global community has a collective responsibility to ensure a secure, safe world for us all. Therefore, the U.S. needs an Ambassador at the United Nations who will build coalitions and strengthen U.S.-U.N. relations. Unfortunately, John Bolton, the abrasive anti-U.N. ideologue and President Bush's nominee to be America's next U.N. Ambassador, seeks to undermine, not reform, the institution.

This would have disastrous consequences for the U.N. and for U.S. interests safeguarded there. For example, the U.S. is depending on the United Nations to assist with such vital tasks as training monitors and conducting difficult elections in Iraq and Afghanistan, securing Syria's withdrawal from Lebanon, leading tsunami relief in South East Asia, and combating terrorism globally. President Bush recognizes the importance of the U.N. and foresees the need for a stronger U.S.-U.N. relationship, demonstrated by the 115 percent increase in U.N. peacekeeping funds in his FY06 budget proposal. Yet John Bolton has argued to abolish the U.N., stating "nothing more should be paid to the U.N. system." (The Washington Times, 1998).

President Bush has said publicly that he recognizes the importance of global alliances. John Bolton, on the other hand, has said, "There is no such thing as the United Nations. There is an international community that occasionally can be led by the only real power left in the world and that is the United States when it suits our interest and we can get others to go along." (1994 Global Structures Convocation, NY, NY) More recently, he has said, "If I were redoing the Security Council today, I'd have one permanent member because that's the real reflection of the distribution of power in the world. (NPR, with Juan Williams, 2000)

Even before being nominated as Ambassador to the U.N., Bolton frequently interfered in U.N. business to promote what he saw were the best interests of the U.S., regardless of allied interest or even the norms of the international community. During the period leading up to the invasion of Iraq, Bolton ordered an intelligence probe of Hans Blix, U.N. arms inspector heading the UNMOVIC mission in Iraq. Unhappy with IAEA director Mohamed El Baradei's stance toward Iran, Bolton ordered yet another intelligence probe, and led what turned into an unsuccessful campaign to remove El Baradei from his job.

Bolton is often unwilling or unable to stay on the reservation. Putting him at the U.N. only raises the stakes.

## **The United States cannot afford John Bolton as our U.N. Ambassador.**

Bolton is known throughout the world as someone who prefers a go-it-alone approach and someone who relishes the role of spoiler of international efforts. He also has a public disdain for international laws that bind us, and that set global norms for all law-abiding nations.

In 1997, Bolton wrote in a Wall Street Journal column that the United States isn't legally bound to pay its United Nations dues. "Treaties are 'law' only for U.S. domestic purposes," he wrote. "In their international operations, treaties are simply political obligations" (Nov. 17, 1997). Yet international agreements like the Geneva Conventions are strongly embraced by military officials and legal scholars alike – who note that these agreements protect American members of the military who fall into enemy hands as much as they protect enemy fighters captured by Americans. They help keep us safe by setting norms for civilized states to follow.

John Bolton became President Bush's point man for blocking any international arrangement that constrained U.S. power. Under his tenure, he ardently fought current and proposed international treaties limiting nuclear weapons testing, landmines, child soldiers, missile defense, and small arms trade. He dismantled the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, blocked a verification clause to the bioweapons treaty, and helped undo Clinton support for the International Criminal Court. And he was a leading proponent of those seeking to vote against ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. When the treaty was rejected in 1999, he said, "The Senate vote is an unmistakable signal that America rejects the illusionary protections of unenforceable treaties" (IPS-Inter Press Service, March 8, 2001).

We cannot continue to go it alone in the world and we cannot tackle the tough issues before us without the support of other nations and without the support of the U.N. community as a whole—unless we want to pay a terrible price in blood, security, credibility and treasure.

## **John Bolton would rather retire the United Nations than reform it.**

When Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice announced Bolton's nomination as Ambassador to the U.N., she announced that Bolton has a "proven record of multilateralism." Nothing could be further from the truth – except, perhaps, as a champion for multilateral institutions and coalitions that the U.S. controls, like NATO and Iraq's "coalition of the willing."

The United Nations does need to be reformed and retooled so that it can work better with member states, such as the U.S., to solve the global problems of the 21st century that no nation can solve on its own. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has recently issued a comprehensive report recommending areas for change. The U.S. should carefully and thoughtfully consider this report and its recommendations. It is difficult to believe Bolton would do so objectively. Bolton's personal hatred for the U.N. is visceral. He has said, "The secretariat building in New York has 38 stories. If you lost ten stories

today it wouldn't make a bit of difference." (February 1994, Global Structures Convocation, New York, NY.)

John Bolton believes that the United States should estrange itself from the U.N., declaring that the majority of Congress "not only does not care about losing the General Assembly vote but actually see it as a 'make my day' outcome." (The Washington Times, 1998) When the Security Council voted against the U.S.'s impending invasion of Iraq, Bolton decided this was further evidence to "why nothing should be paid to the U.N. system," contrary to current U.S. policy.

**John Bolton lacks the credibility and diplomatic skills to represent American interests globally and effectively carry forward the administration's plans for U.N. reform.**

Some have suggested it's a good thing to have someone so pugnacious in the U.N. job, but this is an immature and even dangerous excuse for a nominating an individual everyone knows has the capacity to hurt rather than help U.S. diplomatic initiatives and interests.

There was a time when this approach made sense: in the 1970s, Daniel Patrick Moynihan was the right person for U.S. Ambassador during a time dominated by Anti-Americanism at the U.N. Today's, however, the challenge is not to respond to Anti-Americanism, but to forge collective approaches to common problems with willing allies. We need a facilitator, not a bomb thrower.

Bolton's belief that the international community is led by "the United States when it suits [U.S.] interest" would alienate even America's most devoted allies. (1994 Global Structures Convocation, New York, NY) Bolton has a history of being a diplomatic liability, often defying his direct orders, and on several occasions undermining nuclear weapons negotiations. In 1999, Bolton told The Los Angeles Times that "we are indifferent to whether we ever have 'normal' diplomatic relations with [North Korea], and ... achieving that goal is entirely in their interests not ours."

**Putting John Bolton in the U.N. would be like putting a bull in a china shop.**

These are perilous times. The United States must use every tool in its tool kit to address the array of threats we face. Diplomacy has always been one of the United States' finest tools. Let us continue in this fine tradition. Putting John Bolton in the U.N. would be like putting a bull in a china shop. We can't afford it – and the stakes are too high.

### **Arguments in favor of Bolton -- and responses**

***"Undersecretary Bolton has been an outspoken critic of the United Nations (UN). However, I have been assured that he will bring a more balanced approach to his new role."*** --Senator Lincoln Chafee (R-RI), statement on March 7, 2005

Response: John Bolton promised a more balanced, less confrontation style at his 2001 confirmation hearing as well after a series of provocative statements while out of government. At that time, in response to tough questions about some of his provocative statements, Bolton twice stated he understood the difference between serving a think tank and serving a President (see quotes section).

Unfortunately, Bolton quickly proved he cannot control his tongue or his actions. at the State Department. He pulled the United States out of Biological Weapons Convention negotiations without previously informing our closest allies. In 2002, Bolton told the Wall Street Journal that renouncing the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court "was the happiest moment of my government service"; he told conference of arms control organizations that the U.S. resents the groups when they promote their views at the UN – in direct contrast to actual U.S. policy; and he stated that "The United States believes that Cuba has at least a limited offensive biological warfare research and development effort" which was in direct contrast to intelligence reports. He has labeled those who oppose U.S. positions as "appeasers." He was an unguided missile at the State Department during the past four years who undermined Secretary of State Powell.

***"The American taxpayer expects their ambassador to scrutinize the actions and expenditures of the U.N. and John Bolton will do just that. Most importantly, Bolton is no newcomer to international politics and I expect that he will show dexterity in being both diplomatic and tough at the same time."***

-- Senator George Allen (R-VA), March 8, 2005 statement

Response: A diplomat can be tough and constructive, but Bolton has been tough and destructive during his four years at the State Department. Bolton has a reputation for being tough on North Korea; he lived up to it when he called Kim Jong Il a "tyrannical dictator" of a country in which "life is a hellish nightmare." Unfortunately, his statement almost single-handedly derailed Administration-supported six-party negotiations with North Korea about their burgeoning nuclear weapons program and helped to lead to four years of failure in stopping either the Iranian or the North Korean nuclear programs.

***"Yet the assumption behind much of the criticism of Bolton from the likes of Kerry is that, regardless of his government's foreign policy, a U.N. ambassador has to be at some level a U.N. booster... Nobody would expect a U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union to be a big booster for the Soviets."*** --Mark Steyn, Syndicated Columnist, March 20, 2005

Response: The United Nations is not the Soviet Union -- our sworn adversary for more than five decades. There is no U.N. containment policy, nor do we have nuclear warheads aimed at Geneva (or New York City, for that matter). In fact, the U.N. Ambassador does need to be a U.N. booster. Bush Administration policy is to work with the U.N. and that it is in our interest for the U.N. to build broad international support for our policies. However, there are many politicians in the U.S. who disagree with the Administration's policy. Part of the ambassador's job is to champion the U.N. to those skeptics and bring them on board.

***"This guy has the credibility to go to the skeptics and say, 'It's in our vital interests to have the U.N. because we can't do all these things alone.'"*** --Senior Bush aide, Time Magazine, March 21, 2005

Response: Unfortunately, there is no guarantee Bolton will say it's in our interests to remain a part of a strong and vital United Nations. He has previously stated that "nothing more should be paid to the U.N. system" and that there was no financial crisis at the UN, but there was "a crisis of U.N. legitimacy."

Bolton has never been good at following orders, either. According the Time Magazine article, "critics say he consistently used his perch as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security to undermine former Secretary of State Colin Powell in his policy battles with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Vice President Dick Cheney." In addition, Bolton tends to believe the United Nations useful only when it agrees with American policy. Such a one-sided attitude is not conducive to compromise and the give-and-take necessary to build international coalitions.

***The man nominated to serve as the next U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., John Bolton, is a man of honor and accomplishment who will help to clean up the corruption, fraud and anti-Americanism of the United Nations. He's someone we can count on to stand up to Kofi Annan and help clean up the U.N., all the way to the Secretariat's office.*** --Move America Forward's Support Bolton website

Response: Move America Forward doesn't want the UN cleaned up; they want it eliminated. A March 24, 2004 CNS News article called them "an organization that wants America to abandon the United Nations". The article quoted Co-Chair Melanie Morgan as saying Kofi Annan's proposed reforms are "about trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people so the politicians can give more of our taxpayer money away to a lost cause."

-----

[Following taken from "The Case for Bolton," Center for American Progress - Posted March 15th, 2005]

Is there a single good reason to send arch-unilateralist John Bolton to the United Nations? Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice tried to present a few when she announced Bolton's nomination last week. Not one holds up to scrutiny:

***CONDI'S CLAIM: "John played a key diplomatic role in our sensitive negotiations with Libya when that nation made the wise choice to give up its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction."*** "Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice Announcement of Nomination of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the UN," Press Release, 3/7/05, U.S. Department of State. Posted at <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/43062.htm> . (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: According to Newsweek, talks with Libya "succeeded only after the British managed to sideline the Bush administration's top arms-control official, John Bolton. ... [A]fter a tense session in London, the British complained that Bolton was obstructing talks. Washington agreed to keep Bolton at home. The assurances that Libya sought were quietly given." Michael Hirsh and John Barry, "Madmen, Rogues, and Nukes," *Newsweek*, 10/11/04. Posted at <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6161107/site/newsweek/>. (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: Bolton opposed the very strategy eventually used to encourage Libya to disarm. "In a 2000 law review article he warned that the effort to isolate Libya via prosecution of the terrorists it sponsors and the UN sanctions 'marks the final collapse

of United States policy against Libyan terrorism.” John R. Bolton, "Is There Really 'Law' in International Affairs?" *Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems*, vol. 10 (spring 2000).

**CONDI'S CLAIM: "John was the chief negotiator of the Treaty of Moscow, which was signed by Presidents Putin and Bush to reduce nuclear warheads by two-thirds."** "Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice Announcement of Nomination of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the UN," Press Release, 3/7/05, U.S. Department of State. Posted at <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/43062.htm> . (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: The Moscow Treaty has been harshly condemned by nuclear proliferation experts (in part precisely because it does not reduce nuclear warheads, as Rice claims; it merely requires a change in their operational status). The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists referred to the treaty as the "jettisoning of predictability, verifiability, irreversibility, and mutual accountability as objectives in our nuclear relationship with Russia." An essay for the prestigious American Academy of Arts & Sciences detailing the treaty's "glaring inadequacies" charges that "If this agreement were seriously expected to carry any burden whatsoever, it would not pass even the most rudimentary scrutiny." Christopher Paine, "The Moscow Treaty: Making Matters Worse" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, November/December 2002, pp. 19-21 (vol. 58, no. 06). Posted at [http://www.thebulletin.org/article.php?art\\_ofn=nd02paine](http://www.thebulletin.org/article.php?art_ofn=nd02paine). (Accessed 3/31/2005).

Jeffrey Lewis and John Steinbruner, "The Unsettled Legacy of the Cold War," *Daedalus*, Fall 2002, pp. 5-10. Posted at <http://www.amacad.org/publications/fall2002/Steinbrunerweb.pdf>. (Accessed 3/31/2005).

Union of Concerned Scientists, "Backgrounder: The Moscow Treaty." Posted 3/7/2003 at [http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_security/nuclear\\_weapons/page.cfm?pageID=1134](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_security/nuclear_weapons/page.cfm?pageID=1134). (Accessed 3/31/2005).

For more on the failings of the Moscow Treaty, read this primer by the Union of Concerned Scientists  
([http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_security/nuclear\\_weapons/page.cfm?pageID=1134](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_security/nuclear_weapons/page.cfm?pageID=1134))

**CONDI'S CLAIM: "Through history, some of our best ambassadors have been those with the strongest voices, ambassadors like Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Daniel Patrick Moynihan."** "Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice Announcement of Nomination of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the UN," Press Release, 3/7/05, U.S. Department of State. Posted at <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/43062.htm>. (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: "[C]omparing Bolton to Moynihan ignores fundamental differences in their views of international law and misrepresents Moynihan's position on the U.N." "Media conservatives misrepresent Moynihan to support Bolton nomination", Media Matters for America. Posted at <http://mediamatters.org/items/200503150001>. (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: "[John Bolton] may do diplomatic jobs for the U.S. government, but John is not a diplomat." – Jeanne Kirkpatrick, 2003 "Absent from the Korea talks: Bush's hard-liner." By Christopher Marquis. *The New York Times*. September 2, 2003, A3.

**CONDI'S CLAIM: "John helped build a coalition of more than 60 countries to help combat the spread of WMD through the President's Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI)."** "Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice Announcement of Nomination of John Bolton as U.S. Ambassador to the UN," Press Release, 3/7/05, U.S. Department of State. Posted at <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/43062.htm>. (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: According to the Arms Control Association, “The initiative does not empower countries to do anything that they previously could not do. Most importantly, PSI does not grant governments any new legal authority to conduct interdictions in international waters or airspace.” Arms Control Association, “The Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) At a Glance”, June 2004. Posted at <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/PSI.asp?print>. (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: Critics say the initiative has yielded no major successes. Though some point to Libya as evidence of a PSI breakthrough, a “closer examination of the record shows PSI played no role in Libya’s decision to disarm.” Speaking at the Daily Press Briefing on December 23, 2003, State Department spokesperson Richard Boucher said: “The United States, for many years, has followed closely developments in Libya with regard to weapons of mass destruction... The Proliferation Security Initiative is a more recent development...”. See transcript at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2003/27483.htm>. (Accessed 3/31/2005).

FACT: The legitimacy of the PSI has been undermined by the administration’s refusal to press the Senate to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. This treaty – negotiated more than 20 years ago – has been ratified by 115 nations, including the other members of the Proliferation Security Initiative (who insist that it provides the only legitimate international framework for the initiative). Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has repeatedly criticized the administration for failing to push senators to ratify the treaty. Lawrence Korb. “Bush Failing at Nuclear Security.” (op-ed) *The Boston Globe*, January 2, 2004.

## **Letter from Retired Diplomats to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Richard Lugar**

March 29, 2005

The Honorable Richard G. Lugar  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee  
450 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510-6225

Dear Senator Lugar,

We have noted with appreciation the moves of President Bush at the beginning of his second term to improve U.S. relations with the countries of the European Union and of the United Nations. Maintaining these ties and the willingness of those countries to cooperate with the United States is essential to U.S. security.

It is for this reason that we write you to express our concern over the nomination of John R. Bolton to be permanent representative of the United States at the United Nations. We urge you to reject that nomination.

By virtue of service in the State Department, USAID and Justice Departments, John Bolton has the professional background needed for this position. But his past activities and statements indicate conclusively that he is the wrong man for this position at a time when the UN is entering a critically important phase of modernization, seeking to promote economic development and democratic reforms and searching for ways to cope better with proliferation crises and a spurt of natural disasters and internal conflicts.

John Bolton has an exceptional record of opposition to efforts to enhance U.S. security through arms control. He led a campaign against ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Today, the administration is pressing for development of new types of nuclear weapons. John Bolton blocked more extensive international agreement to limit sales of small arms, the main killer in internal wars. He led the fight to continue U.S. refusal to participate in the Ottawa Landmine Treaty. Today, the U.S. has joined Russia and China in insisting on the right to continue to deploy anti-personnel landmines. John Bolton crafted the U.S. withdrawal from the joint efforts of 40 countries to formulate a verification system for the Biological Weapons Convention and blocked continuation of these efforts in a period of increasing concern over potential terrorist use of these weapons and of terrorist access to the stocks of countries covertly producing these weapons. John Bolton's unsubstantiated claims that Cuba and Syria are working on biological weapons further discredited the effect of U.S. warnings and U.S. intelligence on weapons of mass destruction.

John Bolton led the successful campaign for U.S. withdrawal from the treaty limiting missile defenses (ABM Treaty). The effects of this action included elimination of the sole treaty barrier to the weaponization of space. In the face of decades of votes in the UN

General Assembly calling for negotiation of a treaty to block deployment of weapons in space, he has blocked negotiation in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament of a treaty on this subject. The administration has repeatedly proposed programs calling for weapon deployment in space.

As chief negotiator of the 2002 Moscow Treaty on withdrawing U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons from field deployment, John Bolton structured a treaty without its own verification regime, without required progress reports from both sides, without the requirement to destroy warheads withdrawn from deployment, and without provision for negotiating continued reductions.

Under his guidance, the State Department repudiated important consensus agreements reached in the year 2000 Review Conference of the Non-proliferation Treaty and has even blocked the formulation of an agenda for the next review conference to be held in May 2005. Under John Bolton as Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, the State Department has continued to fail to resolve the impasse with Russia about the legal liability of U.S. personnel working with Russia on the security of the huge arsenal of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of the former Soviet Union and has failed to accelerate measures aimed at the safety and security of this huge arsenal from theft, illegal sale and terrorist access.

John Bolton's insistence that the UN is valuable only when it directly serves the United States, and that the most effective Security Council would be one where the U.S. is the only permanent member, will not help him to negotiate with representatives of the remaining 96% of humanity at a time when the UN is actively considering enlargement of the Security Council and steps to deal more effectively with failed states and to enhance the UN's peacekeeping capability.

John Bolton's work as a paid researcher for Taiwan, his idea that the U.S. should treat Taiwan as a sovereign state, and that it is fantasy to believe that China might respond with armed force to the secession of Taiwan do not attest to the balanced judgment of a possible U.S. permanent representative on the Security Council. China is emerging as a major world power and the Taiwan issue is becoming more acute.

At a time when the UN is struggling to get an adequate grip on the genocidal killing in Darfur, Sudan, Mr. Bolton's skepticism about UN peacekeeping, about paying the UN dues that fund peacekeeping, and his leadership of the opposition to the International Criminal Court, originally proposed by the U.S. itself in order to prosecute human rights offenders, will all make it difficult for the U.S. to play an effective leadership role at a time when the UN itself and many member states are moving to improve UN capacity to deal with international problems.

Given these past actions and statements, John R. Bolton cannot be an effective promoter of the U.S. national interest at the UN. We urge you to oppose his nomination.

Sincerely,

The Hon. Terrell E. Arnold Former Deputy Director, Office of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State (Reagan) Former U.S. Consul General, Sao Paulo, Brazil (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Harry G. Barnes, Jr. Former U.S. ambassador to Romania, Chile, and India (Nixon, Ford, Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) Robert L. Barry Former U.S. ambassador to Bulgaria and Indonesia (Reagan, Clinton) Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs (Carter) Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs (Carter)

Ambassador Josiah H. Beeman Former U.S. ambassador to New Zealand and Western Samoa (Clinton)

Ambassador (ret.) Maurice M. Bernbaum Former U.S. ambassador to Ecuador and Venezuela (Eisenhower, Johnson)

Ambassador (ret.) Richard J. Bloomfield Former U.S. ambassador to Ecuador and Portugal (Ford, Carter, Reagan)

Ambassador George Bunn Former member of U.S. delegation to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) negotiations (Johnson) Former U.S. ambassador to the Geneva Disarmament Conference (UN) (Johnson)

Ambassador (ret.) James Cheek Former U.S. ambassador to Sudan and Argentina (G.H.W. Bush, Clinton)

Ambassador (ret.) Carleton S. Coon Former U.S. ambassador to Nepal (Reagan) Ambassador (ret.) Jane Coon Former U.S. ambassador to Bangladesh (Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) John H. Crimmins Former U.S. ambassador to the Dominican Republic and Brazil (Johnson, Nixon, Ford)

Ambassador (ret.) Richard T. Davies Former U.S. ambassador to Poland (Nixon)

Ambassador (ret.) Jonathan Dean Former U.S. representative to the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction Talks, Vienna (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Willard A. DePree Former U.S. ambassador to Mozambique and Bangladesh (Ford, Reagan, G.H.W. Bush)

Ambassador (ret.) Robert S. Dillon Former U.S. ambassador to Lebanon (Reagan) Former Deputy Commissioner General of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) (Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) Donald B. Easum Former U.S. ambassador to Nigeria and Upper Volta (Burkina Faso) (Nixon, Ford) Former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (Nixon, Ford)

Ambassador (ret.) James Bruce Engle Former U.S. ambassador to Dahomey (Nixon, Ford)

Ambassador (ret.) Richard K. Fox Former U.S. ambassador to Trinidad and Tobago (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Holsey Gates Handyside Former U.S. ambassador to Mauritania (Ford, Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) William C. Harrop Former ambassador to Israel, Kenya, and Zaire (Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, Clinton), Former Inspector General, U.S. Department of State (Nixon)

Ambassador (ret.) Samuel F. Hart Former U.S. ambassador to Ecuador (Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) Arthur A. Hartman Former U.S. ambassador to France and the Soviet Union (Carter, Reagan), Former Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs (Nixon)

Ambassador Ulric Haynes, Jr. Former U.S. ambassador to Algeria (Carter)

Ambassador Gerald B. Helman Former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Geneva (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Robert T. Hennemeyer Former U.S. ambassador to Gambia (Reagan)  
Ambassador (ret.) Lewis Hoffacker Former U.S. ambassador to Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea (Nixon)

Ambassador (ret.) H. Allen Holmes Former U.S. ambassador to Portugal (Reagan) Former Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs (Reagan) Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict (Clinton)

Ambassador (ret.) Robert V. Keeley Former U.S. Ambassador to Mauritius, Zimbabwe, and Greece (Ford, Carter, Reagan) Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (Carter)

Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr. Former Deputy Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency(ACDA) (Carter)

Ambassador Henry L. Kimelman Former U.S. ambassador to Haiti (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Roger Kirk Former U.S. ambassador to Somalia and Romania (Nixon, Ford, Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) Dennis H. Kux Former U.S. ambassador to Ivory Coast (Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) James F. Leonard Former Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations (Ford, Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Samuel W. Lewis Former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs (Ford), Former Director of Policy Planning, State Department (Clinton) Former ambassador to Israel (Carter, Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) Princeton N. Lyman Former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs (Clinton) Director, Bureau of Refugee Programs, U.S. Department of State (G.H.W. Bush), Former U.S. ambassador to South Africa and Nigeria (Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, Clinton)

Ambassador (ret.) Richard Cavins Matheron Former U.S. ambassador to Swaziland (Carter, Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) Charles E. Marthinsen Former U.S. ambassador to Qatar (Carter, Reagan)

Jack Mendelsohn Deputy Assistant Director of the Strategic Programs Bureau, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) (Reagan) Senior ACDA representative on U.S. START delegation (Reagan)

Ambassador Carol Moseley-Braun Former U.S. ambassador to New Zealand and Samoa (Clinton)

Ambassador (ret.) Donald R. Norland Former U.S. ambassador to the Netherlands, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland, and Chad (Johnson, Ford, Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) David Passage Former U.S. ambassador to Botswana (G.H.W. Bush)

Ambassador (ret.) Edward L. Peck Former U.S. ambassador to Iraq and Mauritania (Carter, Reagan)

Ambassador (ret.) Jack R. Perry Former U.S. ambassador to Bulgaria (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Christopher H. Phillips Former Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the UN (Nixon) Former U.S. ambassador to Brunei (G.H.W. Bush)

Ambassador Stanley R. Resor Former Secretary of the Army (Johnson, Nixon) Former U.S. representative to the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction Talks, Vienna (Nixon, Ford, Carter)

Ambassador Nicholas A. Rey Former U.S. ambassador to Poland (Clinton)

John B. Rhinelander Deputy Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State (Nixon) Legal adviser to the U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Delegation (SALT I) (Nixon)

Ambassador (ret.) Stuart W. Rockwell Former U.S. ambassador to Morocco (Nixon)

Ambassador (ret.) Talcott W. Seelye Former U.S. ambassador to Tunisia and Syria (Nixon, Ford, Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Carl Spielvogel Former U.S. ambassador to the Slovak Republic (Clinton)

Ambassador (ret.) Monteagle Stearns Former U.S. ambassador to Greece and Ivory Coast (Ford, Carter, Reagan) Former Vice President, National Defense University (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Andrew L. Steigman Former Ambassador to Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe (Ford)

Ambassador (ret.) Harry E.T. Thayer Former U.S. ambassador to Singapore (Carter, Reagan)

The Hon. Hans N. Tuch Career Minister, U.S. Foreign Service, USIA

Ambassador (ret.) Theresa A. Tull Former U.S. ambassador to Guyana and Brunei (Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, Clinton)

Ambassador William J. vanden Heuvel Former Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations (Carter) Former U.S. representative to the United Nations, Geneva (Carter)

Ambassador (ret.) Christopher van Hollen Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs (Nixon) Former U.S. ambassador to Sri Lanka (Nixon, Ford)

Ambassador (ret.) Robert E. White Former U.S. ambassador to Paraguay and El Salvador (Carter) Former Deputy U.S. Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States (Ford)

Ambassador (ret.) James M. Wilson, Jr. Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, East Asia and Pacific Affairs (Nixon) Coordinator for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, Department of State (Ford)

## **Legislative history: 2001 nomination for Undersecretary of Arms Control**

In 2001, President Bush nominated John Bolton to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

His nomination was controversial from the start. He went through a tough hearing on March 29, 2001, described in the Associated Press story below:

"State Department nominee endures tough criticism"  
AP - March 29, 2001 - By Carolyn Skorneck, Associated Press Writer

President Bush's choice for undersecretary of state for arms control and international security underwent a battering from Democratic senators at his confirmation hearing Thursday.

"It stings," John Bolton told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, when Sen. John Kerry, D-Mass., used the phrase "confirmation conversion," a reference to nominees' changing opinions to win senators' approval for government jobs.

"The purpose of the hearing is to find out who we're nominating," Kerry said. "I think we have every rationale in the world to want to know what the beliefs are of the person being confirmed. It matters."

Bolton and the Democrats clashed over conservative views he expressed in numerous articles as an American Enterprise Institute scholar, such as his criticism of the United Nations and of the Clinton administration's North Korea policy and his promotion of diplomatic recognition for Taiwan.

Bolton, an attorney who held two assistant attorney general positions in the Reagan administration's Justice Department and was assistant secretary of state for international organizations in the first Bush administration, enjoyed the staunch support of the committee's chairman, Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C.

Helms called Bolton "a treasured friend" and repeated his earlier encomium that "John Bolton is the kind of man with whom I would want to stand at Armageddon."

"John is a patriot," Helms said. "He is a brilliant thinker and writer. And, most importantly, he is a man with the courage of his convictions. John says what he means and means what he says. And that is precisely what is needed at the State Department and elsewhere in the government." Democratic members, however, told Bolton that some of his published ideas, such as Taiwan recognition, would be impossible under

established U.S. policy. They wondered whether he could follow policies that go against his beliefs.

Under questioning about North Korea, Bolton told the committee that "I've actually changed my mind from time to time" as circumstances that led to certain views changed. But when Secretary of State Colin Powell lays down a policy, he said, "I will adhere to that policy."

Bolton, referring to the one-China issue, said writing from the American Enterprise Institute afforded him a freedom to express himself, but "I understand the difference between being in a think tank and being a subordinate in the Department of State.

"The broad policies for the treatment of Taiwan and China are set, ... and I respect them, and I will obey them. Of all the different jobs I've had in government, I've never had any allegations that I wasn't following the policies that were set."

During a discussion of the United Nations, Kerry told him that his reference to "confirmation conversions" was not directed at him, but then he seemed to indicate it was.

"Am I asked to vote for the John Bolton who believes ... the U.N. is not a functioning organization or that we can take 10 floors away and it will make no difference?" Kerry asked. "Or do I believe that it's the person that you say you are, because you have reflected and changed some of these views?"

On April 26, 2001, Sen. Joseph Biden, ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, delivered a speech strongly opposing the nomination:

"I am going to oppose Mr. Bolton's nomination . . . Let me state at the outset that I respect Mr. Bolton. I think he is a capable individual. What I do question is his philosophy, his record, his experience in arms control matters, and his diplomatic temperament . . . Mr. Bolton comes to the job with a sparse record on arms control and non- proliferation. But what we do know suggests an individual who questions the relevance of arms control agreements . . . My discomfort level is raised still higher by Mr. Bolton's questioning of whether treaties are binding on nations that sign them. He has written that 'while treaties may well be politically or even morally binding, they are not legally obligatory. They are just not 'law' as we apprehend the term.'"

The Foreign Relations Committee approved the nomination on a 10 - 8 vote. Voting for the nomination were all Republicans plus Sen. Russ Feingold (WI): Helms (NC), Lugar (IN), Hagel (NE), Gordon Smith (OR), Thomas (WI), Frist (TN), Chafee (RI), Allen (VA) and Brownback (KS).

Opposing the nomination were 8 Democrats; Biden (DE), Sarbanes (MD), Dodd (CT), Kerry (MA), Wellstone (MN), Boxer (CA), Torricelli (NJ) and Nelson (FL).

After a debate on May 7 and 8, 2001, the Senate voted to confirm Bolton on a 57 - 43 vote. Voting for Bolton on the Senate floor were seven Democrats: Lieberman (CT), Miller (GA), Bayh (IN), Breaux (LA), Landrieu (LA), Nelson (NE), Feingold (WI)

**The complete vote on confirming Bolton in 2001 as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control - May 8, 2001 - yeas 57, nays 43 - [Rollcall Vote No. 92 Ex.]**

<b>YEAS--57</b>	Hutchinson	Bingaman	Rockefeller
Allard	Hutchison	Boxer	Sarbanes
Allen	Inhofe	Byrd	Schumer
Bayh	Jeffords	Cantwell	Stabenow
Bennett	Kyl	Carnahan	Torricelli
Bond	Landrieu	Carper	Wellstone
Breaux	Lieberman	Cleland	Wyden
Brownback	Lott	Clinton	
Bunning	Lugar	Conrad	
Burns	McCain	Corzine	
Campbell	McConnell	Daschle	
Chafee	Miller	Dayton	
Cochran	Murkowski	Dodd	
Collins	Nelson (NE)	Dorgan	
Craig	Nickles	Durbin	
Crapo	Roberts	Edwards	
DeWine	Santorum	Feinstein	
Domenici	Sessions	Graham	
Ensign	Shelby	Harkin	
Enzi	Smith (NH)	Hollings	
Feingold	Smith (OR)	Inouye	
Fitzgerald	Snowe	Johnson	
Frist	Specter	Kennedy	
Gramm	Stevens	Kerry	
Grassley	Thomas	Kohl	
Gregg	Thompson		
Hagel	Thurmond		
Hatch	Voinovich		
Helms	Warner		
		Leahy	
		Levin	
		Lincoln	
		Mikulski	
		Murray	
		Nelson (FL)	
		Reed	
		Reid	
	<b>NAYS--43</b>		
	Akaka		
	Baucus		
	Biden		

## John Bolton: Background and policy positions

Taken from: "UN Basher as UN Ambassador; Bolton's Baggage"  
By Tom Barry - March 11, 2005 - International Relations Center - [www.irc-online.org](http://www.irc-online.org)

Unlike most neoconservatives, UN Ambassador-designate John Bolton didn't start out his political career on the center-left--either as a liberal, social democrat, or socialist. When Irving Kristol, regarded by many as the "godfather of neoconservatism" described a neoconservative as a "liberal who has been mugged by reality," he wasn't describing John R. Bolton.

In the 1950s through the 1970s, the political forerunners who established neoconservatism as the defining trend within American conservatism went through a left-right transformation. In that political morphing, the neoconservatives have redefined U.S. politics from the Reagan administration through the current Bush administration.

Bolton shares much with the closely knit neoconservative political camp: their red-meat anticommunism, their obsession with China and their support of right-wing Zionism in Israel, and their glorification of U.S. power as the main force for good and against evil in our world. Bolton has also forged close links with neoconservatives while a scholar at the Manhattan Institute and the American Enterprise Institute (AEI). Although sharing most of the neoconservative ideology, Bolton is not himself a true-blue neocon.

Not only his political origins separate him from other middle-aged neoconservatives. Bolton also stands apart from the neoconservative camp because of his longtime association with moderate conservative James Baker and the close ties he had with Dixiecrat Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC). Unlike most neocons, who stay removed from electoral politics, Bolton has repeatedly immersed himself in the mundane and often dirty politics of ensuring Republican Party electoral victories.

One political label that certainly fits Bolton is that of "hawk" or militarist. Like most other Bush administration officials, Bolton is a militarist who has never gone to war—which according to some detractors makes him a "chickenhawk." In his work in the Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush administrations, Bolton has won a reputation for being the right's most effective and strident opponent of the United Nations and all forms of global governance and international law not controlled by the U.S. government.

As a teenager Bolton already believed, as Barry Goldwater did, that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice." In 1964 Bolton volunteered in Goldwater's presidential campaign. From high school, Bolton went to Yale and then on to Yale Law School, where he befriended current Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas and other rightists who were among the first members of the conservative Federalist Society.

After joining the Reagan administration in 1981, Bolton quickly gained a reputation as being one of the new breed of "New Right lawyers" who operated at the second tier of the State Department and gained top policy positions in the Justice Department. Bolton gained entry to the Reagan administration through strong support from Senator Helms

and from New Right strategist Richard Viguerie and his influential Conservative Digest. During Reagan's second term, Bolton began working together with a team of Federalist Society lawyers under Attorney General Edwin Meese. With Federalist Society members and activists in top policy positions, the Justice Department for the first time came under the ideological influence of the New Right.<sup>1</sup>

The chief goal of the Federalist Society has been to roll back the purported hold of the "liberal establishment" on the judiciary and legal profession. Federalist Society members also oppose liberalism in the international arena in the form of international law and multilateral governance. Together with AEI, the Federalist Society sponsors "NGOWatch," a project that monitors the activities of nongovernmental organizations they consider anti-American.<sup>2</sup>

From the start of his political career, Bolton has been a Republican Party loyalist. As a private attorney before joining the Reagan administration in 1981, he worked with Senators Jesse Helms (R-NC) and Paul Laxalt (R-NV).<sup>3</sup> In the 1980s he participated in Republican Party efforts to beat back the voter registration campaigns organized by labor and black organizations.<sup>4</sup>

A veteran of Southern electoral campaigns, Bolton appealed to the racism of white voters and reprised his role in the 2000 presidential campaign. Working closely with his former boss James Baker during the Florida recount following the contested 2000 presidential election, Bolton once again proved his allegiance to the party and polished his reputation as someone "who gets things done."

As part of the Republican Party's legal team, headed by former Secretary of State Baker, Bolton's boss during the George H.W. Bush administration, Bolton put his hard-ball approach to partisan politics to work. In a complimentary article on Bolton, the Wall Street Journal in July 2002 reported that Bolton's "most memorable moment came after the U.S. Supreme Court ordered a halt to the recount, when Mr. Bolton strode into a Tallahassee library, where the count was still going on, and declared: 'I'm with the Bush-Cheney team, and I'm here to stop the vote'."

After thanking Bolton for his services, Vice President-elect Cheney was asked what job Bolton would get in the new administration. "People ask what [job] John should get," Cheney said, "My answer is, anything he wants."<sup>5</sup>

### **Bolton Gets Things Done**

When announcing his nomination as the new UN ambassador, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice called Bolton a "tough-minded diplomat" who has a "proven track record of multilateralism." Bolton certainly has a long track record, but not as a multilateralist. Since the 1970s Bolton has aggressively and stridently attacked multilateral institutions and international treaties. At the same time, however, Bolton has been a firm supporter of multilateral entities and coalitions that the U.S. controls--such as NATO, the "coalition of the willing" in Iraq, and the anti-rogue Security Proliferation Initiative led by Bolton.

"The president and I have asked John to do this work because he knows how to get things done," said Rice. A hard-line unilateralist and an aggressive opponent of

multilateralism and international treaties, Bolton has served as the Bush administration's designated treaty breaker. From the early days of the first Bush administration, Bolton mounted a campaign to halt all international constraints on U.S. power and prerogative, fiercely opposing existing and proposed international treaties restricting landmines, child soldiers, biological weapons, nuclear weapons testing, small arms trade, and missile defense.

During the first administration, Bolton earned his reputation as a hawk who dismantled the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, renounced President Clinton's approval of the International Criminal Court, and blocked the efforts to add a verification clause to the bioweapons convention. Displaying what the Wall Street Journal described as his "combative style," Bolton told an international conference on bioweapons that the verification proposal was "dead, dead, dead, and I don't want in coming back from the dead."

Bolton will face a spirited confirmation battle in the Senate, where four years ago his nomination as the new Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security was approved by a vote of 57-43. All fifty Republicans voted to confirm Bolton, joined by Democratic hawks Ben Nelson, Zell Miller, Joseph Lieberman, Mary Landrieu, Russell Feingold, John Breaux, and Evan Bayh.

In law school and throughout his legal and political career, Bolton has gained a reputation as being abrasive, astute, humorless, and relentless in the pursuit of his political agenda. In his office at the State Department, Bolton displays a mock grenade with the label "To John Bolton--World's Greatest Reaganite."<sup>6</sup>

### **Treaty Breaker**

In a Wall Street Journal op-ed in 1997, Bolton articulated his dismissive view of international treaties. "Treaties are law only for U.S. domestic purposes," he wrote, "In their international operation, treaties are simply political obligations." In other words, international treaties signed by the United States should not be considered as a body of law that the United States should respect in its international engagement but rather just political considerations that can be ignored at will.

Bolton has since the mid-1990s led the charge of the anti-multilateralists and UN bashers against the International Criminal Court. Writing in the National Interest, a journal cofounded by Irving Kristol, Bolton argued in 1998 that signing the ICC would make the "president, the cabinet officers who comprise the National Security Council, and other senior civilian and military leaders responsible for our defense and foreign policy ... the potential targets of the politically unaccountable Prosecutor in Rome."

In support of this position, he contended that international law had already started infringing on the national sovereignty of other countries such as Chile. He charged that the Spanish judge who brought the case against Chile's notorious dictator Augusto Pinochet, who took power in a military coup against an elected government, was using international law for political purposes. In his view, the charges against Pinochet for authorizing the murder of 3,000 Chileans should not concern foreign governments, the

United Nations, or human rights observers. “Chileans made their choice, and have lived with it,” he wrote.

During the 1990s, Bolton spoke out frequently in public and in Congress against the international policies of the Clinton administration. In a June 25, 1995 op-ed in the Washington Times, Bolton lambasted President Clinton for continuing the funding of “programs on international population control and environmental matters rather than fundamental economic reforms in developing countries.” The type of fundamental reforms advocated by Bolton were those of the neoliberal “Washington Consensus” that stipulated that economic liberalization and privatization were the only path to development. In the same op-ed, Bolton assailed Vice President Gore for his “preference for condoms and trees instead of markets.”

In early 2001 Bolton observed: “It is a big mistake for us to grant any validity to international law even when it may seem in our short-term interest to do so because, over the long term, the goal of those who think that international law really means anything are those who want to constrict the United States.”<sup>7</sup>

In 1998, when he was senior vice president of the American Enterprise Institute, Bolton described the ICC as “a product of fuzzy-minded romanticism [that] is not just naïve, but dangerous.”<sup>8</sup> Early in the first year of the Bush administration, Bolton prevailed upon Secretary of State Colin Powell to give him the honor of renouncing the Clinton administration’s signature of the treaty establishing the International Criminal Court (ICC). Bolton called the moment he signed the letter abrogating Clinton’s approval of the ICC “the happiest moment in my government service.”

In his 2003 speech to the Federalist Society, Bolton explained the administration’s “Article 98” legal strategy to undermine the International Criminal Court. “Each Article 98 agreement,” he said, “meets our key objective--ensuring that all U.S. persons, official or private, are covered under the terms of the agreement. This broad scope of the agreement is essential to ensuring that the ICC will not become an impediment to U.S. activities worldwide.”<sup>9</sup> Those countries that do not sign this bilateral agreement are restricted from receiving U.S. military assistance, except for counternarcotics aid.

## **UN Bashing**

Bolton has long dismissed the legitimacy of the United Nations--a multilateral organization that the United States played a key role in creating--not as a pet organization but as a international organization dedicated to “collective security.” A longtime activist with the Federalist Society, Bolton has used this right-wing association of lawyers, judges, and legal experts as a forum to lash out against the United Nations. In a 1994 speech at the liberal World Federalist Association, Bolton declared that “there is no such thing as the United Nations.” To underscore his point, Bolton said. “If the UN secretary building in New York lost ten stories, it wouldn’t make a bit of difference.”

Bolton has also made his stand with those who believe the U.S. government should stop its payments to the United Nations. “Many Republicans in Congress--and perhaps a majority,” Bolton said before joining the George W. Bush administration, “not only do not care about losing the General Assembly vote but actually see it as a ‘make-my-day’

outcome. Indeed once the vote is lost... this will simply provide further evidence to many why nothing should be paid to the UN system.”<sup>10</sup>

In a 1999 article in the Weekly Standard titled “Kofi Annan’s Power Grab,” Bolton laid out the neoconservative position on U.S. military supremacy with respect to what the neocons regarded as the outdated UN Charter. Bolton took issue with Annan’s description of the United Nations as “the sole source of legitimacy on the use of force.” According to Bolton, “If the United States allows that claim to go unchallenged, its discretion in using force to advance its national interests is likely to be inhibited in the future.” In mounting the challenge to Annan and the United Nations, Bolton also criticized President Clinton for “his implicit endorsement of the Annan doctrine” during his speech opening the General Assembly session that year.

In Bolton’s view, Annan had put his own legitimacy at risk by expressing his concerns about the NATO bombing campaign over the former Yugoslavia. When visiting the war zone, Annan said: “Unless the Security Council is restored to its preeminent position as the sole source of legitimacy on the use of force, we are on a dangerous path to anarchy.” Subsequently, in the secretary general’s annual report to the UN membership, Annan wrote that “enforcement actions without Security Council authorization threaten the very core of the international security system. ... Only the [UN] Charter provides a universally legal basis for the use of force.” Bolton wrote that these were “sweeping--indeed, breathtaking--assertions,” although from a post-Iraq invasion perspective Annan’s statements could be described as prophetic.

According to Bolton, “The implicit premise of the Annan doctrine--that force is unimportant while ‘international law’ is practically everything--is widely held in Europe, but is also popular here, particularly in the Clinton administration.” Bolton warned that “if the Annan doctrine is left unanswered, we will soon hear about ‘emerging new international norms’ that will make it harder and harder for the United States to act independently in its own legitimate national interest. And we will wait in vain for our adversaries to follow those ‘norms’.”<sup>11</sup>

After the UN voted not to authorize the administration’s planned invasion of Iraq, Bolton said the decision was “further evidence to many why nothing should be paid to the UN system.” In the run up to the war, he ordered an intelligence probe of UN arms inspector Hans Blix, who headed the UNMOVIC inspection mission in Iraq, and Mohamed El Baradei, director of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Not pleased with El Baradei’s lack of a strong stance against Iran, Bolton led a unsuccessful campaign to remove him from his post at the conclusion of his second term.<sup>12</sup>

Bolton described his theory about the legitimacy of U.S. military actions in his 2003 speech to the Federalist Society. According to Bolton, if the U.S. follows its own constitutional procedures then there is no question about the legitimacy of any resulting U.S. actions abroad. In Bolton’s view, “There’s a fundamental problem of democratic theory for those who contend, implicitly or otherwise, that the proper operation of America’s institutions of representative government are not able to confer legitimacy for the use of force.”

“Make no mistake,” said Bolton, “Not asserting that our constitutional procedures themselves confer legitimacy will result over time in the atrophying of our ability to act independently.”

During his career Bolton has never minced words when it comes to his opinions about the United Nations. While his straight-shooting has clarified his opinions on U.S. moral and political supremacy and on what he sees as the dubious legitimacy of the United Nations, Bolton also sees the United Nations as an institution that can be manipulated, exploited, and controlled.

At the same time that Bolton has been bashing the UN, he has been willing to use it to further his political agenda, even taking money personally from the organization that he has labeled as corrupt. When he served as Assistant Secretary of State of International Organization Affairs during the George H.W. Bush administration, Bolton recommended that the United Nations Development Program provide a \$2 million grant to the Institute of East-West Dynamics.

The institute was established in 1991 to provide training in free-market principles to the transitional economies of Eastern Europe. Its principals included numerous right-wing UN critics including Burton Pines, then vice-president of the Heritage Foundation and the longtime chief of its UN Assessment Project. The institute’s president was Pedro Sanjuan, a former director of the AEI’s Hemispheric Center and a former UN official during Jeane Kirkpatrick’s tenure as UN ambassador.

Other board members and advisers included an array of figures who were involved in supporting the Nicaraguan contras in their U.S.-backed counterrevolutionary war against the Sandinista government, including Angier Biddle Duke, a member of the NED-funded PRODEMCA and Duncan Sellars, chairman of the International Freedom Fund and former executive director of the Conservative Caucus.

Bolton, who as a member of the Reagan administration had led the insider campaign to withdraw U.S. membership in UNESCO, had no scruples about recommending that UN moneys be used to fund a free-market, anti-communist “development” organization. In November 1991, Bolton congratulated the UNDP for having made an “initial contribution” of \$250,000 to the Institute of East-West Dynamics.<sup>13</sup>

Bolton himself worked for the United Nations from 1997 to 2000 as an assistant to James Baker, who UN Secretary General named as Special Envoy on the Western Sahara. While working for the United Nations during the Clinton administration, Bolton had no qualms about “put[ting] my UN hat on” at the same time he was AEI’s senior vice president.<sup>14</sup> The mission to resolve the demands of the Sahrawi people’s claim of the Western Sahara, a territory of Morocco, failed in part because of the Baker-Bolton team’s own lack of support for the UN resolution condemning Morocco’s colonization of the Western Sahara.<sup>15</sup>

### **Armageddon Man**

Bolton is a militarist who embraces the “peace through strength” philosophy of international affairs. Praising Bolton in a speech he delivered on January 1, 2001 at the

American Enterprise Institute, Sen. Jesse Helms, who was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said, "John Bolton is the kind of man with whom I would want to stand at Armageddon."

Bolton was a leading voice against the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), signed by President Clinton but never ratified because of strong congressional opposition from Republicans. Following the 1999 Senate vote rejecting the treaty, Bolton said that the vote marked "the beginning of a new realism on the issue of weapons of mass destruction and their global proliferation. The Senate vote is an unmistakable signal that America rejects the illusionary protections of unenforceable treaties."

A report by the National Academy of Sciences, titled Technical Issues Related to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, addressed Bolton's stated grounds of opposition to the CTBT. The report argues that the stated concerns over verification (primarily) and viability of U.S. nuclear stockpile (secondarily) are not technically a problem. According to the report: "Verification capabilities for the treaty are better than generally supposed. U.S. adversaries could not significantly advance their nuclear weapons capabilities through tests below the threshold of detection, and the United States has the technical capabilities to maintain confidence in the safety and reliability of its existing weapons stockpile without periodic nuclear tests."

The Committee on Technical Issues Related to Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which wrote the report, was formed in mid-2000 at the request of Gen. John Shalikashvili, former chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and then special adviser to the president and secretary of state for the CTBT. Committee members included former directors of the Los Alamos, Sandia, and Oak Ridge national laboratories; other experts on nuclear-weapon design, testing, and maintenance; a leading expert on seismic verification of nuclear explosions; and a former commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific.

While undersecretary of state, Bolton was responsible for organizing the administration's Proliferation Security Initiative, as a kind of "coalition of the willing" focused on stopping the transfer of WMDs and precursor material. Announced by President Bush while in Poland in May 2003, the PSI is, according to Bolton, "legitimate and will be extremely effective in its efforts against weapons of mass destruction proliferation." Bolton described the PSI--which specifies that partner nations will cooperate with the United States in intercepting and confiscating suspect shipments going or coming from "rogue" countries--as an example of how the United States can "defend its national interests using novel and loose coalitions."<sup>16</sup>

In mid-2001 Bolton announced at the UN Conference on Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons that Washington opposed any initiative to regulate trade in small arms or in non-military rifles--or any effort that would "abrogate the constitutional right to bear arms." Accompanying Bolton to the conference were members of the National Rifle Association (NRA). "It is precisely those weapons that Bolton would exclude from the purview of this conference that are actually killing people and endangering communities around the world," said Tamar Gabelnick, director of the Arms Sales Monitoring Project at the Federation of American Scientists. She charged that the U.S. delegation, led by

Arms Control Secretary Bolton, single-handedly destroyed any possibility of consensus around the Small Arms Action Plan.<sup>17</sup>

### **The New Europe**

Before Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld spoke of the U.S. alliance with the “New Europe” while dissing the “Old Europe,” Bolton already had signaled that the post-WW II transatlantic alliance was being overhauled by Washington. Months before the U.S. invasion of Iraq, Bolton warned that “the Europeans can be sure that America’s days as a well-bred doormat for EU political and military protection are coming to an end.”

Bolton has been a player in a strategy by U.S. militarists and neoconservatives to expand NATO and to form new U.S.-led political and military coalitions in Central and Eastern Europe. Leading this initiative have been two neoconservative institutes that are located in the same building in Washington, DC--the Project for the New American Century and the American Enterprise Institute.

Before joining the Bush administration, Bolton was a member of the New Atlantic Initiative, a bipartisan initiative sponsored by AEI and funded by two right-wing foundations: Olin Foundation and Lynde & Harry Bradley Foundation. The New Atlantic Initiative was launched in June 1996 following the Congress of Prague, where more than 300 conservative politicians, scholars, and investors discussed “the new agenda for transatlantic relations.”

Headquartered at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) in Washington, DC, the New Atlantic Initiative is dedicated to strengthening North Atlantic cooperation, admitting the transitional democracies of the former Soviet bloc into NATO and the European Union, and establishing a free trade area between an enlarged European Union and the NAFTA countries.<sup>18</sup> The New Atlantic Initiative is closely associated with the Project on Transitional Democracies, and was also closely linked to the now-defunct U.S. Committee on NATO--groups that were both founded by PNAC board members.<sup>19</sup>

### **Middle East Restructuring with Israel at the Center**

Bolton is an outspoken hawk on U.S. policy in the Middle East, and has since the mid-1990s been closely associated with neoconservative organizations and pressure groups that are close to the right-wing Likud party in Israel--including the Project for the New American Century, American Enterprise Institute, Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, and the Committee for Peace and Security in the Gulf (CPSG).

Bolton boasts that one of his most important achievements was the central role he played at the State Department in 1991 in leading the successful campaign to repeal the 1975 General Assembly resolution equating Zionism with racism, “thus removing the greatest stain on the UN’s reputation.”

Self-identified as a bipartisan group whose members are prominent in U.S. international policy circles, the Committee for Peace and Security in the Gulf was launched by neoconservatives in 1998 as part of their incipient campaign to build support for regime change in Iraq. Underwritten by the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation and organized

by the neoconservative Center for Security Policy, CPSG called on Washington to adopt a “comprehensive political and military strategy for bringing down Saddam and his regime.” Working closely with Ahmad Chalabi’s Iraqi National Congress (INC), CPSG, which was co-chaired by Richard Perle, included most of the charter members of the Project for the New American Century (including Paul Wolfowitz, Douglas Feith, Dov Zakeim, and Peter Rodman) and an array of AEI scholars, including Richard Perle, Jeffrey Gedmin, Michael Ledeen, Joshua Muravchik, David Wurmer, and John Bolton.<sup>20</sup>

Along with other Bush administration officials, Bolton was on the board of advisers of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs before joining the administration. JINSA supports a “peace through strength” policy to support Israel and works to build “strategic ties” between the U.S. military and U.S. military contractors with Israel. Other administration figures associated with this militarist organization that aims to strengthen the military-industrial complexes in both Israel and the United States are Richard Cheney, Douglas Feith, and Paul Wolfowitz.

Two months prior to the Iraq invasion, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control John Bolton traveled to Jerusalem to meet with former Prime Minister Netanyahu and Prime Minister Sharon to discuss strategies for “preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction.” No mention was made of the widely accepted fact--although never mentioned by the United States --that Israel is the only nuclear power in the Middle East. Instead, the undersecretary for disarmament affairs focused on the Bush administration’s disarmament targets following the planned invasion of Iraq. Bolton in February 2003 said that once regime change plans in Iraq were completed, “it will be necessary to deal with threats from Syria, Iran, and North Korea afterwards.”<sup>21</sup>

With respect to Syria, Bolton has been the administration’s attack dog. Without offering any evidence to support his allegations, Bolton in May 2003 said that the Bush administration “knows that Syria has long had a chemical warfare program” including maintaining a “stockpile of the nerve agent sarin and is engaged in research and development of a more toxic and persistent nerve agent.”

What’s more Bolton raised alarmist claims that Syria “is pursuing the development of biological weapons and is able to produce at least small amounts of biological warfare agents.”<sup>22</sup> Soon after the Iraq invasion and despite the fact the no WMDs were found in Iraq, Bolton warned Syria, Libya, and Iran that “the cost of their pursuit of weapons of mass destruction is potentially quite high.”

### **Contras and Cuba**

When he worked as an assistant attorney general under Edwin Meese, Bolton thwarted the Kerry Commission’s efforts to obtain documentation, including Bolton’s personal notes, about the Iran-Contra affair and alleged Contra drug smuggling. Working with congressional Republicans, Bolton also stonewalled congressional demands to interview deputies of then-Attorney General Edwin Meese regarding their role in the affair.<sup>23</sup>

Also while at the Justice Department, Bolton refused to provide internal documents to the Senate during the confirmation hearings for the nominations of Rehnquist, Scalia, and Kennedy to the Supreme Court.<sup>24</sup>

Speaking before an audience at the Heritage Foundation in May 2002, Bolton made the case that Cuba should be included among the axis of evil countries because of its development of biowarfare capacity. Cuba is world renowned for its biomedical industry, but according to Bolton the industry was concealing a WMD project. He charged that Cuba has “at least a limited offensive biological warfare research development effort” and that it has “provided dual-use technology to other rogue states.”

Providing no evidence for his allegations, Bolton said that Cuba was involved in the sales of illicit biowarfare technology at least in part as a way to boost its cash-short economy. Other administration officials, when pressed, declined to support Bolton’s charges against Cuba. Bolton’s claims that Cuba was developing biological weapons and that Syria possessed WMDs were completely unsubstantiated by leading officials.

Bolton never complied with congressional demands to provide documentation on the Cuban assertion, and the CIA effectively blocked Bolton’s appearance before the Senate regarding his allegations about Syria’s weapons of mass destruction. A congressional investigation of Cuba’s alleged WMD program found no evidence to back Bolton’s assertions.<sup>25</sup>

### **Cornering and Confronting the Dragon**

One of the long-running divides in the Republican Party is between those who favor constructive engagement with China and those who propagate an alarmist view of China. John Bolton is a leading figure in the confrontationalist “China lobby,” sometimes called the Blue Team. In the post-WW II period, the China lobby was most closely associated with the old guard right and militantly anticommunist organizations like the American Security Council.

Today, the China lobby finds its home in the neoconservative think tanks and policy institutes, notably the American Enterprise Institute and the Center for Security Policy. With such figures as John Bolton, it has also found a home in the Bush administration. Bolton and other administration figures, such as CIA director Porter Goss and Donald Rumsfeld, are warning that China increasingly represents a military threat not just to other Asian countries but to the United States itself.<sup>26</sup>

Bolton is not only one of the administration’s leading hawks on China policy, he is also its strongest advocate of Taiwan’s independence and of U.S. defense of Taiwan. Bolton has close professional and personal ties in Taipei. According to an investigative report by the Washington Post (April 9, 2001), Bolton was on the payroll of the Taiwan government before joining the Bush administration. Bolton received \$30,000 for “research papers on UN membership issues involving Taiwan” at the same time he was promoting diplomatic recognition of Taiwan before various congressional committees.<sup>27</sup>

In 1999 Bolton, speaking as an AEI scholar, said that “...diplomatic recognition of Taiwan would be just the kind of demonstration of U.S. leadership that the region needs

and that many of its people hope for. The notion that China would actually respond with force is a fantasy." Bolton joined a prominent group of neoconservatives and traditional conservatives who signed a statement jointly sponsored by the Project for the New American Century and the Heritage Foundation that lambasted the Clinton administration for its failure to offer unequivocal support of Taiwan. The statement, whose signatories included William Kristol, Elliott Abrams, Richard Perle, I. Lewis Libby, Edwin Meese, William Buckley, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Paul Weyrich, James Woolsey, and Paul Wolfowitz, called for a state-to-state relationship with Taiwan.<sup>28</sup>

Before joining the administration, Bolton was a contributing columnist for the Taipei Times. When Taiwan's first lady Wu Shu-chen visited Washington in what was widely regarded as a quasi-official state visit, Bolton, described by the Taipei Times as "an ardent friend of Taiwan," held a lengthy personal discussion with President Chen Shui-bian's wife. At the time of his election, Bolton charged the Clinton administration of a policy of "strategic ambivalence" that left Taiwan vulnerable to Chinese invasion. According to Bolton, the U.S. should defend Taiwan against any possible provocation by China, including in the frontline islands of Kinmen and Matsu.

At the time of Wu Shu-chen's visit, both Taiwanese and U.S. officials said the visit was not a private one and she would not be meeting with U.S. government officials. The first lady addressed a forum at AEI in which she called for the country's admission to the United Nations as an independent nation--a prospect that China has said it would not tolerate given that it considers Taiwan to be a "renegade" province. Wu Shu-chen was also awarded the Democracy Service Medal by the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), a neoconservative-led institution that depends almost exclusively on U.S. government funding.<sup>29</sup> Presenting the award was Rep. Christopher Cox, a "China Lobby" member who has worked closely with Bolton on China and is a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus.

Like many neoconservatives, Bolton charged that the Clinton administration practiced "disdainful diplomacy toward the Republic of China on Taiwan" while giving preferential treatment to the Palestinian Authority. The neoconservative camp generally regards U.S. policy toward Taiwan as a bellwether for the degree of U.S. commitment to Israel. According to Bolton, writing in January 2000 for AEI: "That the PLO is a more consequential player [than Taiwan] in the United Nations speaks volumes... [about] the organization's detachment from reality."<sup>30</sup>

In July 2003, during the run-up to the six-nation talks with North Korea, Bolton described President Kim Jong Il as the "tyrannical dictator" of a country where "life is a hellish nightmare." North Korea responded in kind, saying that "such human scum and bloodsucker is not entitled to take part in the talks.... We have decided not to consider him as an official of the U.S. administration any longer nor to deal with him." The State Department sent a replacement for Bolton to the talks.<sup>31</sup>

## **Legal Sleaze**

John Bolton, a Yale-trained lawyer, rejects the legitimacy of international law--at least when international conventions, treaties, and norms constrain what he regards as U.S.

national interests. Bolton also has a record of questionable legal and ethical dealings at home.

As an associate at the high-powered Covington law firm, Bolton in 1978 worked with Sen. Jesse Helms and the National Congressional Club, the senator's campaign-financing organization, to help form a new campaign finance organization called Jefferson Marketing. According to the Legal Times, Jefferson Marketing was established "as a vehicle to supply candidates with such services as advertising and direct mail without having to worry about the federal laws preventing PACs, like the Congressional Club, from contributing more than \$5,000 per election to any one candidate's campaign committee." After its formation, Jefferson Marketing became a holding company for three firms--Campaign Management Inc., Computer Operations & Mailing Professionals, and Discount Paper Brokers.

Together with another Covington attorney, Brice Clagett, Bolton later represented the National Congressional Club and Jefferson Marketing--which were treated as a single legal entity--in various lawsuits filed against it by the Federal Election Commission (FEC)--all of which led to a \$10,000 fine levied by the FEC against the National Congressional Club in 1986.

In 1987 the National Congressional Club reported a debt of \$900,000, with its major creditors being Richard Viguerie, Charles Black, Jr., Covington and Burling, and the DC law office of Baker & Hostetler--all of which maintained good relations with the right-wing political action committee as their debts for service offered went unpaid. Jefferson Marketing was the PAC's largest creditor, with more than \$676,000 due from the National Congressional Club. By the end of the decade, FEC documents showed that Helms' political action committee owed Covington \$111,000. But this was not considered a major concern for Covington, according to firm spokesman H. Edward Dunkelberger, Jr.<sup>32</sup>

A decade later Bolton was again entangled in money laundering schemes to support Republican candidates, but this time it involved money channeled from Hong Kong and Taiwan to the Republican Party by way of a "think tank" linked to the Republican National Committee (RNC). In 1995-96 Bolton served as president of the National Policy Forum (NPF), which, according to a congressional investigation, functioned as an intermediary organization to funnel foreign and corporate money to Republicans.

The NPF had been established in 1993 in anticipation of the 1994 general election. Founded by the RNC's chairman Haley Barbour a few months after he assumed the party's chairmanship, the forum was organized as a nonprofit, tax-exempt education institute, although the IRS later ruled that NPF was a subsidiary of the RNC and not entitled to its requested tax-exempt status.

A congressional investigation into foreign money and influence in the 1996 presidential campaign brought to light the role of the NPF, which, according to a minority report of the congressional committee, channeled \$800,00 in foreign money into the 1996 election cycle after having also used the same mechanisms to fund congressional races around the country in 1994.

When John Bolton became NPF president in 1995, the forum began organizing “megaconferences” as a hook to raise money for the party. These conferences brought together Republican members of congress, lobbyists, and corporate executives to discuss matters that were frequently the object of pending legislation. An NPF memo laid out the funding strategy: “NPF will continue to recruit new donors through conference sponsorships. ... In order for the conferences to take place, they must pay for themselves or turn a profit. Industry and association leaders will be recruited to participate and sponsor those forums, starting at \$25,000.”

Corporate representatives professed surprise at the size of the contribution request. “It’s pretty astounding,” said one invitee. “If this doesn’t have ‘payment for access’ (to top GOP lawmakers) written all over it, I don’t know what does.”

Bolton also made sure that handsome contributors received their money’s worth. In another NPF memo, two NPF employees told Bolton that, in return for a \$200,000 donation by US West, the telecommunications company should be assured that the policy issues that most concern them should be incorporated into the NPF agenda for their upcoming telecommunications “megaconference.”

In addition to the continuing money laundering, during John Bolton’ tenure as NPF president, the forum received a \$25,000 contribution from the Pacific Cultural Foundation. Both Barbour and Bolton expressed their appreciation in a letter to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative, which functions as Taiwan’s embassy in Washington. According to one communication with Taiwan’s official representative in Washington, it was noted that the “generous contribution” would enable the forum “to continue to develop and advocate good international policy.”

Bolton left his position at the National Policy Forum shortly before Congress launched its probe into whether the group illegally accepted foreign contributions. No charges were ever filed as a result of the congressional hearings, which according to the Democratic Party minority members of the committee didn’t devote adequate resources into the investigation of NPF operations.<sup>33</sup>

## **Foreign Policy Mandate**

The naming of Bolton as UN ambassador was another clear signal from President Bush that he intends to forge ahead with the national security strategy blueprint laid out for him by groups like the Project for the New American Century and the American Enterprise Institute. This has never been a hidden agenda, and during Bush’s first term the radical statements and policies of Bolton and other high foreign policy officials clearly described the directions and methods of this aggressive foreign and military policy agenda.

The president says his reelection gave him a mandate for his radical policy agenda at home and abroad. By nominating Bolton to represent the United States before the international community, President Bush has in effect challenged all nations either to get with the agenda or be swept aside by U.S. power and purpose.

1. Philip H. Burch, *Reagan Bush, and Right-Wing Politics: Elites, Think Tanks, Power, and Policy* (Greenwich, CN: JAI Press, 1997), p. 158.
2. NGOWatch  
<http://www.ngowatch.org/>
3. Jill Abramson, "Right Place at the Right Time," *American Lawyer*, June 1986; Philip H. Burch, *Reagan Bush, and Right-Wing Politics: Elites, Think Tanks, Power, and Policy* (Greenwich, CN: JAI Press, 1997), p. 182.
4. Christopher Marquis, "Absent from the Korea Talks: Bush's Hard-Liner," *New York Times*, September 2, 2003.
5. *Wall Street Journal*, July 19, 2002; "John Bolton: The Iron Hand in the State Department's Velvet Glove," *NewsMax.com*, July 19, 2002.
6. Glenn Kessler and Colum Lynch, "Critic of UN Named Envoy," *Washington Post*, March 8, 2005.
7. Gabriel Espinosa Gonzales, "The Dubious Career of John Bolton: The Latest Mad Man at Foggy Bottom." *CounterPunch*, December 16, 2004  
<http://www.counterpunch.org/gonzalez12162004.html>
8. "John Bolton: The Iron Hand in the State Department's Velvet Glove," *Newsmax.com*, July 19, 2002  
<http://newsmax.com/scripts/showinside.pl?a=2002/7/19/113709>
9. "Address by the Honorable John Bolton," *The 2003 National Lawyers Convention of the Federalist Society*, November 13, 2003.
10. *Washington Times*, October 24, 1998.
11. John R. Bolton, "Kofi Annan's UN Power Grab," *Weekly Standard*, October 4, 1999.
12. Gabriel Espinosa Gonzales, "The Dubious Career of John Bolton: The Latest Mad Man at Foggy Bottom." *CounterPunch*, December 16, 2004  
<http://www.counterpunch.org/gonzalez12162004.html>
13. Ian Williams, "United Nations of America? Why the Right Loves the UN," *The Nation*, April 13, 1992.
14. Honorable John Bolton, "Resolving the Western Sahara Conflict," *Defense Forum Foundation*, March 3, 1998.
15. See Stephen Zunes, "Western Sahara Conflict Continues to Challenge the United Nations," *Foreign Policy in Focus/International Relations Center*, September 2003.  
<http://www.fpif.org/papers/sahara2003.html>
16. "Address by the Honorable John Bolton," *The 2003 National Lawyers Convention of the Federalist Society*, November 13, 2003.
17. Jim Lobe, "North Korea Won't Recognize State Department Ideologue," *CommonDreams.org*, August 8, 2004.
18. "New Atlantic Initiative," *Right Web Profile, International Relations Center*  
<http://rightweb.irc-online.org/org/nai.php>
19. "U.S. Committee on NATO," *Right Web Profile, International Relations Center*  
<http://rightweb.irc-online.org/org/uscnato.php>  
"Project on Transitional Democracies," *International Relations Center*  
<http://rightweb.irc-online.org/org/ptd.php>
20. Letter to the President, February 19, 1998, *Committee for Peace and Security in the Gulf*  
[http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/index.jsp?section=papers&code=01-D\\_76](http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/index.jsp?section=papers&code=01-D_76)
21. Ian Williams, "John Bolton in Jerusalem: The New Age of Disarmament Wars," *Foreign Policy in Focus*, February 20, 2003.  
<http://www.fpif.org/commentary/2003/0302bolton.html>
22. Ian William, "Road to Damascus," *Foreign Policy in Focus/Project Against the Present Danger*, November 24, 2003.  
<http://www.presentdanger.org/commentary/2003/0311damascus.html>
23. Jim Lobe, "North Korea Won't Recognize State Dep't. Ideologue." *Inter Press Service*, August 4, 2003.  
<http://home.earthlink.net/~platter/articles/030804-lobe.html>
24. Council for a Livable World, *Oppose John Bolton's Nomination as State Department's Arms Control Leader!* August 11, 2001  
<http://www.clw.org/bush/opposebolton.html>
25. Jim Lobe, "North Korea Won't Recognize State Dep't. Ideologue." *Inter Press Service*, August 4, 2003  
<http://home.earthlink.net/~platter/articles/030804-lobe.html>

26. Conn Hallinan, "Cornering the Dragon," Foreign Policy In Focus, February 25, 2005.  
<http://www.fpif.org/commentary/2005/0502dragon.html>
27. Foreign Policy in Focus: The Republican Rule: Other Officials' Profiles.  
<http://www.fpif.org/republicanrule/officials.html>; David Corn, "Bush Gives the UN the Finger." The Nation, March 7, 2005.  
<http://www.thenation.com/capitalgames/index.mhtml?bid=3&pid=2245>; Ian Williams, "Bush's Perverse UN Pick." The Nation, March 8, 2005.  
<http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20050321&s=williams>
28. "Statement on the Defense of Taiwan," PNAC and Heritage Foundation, August 20, 1999.  
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/Taiwandefensestatement.htm>
29. Charles Snyder, "U.S. Policy Maker Bolton Meets with First Lady Wu," Taipei Times, September 26, 2002.
30. John Bolton, "Unequal Treatment for Taiwan," On the Issues, AEI, January 1, 2000.
31. "North Korea Bans Bolton from Talks," Associated Press, August 3, 2003.  
<http://washingtontimes.com/world/20030804-121425-6611r.htm>
32. Charles Babington, "Helms PAC's Debt to Covington Lingers," Legal Times, February 19, 1990; James Lyons, "Congressional Club, Once Mighty, in Deep Debt," Legal Times, November 23, 1987; Ben Macintyre, "Bush Accepted Foreign Donations," The Times (London), February 9, 2000.
33. Investigation of Illegal or Improper Activities in Connection with 1996 Federal Election Campaigns. Final Report of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, Senate, March 10, 1998.  
[http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1998\\_rpt/sgo-sir/4-3.htm](http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1998_rpt/sgo-sir/4-3.htm)

Tom Barry is policy director of the International Relations Center, online at [www.irc-online.org](http://www.irc-online.org). Barry directs the IRC's Right Web project.

## John Bolton in his own words

### **Bolton on the United Nations:**

"There's no such thing as the United Nations." (Global Structures Convocation, Feb. 3, 1994)

"There is an international community that occasionally can be led by the only real power left in the world and that is the United States when it suits our interest and when we can get others to go along. And I think it would be a real mistake to count on the U.N. as if it is some disembodied entity out there that can function on its own." (Global Structures Convocation, Feb. 3, 1994)

"If the U.N. secretary building in New York lost 10 stories, it wouldn't make a bit of difference." (Global Structures Convocation, Feb. 3, 1994)

In an interview in 2000 on National Public Radio, Mr. Bolton told Juan Williams, "If I were redoing the Security Council today, I'd have one permanent member because that's the real reflection of the distribution of power in the world." ... "And that one member would be, John Bolton?" Mr. Williams queried. "The United States," Mr. Bolton replied. (New York Times, March 9, 2005)

"Not only do not care about losing the General Assembly vote but actually see it as a 'make my day' outcome." (The Washington Times, 1998; reprint: USA Today, September 11, 2001)

### **Bolton on UN arrears:**

"Moreover, many Republicans in Congress -- and perhaps a majority -- not only do not care about losing the General Assembly vote but actually see it as a 'make my day' outcome. Indeed, once the vote is lost, and the adverse consequences predicted by the U.N.'s supporters begin to occur, this will simply provide further evidence to many why nothing more should be paid to the U.N. system. (Moreover, even if the General Assembly vote is lost, we retain our Security Council seat and veto, which are far more important.)" (Washington Times, October 24, 1998)

### **Bolton on UN arrears:**

CHARLAYNE HUNTER GAULT: Starting with you, Mr. Bolton, should the United States pay its U.N. dues now?

JOHN BOLTON: Absolutely not. I think the most important thing to understand about this current debate is that there really is no financial crisis at the United Nations. What we do face is a crisis of U.N. legitimacy. (Newshour with Jim Lehrer, February 13, 1997)

### **Bolton in response to criticisms of his comments on the U.N.:**

Question from Sen. Jesse Helms: "Now then, you have written extensively about the United Nations and other international organizations, and so I want to ask you in general, do you believe that U.S. involvement in multilateral organizations can serve our foreign policy interests?"

Bolton response: "I have said and written repeatedly that the United Nations can be an effective instrument of American foreign policy. And it has occurred to me that this

question was going to be raised by somebody in this hearing and I've given some thought to the answer. And I want to -- the way I'd like to answer it -- I want to have in mind specifically what Senator Kerry said about a confirmation conversion because I must tell you, Senator, those words sting. And my answer is -- and I don't think they are accurate, respectfully -- the answer that I am going to give describes three things that I have done in the course of my career that I think do show, not by rhetoric here today, but by what I have actually done in the real world, that I do believe the United Nations can be an effective part of American foreign policy." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Bolton nomination, March 29, 2001)

**Bolton explaining controversial statements while out of government:**

You know, I've been very privileged to be at AEI these past four years and, like most residents of think tanks, one of the advantages that we have, which I think serves a very positive role in helping to formulate policy in Washington, is to speak without political constraints --to speak our mind, to test theories, and to look at policies without having political obligations, and to engage in debate. One of the things that you do when you engage in debate is you learn and, in fact --I guess I should say this right at the beginning of the hearing, I've actually changed my mind from time to time. (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Bolton nomination, March 29, 2001)

**Bolton on intervention to stop slaughter:**

O'REILLY: And I find it difficult to stand by and watch another Cambodia, another Rwanda, unfold. And I believe the United States has a responsibility here.

BOLTON: Let me ask you this, Mr. O'Reilly. How many dead Americans is it worth to you to stop the brutality?

O'REILLY: I don't think I would quantify that because...

BOLTON: I think you have to quantify it. I think if you don't answer that question...

O'REILLY: ... I think if you're going to be a superpower...

BOLTON: ... you're ducking the key point that the commander in chief has to decide upon before putting American troops into a combat situation. We are now at war with Serbia. And the president has to be able to justify to himself and to the American people that Americans are about to die, or may well die, for a certain specific American interest. [edited]

BOLTON: I believe...

O'REILLY: ... I do not believe in standing by while people are slaughtered.

BOLTON: ... Our foreign policy should support American interests. Let the rest of the world support the rest of the world's interests

(March 24, 1999 conversation on "The O'Reilly Factor")

**Bolton opposition to intervention in Kosovo:**

"The point that I was making about U.S. interests in the Kosovo crisis was that ultimately -- and I'm thinking back now to the time of Rambouillet and the immediate aftermath -- I do not believe -- and I think this is where the quote of that U.S. interests comes from -- I do not believe that there is a vital American national interest in the question of whether Kosovo is independent, whether it's an autonomous province within Serbia, or whether it's fully integrated within Serbia. I don't think as between Kosovar Albanians and Serbs that we should have come down on one side or the other . . . I believe the destabilizing threat now obviously is a broader conflict in the Balkans

involving Greece, Albania, Macedonia and Bulgaria. I have been of the view that -- and I've written this -- that the NATO air campaign contributed to the destabilization in Kosovo and contributed to what Milosevic did." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Bolton nomination, March 29, 2001)

**Bolton on Kyoto and Law of the Sea Convention:**

"As with the long-unratified Law of the Sea Convention, the Kyoto treaty seems unlikely to win approval in either the near or the long term. Opposition arises largely because both are thought to be not only undesirable as policy but also illegitimate methods of forcing fundamental policy changes on the United States outside the customary political process. There is little doubt that the sweeping changes in energy and other policies required to meet the Kyoto treaty's emissions reduction targets would never be adopted by Congress." – in "Unilateralism Is Not Isolationism," Understanding Unilateralism in Foreign Relations. Gwyn Prins, ed.

**Bolton on the need for verification:**

"Now I hate to be accused of thinking like a lawyer, but I have to tell you, it makes me a little bit nervous not to have the structures in place, particularly when it gets to questions of verification and compliance. What we do unilaterally, what the Russians do unilaterally, would have to rely on national technical means to verify, and we would not have the advantages, at least not a priori, of the on site inspections that I think, beginning with the INF Treaty, really transformed the arms control world . . . I think we certainly need better implementation and verification of the existing agreements." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Bolton nomination, March 29, 2001)

**Bolton's Iran approach:**

In an interview, Mr. Bolton declined to comment on whether regime change was appropriate for Iran, other than to say that even without outside support, widespread unhappiness among Iranians over a lagging economy and stifling religious rule could bring a "revolution from below." "When the old regime in South Africa collapsed they got rid of their nukes," Mr. Bolton said. "When Ukraine became independent they did the same. At a time of profound dislocation, it is not inconceivable that a new government in Tehran might be persuaded to drop its nuclear program." ("Bush Aides Divided on Confronting Iran Over A-Bomb ", New York Times, 9/21/04)

**Bolton on biological weapons work in Cuba:**

In March 2002, Bolton asserted that "the United States believes that Cuba has at least a limited offensive biological warfare research and development effort" and had also "provided dual-use biotechnology to other rogue states." A month later, he ratcheted up his comments that Cuba remained a "terrorist" threat to the United States and that its biological weapons program should be seen in that light. ("In Stricter Study, U.S. Scales Back Claim on Cuba Arms" NY Times, Sept 17, 2004). The intelligence community has scoffed at Bolton's assertions.

**Bolton and Libya:**

While Condoleeza Rice gave Bolton credit for his "role" in the effort to convince Libya to give up its nuclear program, there is evidence that that foreign policy success happened in spite of Bolton. "One reason the Bush administration was able to take a more constructive course with Libya was that the White House, uncharacteristically, sidelined

the administration's neoconservative wing -- which strongly opposes any offer of carrots to state sponsors of terrorism, even when carrots could help end such problematic behavior -- when crucial decisions were made...in the lead up to the negotiations involving Libyan weapons of mass destruction, the neoconservatives at the Pentagon and in the shop of Under Secretary of State John Bolton were left out of the loop." (Flynt Leverett, "Why Libya Gave Up on the Bomb" NY Times, 1/23/04)

**Bolton on North Korea:**

"While everyone can agree that we must seek to avoid a disastrous, and possibly nuclear, war on the Korean peninsula and beyond, it is unconscionable that the White House is unable to muster even a modicum of resoluteness to contain, let alone roll back, the North Korean threat . . . A sounder U.S. policy would start by making it clear to the North that we are indifferent to whether we ever have "normal" diplomatic relations with it, and that achieving that goal is entirely in their interests, not ours. We should also make clear that diplomatic normalization with the U.S. is only going to come when North Korea becomes a normal country." (Los Angeles Times, September 22, 1999)

**Bolton on test ban treaty:**

"The Senate vote on the CTBT actually marks the beginning of a new realism on the issue of weapons of mass destruction and their global proliferation. Although undoubtedly a stinging and perhaps crippling humiliation for the Clinton administration, the Senate vote is also an unmistakable signal that America rejects the illusionary protections of unenforceable treaties." (The Jerusalem Post, October 18, 1999)

**Bolton on Taiwan:**

"...diplomatic recognition of Taiwan would be just the kind of demonstration of U.S. leadership that the region needs and that many of its people hope for. For too long, Beijing has indulged in angry and intemperate language reminiscent of Nikita Khrushchev's performance at the United Nations when he pounded his shoe on his desk to express displeasure. Beijing should understand that such carrying on is not acceptable. The notion that China would actually respond with force is a fantasy, albeit one the Communist leaders welcome and encourage in the West." (The Weekly Standard, Editorial, August 9, 1999)

**Bolton on his pre-government stance on the independence of Taiwan:**

"What I am saying is that I understand the difference between being in a think tank and being a subordinate in the Department of State. The policies, the broad policies for the treatment of Taiwan and China are set by others, and I will respect them and I will obey them. In all the different jobs I've had in the government, I have never had any allegation that I wasn't following a policy that was set." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Bolton nomination, March 29, 2001)

**Bolton on Kashmir:**

"Other than the possibility of a nuclear war or even a non nuclear conflagration across the subcontinent, the United States, quite frankly, has very little interest in the question of the political status of Kashmir." (National Public Radio, March 3, 1999)

**Bolton on Lloyd Axworthy of Canada:**

"A lot of Axworthy's initiatives are poorly disguised anti-Americanism," says John Bolton, senior vice-president of the American Enterprise Institute in Washington and former assistant secretary of state for international organizations under former president George Bush. According to Mr. Bolton, Canada has championed the land mines campaign and the International Criminal Court in order to isolate the United States, which is opposed to both initiatives. Washington has rejected the ICC because there were no controls to ensure it would not be used maliciously against American military officials who were involved in U.S. missions around the world. "His moral sense overcomes what's real in the world," says Mr. Bolton. "But a country like Canada can afford to take such a position because nobody is ever really going to hold it to account."

Bruns International - 1999 -

<http://www.unb.ca/web/bruns/0001/issue3/intnews/axworthy.html>

**On Diplomacy:**

"I don't do carrots." (Los Angeles Times, March 8, 2005)

**Bolton on the International Criminal Court:**

"Support for the International Criminal Court concept is based largely on emotional appeals to an abstract ideal of an international judicial system unsupported by any meaningful evidence and running contrary to sound principles of international crisis resolution." (New York Times, March 9, 2005)

Signing the letter informing the U.N. that Washington was renouncing the Rome Treaty to create the ICC "was the happiest moment of my government service." (Washington Post, March 8, 2005)

**On Bolton on dumping El Baradei:**

Dafna Linzer, "U.S. Alone in Seeking Ouster: 15 Countries Rebuff Effort to Unseat Head of Nuclear Agency": The U.S. effort, led by John R. Bolton, the undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, included sifting through intercepts of ElBaradei's phone calls in hopes of finding material to use against him. There have also been orchestrated leaks by unnamed U.S. or Western officials who have told reporters that Iran was secretly improving upon a weapons program and that ElBaradei was trying to hide that information from the IAEA board. Yesterday, diplomats in Vienna, where the IAEA is based, said one of the more recent accusations -- that Iran had bought large quantities of the metal beryllium for a nuclear charge -- had proved to be unfounded.

(Washington Post, January 22, 2005)

(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27841-2005Jan21.html>)

**Bolton on unilateral sanctions:**

"The United States has no hesitancy whatever to impose sanctions unilaterally, when our law requires it or when we think, as a matter of policy, that it's appropriate to do so. Certainly, if you had broad international participation in sanctions, that would be positive, but the United States doesn't wait for everybody in the UN General Assembly to agree before we make sanctions decisions." (John Bolton press conference in Tokyo, Japan - February 10, 2005)

**Bolton on Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) obligations:**

QUESTION: Kyodo News. I would like to ask you about nonproliferation issues. We are waiting for the upcoming NPT [Non-Proliferation Treaty] -- May's NPT review conference, and some non-nuclear states are saying that the 13 steps on disarmament should be the basis for further negotiation. How could you respond to that assertion?

BOLTON: "The 13 steps in several respects have been overtaken by events. The United States has withdrawn from the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] Treaty of 1972; we have made it plain we do not intend to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We have signed the Treaty of Moscow with Russia, which provided for both the Russian and the American sides to draw down, over a 10-year period, our operationally deployed strategic nuclear warheads, from a range of about 6,000 each to the amount specified in the treaty, which is 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed warheads over that 10-year period. So many aspects of the 13 steps are five years old. And you know, the 13 steps were contained in the final document of the 2000 review conference. It's not legally binding. It's a political statement, and times change. Politics change. We'll see where we go from here." (John Bolton press conference in Tokyo, Japan - February 10, 2005)

**Bolton on intelligence estimates:**

"And I think if you look at the case of Iraq, which has been much in the news because of the absence of WMDs [weapons of mass destruction], if you actually look at Iraq over a 15-year period, it shows that intelligence can be wrong in different directions. In the case most recently, where there was an assessment that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction, that turned out not to be accurate. After the first Persian Gulf War, we learned that our assessment of Iraq's nuclear weapons program at that point was very inadequate and that the Iraqis were much further advanced than we had had reason to believe. So I think what this tells us is that intelligence estimates are estimates, and while you might say that the question of an Iranian capability is several years away, a due regard for our own humility ought to tell us we might be wrong, and that in either direction." (John Bolton press conference in Tokyo, Japan - February 10, 2005)

**Bolton on weapons in space negotiations:**

"We are not prepared to negotiate on the so-called arms race in outer space. We just don't see that as a worthwhile enterprise." (Bolton press conference, Geneva, Switzerland, September 10, 2004)

**Bolton on the need for bi-partisan support:**

"As I said in my opening statement, you know, a negotiator's hand is strengthened overseas when there is a perception of a united Congress behind him. And if I were fortunate enough to be confirmed, to the extent I could find ways to get bipartisan support, I would work hard to do it." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Bolton nomination, March 29, 2001)

**Bolton on non-proliferation programs:**

"I believe that these programs, if well managed, if supported by the Russians and if supported by adequate foreign funding in addition to the U.S. funding, can be and are in the U.S. national interest. Most of them are administered by another department, but they do figure in to discussions with the Russians. And I think I do have -- I do have some equities in that regard. So I don't -- if I was unclear this morning, let me try and clarify it now. There isn't any disagreement in principle on the priority of these programs; how they work out in a budget review, how they're managed, how they're prioritized, I think it's appropriate and a good idea for a new administration to get its act together, which I hope we will be able to do." (Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Bolton nomination, March 29, 2001)

**Bolton supports some treaties:**

"Multilateral agreements are important to our nonproliferation arsenal. This Administration strongly supports treaties such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Biological Weapons Convention. But in order to be effective and provide the assurances they are designed to bring, they must be carefully and universally adhered to by all signatories. Therefore, strict compliance with existing treaties remains a major goal of our arms control policy." (Speech by John R. Bolton, Heritage Foundation, May 6, 2002)

## What Senators have said about John Bolton In 2005:

**Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN)** “Sen. Lamar Alexander, Tennessee Republican and a member of the committee, said the president showed strong leadership by choosing Mr. Bolton in the face of a difficult confirmation battle. Still, he said, the outcome rests with Mr. Bolton. ‘How this goes will depend on his confirmation hearing and how he handles it,’ Mr. Alexander said.” (Washington Times, March 21, 2005)

**Sen. Joseph Biden (D-DE)**: “Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware, top Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, said he was ‘surprised’ by Bolton’s nomination and said his ‘stated attitude toward the United Nations gives me great pause.” (Reuters, March 7, 2005)

**Sen. Lincoln Chafee (R-RI)**: “Chafee said he would make ‘no commitments’ to vote for Bolton, adding that Bush’s pick was “a surprising appointment, there’s no doubt about that . . . Chafee noted that ‘in general’ he has supported the president’s nominees to all types of federal posts, but said he wanted to sit down with Bolton today and look over materials related to his nomination before making a decision. ‘The rhetoric is that he’s going to support the mission of the United Nations,’ Chafee said.” (Roll Call, March 9, 2005)

“The nomination of Undersecretary of State John Bolton brings a seasoned member to the Diplomatic team that will represent us through some very difficult times ahead. Undersecretary Bolton has been an outspoken critic of the United Nations (UN). However, I have been assured that he will bring a more balanced approach to his new role. While I believe that the UN is a worthy organization that accomplishes much good, such as administering the recent elections in Iraq, I also understand that it needs to move forward with necessary reforms to improve the organization. I look forward to speaking with Undersecretary Bolton at his confirmation hearings about the myriad issues that he will be confronting if he is confirmed.” (Chafee press statement, March 7, 2005)

**Sen. Norman Coleman (R-MN)**: “Sen. Norm Coleman, Minnesota Republican, said Mr. Bolton is the right man to push the United Nations from within to restore its credibility. ‘Oil-for-food tarred that credibility. I think in Bolton you get somebody who wants to make sure the U.N. is working with us to do the right thing,’ Mr. Coleman said.” (Washington Times, March 21, 2005)

**Sen. Jon Corzine (D-NJ)**: “Mr. Corzine described Mr. Bolton as a leading foreign policy hardliner, and said he was responsible as much as any member of the Bush administration for needless confrontations with other countries and the international isolation he said had plagued the president’s first term.” (Voice of America, March 8, 2005)

**Sen. Chris Dodd (D-CT)**: “Sen. Chris Dodd, a Connecticut Democrat, said Bolton was the wrong choice when the United States was seeking to mend fences after the Iraq invasion. ‘I have every reason to believe that John Bolton’s antipathy to the U.N. will

prevent him from effectively discharging his duties as our ambassador,' he said." (Reuters, March 7, 2005)

**Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-NE):** "I want to see whoever we send up there committed to making the United Nations better, more responsive, more responsible, and who believes that he can work with Kofi Annan to do that,' Hagel said. 'To go up there and kick the UN around doesn't get the job done.'" (Boston Globe, March 8, 2005)

"I do have concerns, because the United Nations is a very important institution,' Hagel said. 'We need to send someone to the U.N. that has the skills to work with the secretary-general.'" (Roll Call, March 9, 2005)

WASHINGTON (AP) -- "Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel said Monday he would support the nomination of John R. Bolton, who has criticized the United Nations, to be U.S. ambassador to the world organization . . . Hagel, R-Neb., said in a statement that he had met with Bolton, the undersecretary of state for arms control and international security. 'His experience and knowledge will serve him well as he represents America's interests in the U.N. at a critically important time,' said Hagel, who praised Bolton's commitment to consult regularly with Congress." (AP, March 14, 2005)

**Sen. John Kerry (D-MA):** "This is just about the most inexplicable appointment the president could make to represent the United States to the world community,' said Sen. John Kerry, D-Mass. Sen. John Kerry of Massachusetts said the nomination carries with it 'baggage we cannot afford.'" (US Fed News, March 7, 2005)

**Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN):** "Sen. Richard Lugar, the Indiana Republican who chairs the Foreign Relations Committee, said he would probably vote to approve Bolton but did not offer a clear endorsement. 'I'm going to reserve any comments about the appropriateness or not of the president's choice,' he told reporters." (The Associated Press, March 8, 2005)

**Sen. Harry Reid (R-NV):** "This is a disappointing choice and one that sends all the wrong signals. At a time when President Bush has recognized we need to begin repairing our damaged relations with the rest of the world, he nominates someone with a long history of being opposed to working cooperatively with other nations. Just as unfortunate, Mr. Bolton has overseen this Administration's flawed proliferation policy that has seen North Korea quadruple its nuclear arsenal and seen Iran take dangerous steps toward the development of nuclear weapons. Mr. Bolton will have much to answer for during the course of his confirmation hearings." (Press statement, March 7, 2005)

**Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D-MD):** "Maryland Democratic Sen. Paul S. Sarbanes, a member of the Foreign Relations panel, expressed 'serious reservations,' saying Bolton had displayed skepticism about 'this nation's long-standing tradition of seeking to carry out the vision and responsibilities of world leadership through the United Nations and other major multilateral institutions.'" (Baltimore Sun, March 8, 2005)

**Sen. John Sununu (R-NH):** "He can be very helpful and very constructive in making the U.N. operate more effectively,' said Sen. John Sununu (R-N.H.). 'He's raised concerns in the past about its effectiveness.'" (Roll Call, March 9, 2005)

## **Statements made during 2001 debate on Bolton nomination to be Under Secretary of State:**

**Sen. Joseph Biden (D-DE):** “I am concerned, finally, about Mr. Bolton’s diplomatic temperament for this position, which involves the management of complex negotiations in a wide range of arms control and non proliferation issues. Stated another way: It takes the patience of Job. I am not sure how good I would be in the position. There are sensitive and difficult negotiations. Mr. Bolton’s penchant for inflammatory rhetoric gives me pause about his ability to handle this task.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

**Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM):** “Given Mr. Bolton’s position in opposition to key arms control agreements of our time, I’m very concerned that he believes that U.S. unilateralism is the only reliable means to assure our national security. I strongly reject that view. Unilateralism is reversible and unpredictable, and in my view, portends greater instability among nations.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

**Sen. Chris Dodd (D-CT):** “Mr. Bolton has also expressed worrisome views on U.S. involvement in the Balkan wars, stating that he saw ‘no tangible interest’ in those conflicts. And while it is true that American territory or interests were not directly threatened by the bloodshed in the Balkans, certainly instability in Europe must always be a matter of concern to the United States as should human rights abuses that rise to the level of near genocide. I am concerned that Mr. Bolton’s seemingly insular view of American interests and responsibilities...The world we live in today is dangerous. For better or worse, the United States must play a major role in ensuring that there are safeguards to protect our national security and foreign policy interests. Without doubt these dangers include the possibility of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It may be true that no longer is our main concern a purposeful attack by another superpower, but rather asserts that it is time to re-examine our international arms framework, but it’s not a time for isolation or bravado. Given the critical negotiations and challenges that await the new administration, there is no room for inexperience. We need a skilled and steady hand shaping disarmament policy that is right for the 21st Century. In my view Mr. Bolton does not possess such qualities, and that is why I have reluctantly decided to vote against his nomination for this critical position.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

**Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-ND):** “President Bush nominated John Bolton for the job. He is exactly the wrong nominee. He is exactly the wrong person to put in this position. Again, I do not know him personally. But I know of his thinking and writings and how he has expressed himself in recent years about these subjects . . .” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 7, 2001)

**Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA):** “Mr. Bolton has also suggested that ‘There is no such thing as the United Nations...’. How effective can United States leadership be in the international community if these views guide U.S. policy? In some ways, Mr. President, I think the recent loss of the U.S. seat on the Human Rights Commission provides us an early indication of what answer we can expect from the rest of the international

community to that question.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

**Sen. John Kerry (D-MA):** “President Bush has promised to work with our friends and allies to build a new framework for U.S. policies on arms control and international security. But his nomination of John Bolton to be the principal advisor to the Secretary of State on these issues is just one of many steps that have sent a decidedly mixed message about his commitment to pursuing a thoughtful, cooperative approach....Finally, while Mr. Bolton’s testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee seemed to suggest that his current views are more moderate than his writings indicate, I remain perplexed by the question of what views he will take with him into this administration. This is not an academic or inappropriate issue to raise. While, ultimately, Mr. Bolton’s personal opinions will be subsumed by the decisions of the Secretary of State and the President, he will have an enormous amount of influence in the policy debates that shape those decisions. I find it difficult to imagine that a man who has dedicated his life to public service on behalf of a set of values that he has taken the time to articulate in public writings will suddenly cease to advocate on behalf of those values at exactly the moment when his ability to influence public debate is at its zenith.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

**Sen. Herbert Kohl (D-WI):** “I am also deeply concerned about Mr. Bolton’s views on the United Nations. As Under Secretary, he would advise the President and the Secretary of State on policy decisions on U.S. security commitments worldwide and on arms transfers and security assistance policy and programs. He would need to work with the international community and the United Nations to meet these goals. Yet, in 1994, Mr. Bolton wrote starkly that ‘there is no such thing as the United Nations.’ He has said that the majority of Congress and most Americans do not care about losing the U.S. vote in the General Assembly. Virtually every other nation in the world supports the United Nations and the United States should be dedicated to strengthening, not weakening, it.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

**Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT):** “...As Senator Biden appropriately pointed at Mr. Bolton’s confirmation hearing, Mr. Bolton lacks the diplomatic temperament for this job. He is prone to making confusing statements and using inflammatory rhetoric against those with whom he does not agree. He once stated that ‘Republicans are adults on foreign policy questions, and we define what we’re willing to do militarily and politically by what is in the best interests of the United States.’ What does this mean? Do Democrats not act in the best interests of the United States? Are Democrats like Lee Hamilton, Sam Nunn, and James Sasser not adults on foreign policy? It is a ludicrous and offensive statement....We need a person in this important position who will help craft a bipartisan foreign policy and work with our friends and allies to make America more secure. Mr. Bolton is not that person, and I will vote ‘no’ in his nomination.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

**Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI):** “Mr. Bolton is clearly and intelligent and capable individual. However, his publicly stated views and past actions indicate that he believes that is in the best interests of United States security to act unilaterally, with little regard for the views and agreements of the international community. We live in an increasingly

interdependent world. Today, it is more important than ever before to use such tools as the United Nations, international law and treaties to promote and ensure international security and arms control.” (Senate floor debate on 1st Bolton nomination, May 8, 2001)

## **Newspaper editorials from around the country**

### **Editorials opposing the Bolton nomination**

“The Bolton posting shoots off sparks in all the wrong directions. The White House may not like the United Nations, but it needs the organization's clout in rebuilding Afghanistan and Iraq. What about Taiwan, Iran and North Korea, the hot spots du jour? The United States may broker an Israeli- Palestinian peace, but it can't sell the results without an international blessing that only the United Nations can confer. The United Nations may seem tangled, indecisive and inefficient at times. But that's not an argument for junking it or dispatching a one-man wrecking crew to the Security Council. If Bolton is to be the next ambassador, he must show that his days as a caustic critic have taught him how to improve the organization, not destroy it.”

***-San Francisco Chronicle, March 9, 2005***

“President Bush got good reviews in Europe last month, but his second-term diplomatic charm offensive suffered a severe setback Monday with his nomination of John Bolton as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. Bolton, an arms control expert with very little patience for multilateral niceties, is a leader of the administration's neoconservative hawks, who have been openly scornful of the United Nations.”

***-Los Angeles Times, March 8, 2005***

“On Monday, President Bush nominated John Bolton, an outspoken critic of multinational institutions and a former Jesse Helms protege, to be the representative to the United Nations... We certainly look forward to Mr. Bolton's confirmation hearings, and, after that, his performance at the United Nations, where he will undoubtedly do a fine job continuing the Bush administration's charm offensive with the rest of the world. Which leaves us wondering what Mr. Bush's next nomination will be. Donald Rumsfeld to negotiate a new set of Geneva Conventions? Martha Stewart to run the Securities and Exchange Commission? Kenneth Lay for energy secretary?”

***-The New York Times, March 9, 2005***

“Beyond his stated views on the United Nations -- and more generally his low opinion of all things multilateral -- Bolton's general undiplomatic demeanor is a profound mismatch with the attributes usually associated with an American ambassador to the United Nations. It is a singularly sensitive position that requires someone who plays well with others. Bolton does not; he tries instead to commandeer the sandbox... Given his record, both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate should start with a presumption that Bolton is a U.N. enemy... Unless Bolton can make a powerful case that he and the White House support the United Nations and seek to help it work more effectively, he should be rejected. The Senate should not accept complicity in an effort to destroy the only institution in this troubled world that is capable of resolving conflict without resorting to arms.”

***-Minneapolis Star-Tribune, March 10, 2005***

“It is hardly surprising that the nomination of John Bolton, a blunt-spoken conservative, to be the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations should have generated strong reactions. Bolton himself has always been a man of strong views. But it is not Bolton's

strong opinions, and certainly not his conservative political stance, that make him a poor choice to advance this country's interests at the U.N.; it is his much-chronicled disdain of the U.N. itself. International diplomacy is not easy. If it were, more of it would get done. There are times when reading the riot act is called for. Bolton can do that, no doubt. But there are many more times that require deftness, patience, compromise and bridge-building. At these subtle arts, Bolton is not as adept. If President Bush wants Bolton at the U.N., Bush probably should be allowed to have him there. And by reason of his many years of service at the State Department, Bolton certainly appears qualified. But whether he is the best person - or even a good person - for the job is much less clear.”

***-Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel, March 10, 2005***

“Since his re-election, President Bush has toned down his rhetoric, traveled to Europe to confer with allies and in general tried to project a more cooperative image to other nations made nervous by American aggressiveness. Then he went and named John Bolton as America's ambassador to the United Nations, a step that threatens to undo much of his earlier work. In the past, Bolton has also harshly attacked the United Nations. It is one thing to be critical of the United Nations' performance — the agency deserves much of its reputation as an incompetent bureaucratic bungler. But Bolton has questioned the very reason for its existence, which makes him an odd and perhaps even destructive choice for Bush.”

***-The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, March 7, 2005***

“IN APPOINTING John Bolton, an abrasive ideologue hostile to international treaties and cooperation, as the US ambassador to the United Nations, President Bush has put at risk his own second-term project of reviving the mainstream internationalist tradition of US foreign policy. Democratic senators and Republican moderates wary of having such a doctrinaire unilateralist represent this country at the UN may not succeed in blocking his confirmation. But they are entitled to get him on the record in confirmation hearings in support of UN activities such as peacekeeping and organizing elections -- activities that the rest of the world commends and that serve American interests. If there is a silver lining to Bolton's UN appointment, it would be that he would be kept away from a policymaking role at the State Department or the White House. If Bolton is confirmed, he must not be allowed to deform or deflect the more internationalist foreign policy Bush has at last begun to follow.”

***-Boston Globe, March 9, 2005***

“John Bolton is the wrong person to serve as the United States' representative to the United Nations. The Senate should reject President Bush's nomination of him. The choice of Bolton, previously undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, to succeed John Danforth is bewildering.”

***-The Philadelphia Inquirer, March 10, 2005***

“Previous Republican administrations have named tough talkers, such as Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Jeane Kirkpatrick, to be ambassador to the United Nations. Nonetheless, George W. Bush's nomination of John Bolton to be his man in New York will give his partners around the world pause. Not only has Mr Bolton proved to be very abrasive as the State Department's chief arms controller over the past four years, but he is also an

avowed unilateralist and long-standing critic of the UN. On the face of it, his appointment runs counter to the US president's apparent new stress, especially during his trip to Europe last month, on co-operative diplomacy in his second term."

**--The Financial Times, March 9, 2005**

"Like it or not, the United States, as a U.N. founder and world superpower, must play a role in refurbishing the U.N.'s tarnished image so that it becomes a forum to successfully handle international disputes. To do so, America must provide a representative who desires to make the U.N. work, not one who might wish that it would go away."

**- Ft. Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel, March 14, 2005**

"The Senate that confirmed Eleanor Roosevelt to work with the United Nations in 1946 chose intellect and compassion over ignorance and combativeness. Hopefully, the Senate of 2005 will prove to be equally enlightened and reject the nomination of John Bolton."

**-Wisconsin State Journal, March 13, 2005**

"John Robert Bolton is smart, dedicated and single-minded in pursuit of what he perceives to be U.S. interests. Nor are those interests selfishly unilateral, despite what critics say. Bolton worked for free on the fruitless attempts to organize a U.N. referendum in the Western Sahara a dozen years ago. More recently, he won friends in Russia by the straightforward way he helped rewrite key strategic arms accords to suit both nations. Yet Bolton's nomination as the new U.S. ambassador to the United Nations must not be sustained. Bolton will not get the job done when America needs to exercise leadership on reform at the United Nations and display nuance on Syria and Iran. He is the anti-diplomat when only a diplomat will do."

**-Cleveland Plain Dealer, March 11, 2005**

### **Editorials in Support of John Bolton**

"It is now 60 years since the San Francisco Conference inaugurated the U.N. In that time, U.S. interests have more often been stymied than advanced by our participation. But the U.N. has also been the place where past ambassadors such as Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Jean Kirkpatrick made America's case. We expect Mr. Bolton will carry on in that tradition, and perhaps even rescue the U.N. from itself."

**-Wall Street Journal, March 8, 2005**

"If the Senate confirms the appointment, Bush will have aimed a tidal wave of energy and candor at the snoozy UN complex on New York City's East River. This promises to be a rude awakening for a body too often consumed by such weighty issues as where in Manhattan diplomats can park free, and who'll be air-kissing whom at tonight's reception... Bolton alone won't cure fecklessness and corruption. Count on him, though, to demand that the UN live up to its promise rather than shirk it. One way to view Bush's nomination of a first-teamer such as Bolton is that the administration is serious not only about UN reform, but also about the UN's potential for good... UN delegates need to hear more confrontational talk about the organization's failings and also about nuclear

proliferation, an area in which Bolton is expert. And if a tidal wave on the East River breaks some cobwebbed windows, good.”

***-Chicago Tribune, March 10, 2005***

“If confirmed, Mr. Bolton must also address such issues as the overdue reconfiguration of the Security Council, which has the same membership that it had at the end of World War II -- the conflict that brought the world body into being but which no longer defines the world's politics. Mr. Bolton would have to push aggressively for reform, yet not so hard as to antagonize people and thus block improvement. If he could find the right balance, he might turn out to be just the right person for the U.N. ambassador's job, in the tradition of such sharp-tongued predecessors as Jeane Kirkpatrick and Daniel Patrick Moynihan.”

***-The Providence Journal, March 22, 2005***

“It's worth remembering that U.N. ambassadors aren't there to represent the United Nations. Nor are they there to blend into the woodwork or apologize for American foreign policy. They are there to vigorously advance American interests and values, which are sometimes at odds with the interests and values of the United Nations. With that in mind, we think Mr. Bolton is a bold choice for the job.”

***-The Orange County Register, March 14, 2005***

## Articles and OpEds of Interest

### "Boltonism"

**New Yorker - Issue of 2005-03-21 - by Samantha Power - Posted 2005-03-14**

Barring a sudden and improbable outbreak of independent judgment in the Senate, John Bolton will soon be confirmed as President Bush's Ambassador to the United Nations, an institution he openly disdains. "It is a President's prerogative to name his ambassadors," Secretary-General Kofi Annan meekly told reporters last week. When he was asked whether he saw the nomination as a hostile act, he laughed and said, "I'm not sure I want to be drawn on that one." At U.N. headquarters, staffers walked around in a daze of disbelief. They had hoped that Bush's congenial European trip—combined with the U.N.'s moves toward internal reform and its indispensable role in pulling off the Iraqi elections—would spawn a U.S.-U.N. détente. Then came word that Bush was sending them Bolton.

"I'm pro-American," Bolton says, as if that required him to be anti-world. He dismisses the U.N.'s tools for promoting peace and security. International law? "It is a big mistake for us to grant any validity to international law even when it may seem in our short-term interest to do so—because, over the long term, the goal of those who think that international law really means anything are those who want to constrict the United States." (Never mind that such laws might have "constricted" the torture of detainees.) Humanitarian intervention? It's "a right of intervention that is just a gleam in one beholder's eye but looks like flat-out aggression to somebody else." Negotiation as a way of dealing with rogue states? "I don't do carrots," Bolton says.

It is easy to catalogue the things that John Bolton doesn't "do"—encourage payment of U.N. dues, support the International Criminal Court, strengthen international disarmament treaties. What he does do is less obvious. As Under-Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, he has rightly been given credit for the Proliferation Security Initiative, which attempts to interdict shipments of fissile material and which is supported by sixty nations, including France and Germany. But on his watch North Korea, the chief target of his ire, reprocessed enough plutonium to make six new nuclear weapons. Bolton boasts of "taking a big bottle of Wite-Out" to President Clinton's signature on the statute for the International Criminal Court ("a product of fuzzy-minded romanticism" that is "not just naïve but dangerous"). Yet the Administration's assault on the I.C.C. has, in fact, bolstered the court's legitimacy internationally. Powerful middle-tier countries (like Germany) have helped make up the loss of American funds and personnel, and the court is now deep into investigations of mass slaughter in Congo and Uganda.

Bolton is also a longtime skeptic of tools that are increasingly part of the Bush Administration's arsenal. Nation building is a "fallacy," he thinks. "The U.S. is still engaged in nation building here two hundred and twenty-five years plus after the Declaration of Independence, and we still have a long way to go," he said in 2002. "The idea that we can nation build for somebody else is just unrealistic." When Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice announced Bolton's nomination, last Monday, she said, "We who are on the right side of freedom's divide have an obligation to help those who are

unlucky enough to be born on the wrong side of that divide.” But Bolton, who stood stoically next to her, has never believed that spreading freedom is America’s business.

It is unclear what the Bush Administration has in mind by shipping Bolton to New York. The appointment has been spun as “Nixon goes to China.” Nixon, however, actually went to China: the visit was compatible with his world view. Bolton, by contrast, seems averse to compromise, and is apparently committed to the belief that the U.N. and international law undermine U.S. interests. If he is to be an engine for U.N. reform, he will have to jettison his core values. He will have to work on expanding the Security Council, even though, in 1997, he said, “Leave the veto alone, and leave the Security Council’s membership alone.” (More recently, he suggested shrinking membership to a single state: his.) He will have to work with European states, even though he believes that “some Europeans have never lost faith in appeasement as a way of life.” He will have to cooperate with China, even though he has called for full diplomatic recognition of Taiwan. And, if the Administration is serious about prosecuting the perpetrators of atrocities in Darfur, he will have to allow the Security Council to refer the case to the I.C.C.

The appointment of John Bolton has the look of a bureaucratic fix for an Administration that doesn’t really care what happens to the U.N. At the State Department, Bolton, a protégé of Vice- President Dick Cheney, has behaved more like a grandstander at a conservative think tank than like a diplomat. Colin Powell endured the collateral damage caused by his outbursts, but Rice made it plain that she would have none of it, and passed over Bolton for Deputy Secretary of State. Cheney reportedly then insisted that Bolton get the U.N. When Madeleine Albright and Richard Holbrooke were appointed U.N. Ambassadors, President Clinton announced the nominations. Bush did the same for his first-term nominees, John Negroponte and John Danforth. Rice, in naming Bolton herself, sent a not so subtle signal that she expects to remain boss.

Nobody is more aware of a “U.N. in crisis” than the U.N.’s senior officials. They know that the U.N. is first and foremost a gathering of states, and an organization run by the most powerful of them. To be effective, the U.N., as Bolton himself has said, “requires sustained American leadership.” Kofi Annan, speaking in Madrid three days after the nomination, praised Bolton’s Proliferation Security Initiative and said that the “most vital” aim of the U.N. should be denying terrorists access to nuclear materials. The Administration did not return the love: instead, Rice sent Annan a letter informing him that the United States had unilaterally withdrawn from yet another international agreement, this one regarding an international court’s jurisdiction over the claims of foreigners held in American jails.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will have a lot to contemplate when the ever-quotable Bolton arrives for confirmation. At the U.N. last week, the most discussed Boltonism was the claim that if the U.N. building “lost ten stories it wouldn’t make a bit of difference.” One staffer sighed and said, “He didn’t say which ten floors he would like to see disappear. Perhaps that leaves us some room for influence.”

**"The Domestic Bolton"**  
**Michael Tomasky, The American Prospect Online, Mar 21, 2005.**

Opposition to the UN nominee has centered on his international record. But it's his history as a party hack that's the real story.

The first wave of protest against President Bush's nomination of John Bolton to be his ambassador to the United Nations centered, plausibly enough, on Bolton's international track record, and specifically on his long history of bellicose commentary about the world body.

But there's a domestic Bolton, too. While the international Bolton gives cause for concern, the real problem is the domestic Bolton, and Democrats and moderate Republicans on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who have reservations about the nomination should be looking at the domestic Bolton's background, because it suggests not mere rhetorical bellicosity but possible sleaze.

To cut to the chase: Did Bolton play any role in helping to conceal a foreign campaign contribution channeled to the Republican National Committee that may have helped the RNC prevail in the 1994 congressional elections?

Here's the story. In the run-up to the 1994 elections, Haley Barbour formed an outfit called the National Policy Forum (NPF), a nonprofit policy and research institute. Barbour was the head of the RNC at the time, and he took the reins of the NPF as well.

As was widely reported at the time, the NPF was partially endowed via a loan Barbour solicited with the help of a Hong Kong businessman and Taiwanese citizen named Ambrous Tung Young. The value of the loan, from a lending institution to the NPF, was \$2.1 million; Young put up the collateral in the form of certificates of deposit.

The NPF had owed the RNC \$1.6 million; so, once the NPF had secured its loan, it paid back the RNC the \$1.6 million it owed. This sounds all well and good -- except for the fact that the NPF repaid the loan in October 1994, which, handily enough, gave the Republican Party that much more money to spend on its congressional candidates in elections just a couple of weeks away. Republicans gained 54 seats in the House of Representatives that election, and while no one's arguing that they made those gains only because of this late cash infusion, it clearly couldn't have hurt. There were additional allegations that the NPF was engaging in activities that were more directly political than the group's charter would have allowed.

The story gets dirtier -- and brings us to what is, for current purposes, the punch line. By 1996, the NPF had defaulted on the loan. In April of that year, the NPF sought to extend the loan's maturity date and revise its terms. That having apparently failed, the NPF took a far more dramatic step in May, according to a June 8, 1997, article by Dan Morgan in The Washington Post. The NPF's then-new president authorized the holder of the note, Signet Bank, to start taking its payments directly out of the certificates of deposit put up by Young as collateral -- without Young's knowledge, by all accounts. That NPF president? John Bolton.

Signet Bank called the loan (\$1.3 million remaining at that point) in September 1996, according to Morgan's reporting. This left a teed-off Young holding the bag, and in early 1997, the GOP agreed to pay Young 50 cents on the dollar (a sure sign that Young was not a happy camper).

It all smelled bad enough that the Republican-controlled Senate, holding hearings in the summer of 1997 on the role of foreign money in the 1996 election (for the purpose of trying to embarrass the Clinton administration -- John Huang, Charlie Trie, et al.), had to devote at least a couple days' worth of hearings to letting Democrats pursue the NPF matter.

A key question the Democrats tried to push at the time was whether Barbour knew that the money that collateralized the loan had come from Hong Kong. Barbour denied knowing this. But one witness at the hearings, a GOP fundraiser named Frederick Volcansek, testified that he told Barbour at the time that the source of the money was Young's Hong Kong business. In addition, Barbour had met with Young -- in Hong Kong! Yet in the face of all this, Barbour told the committee that the idea that the money came from Hong Kong "never entered my mind."

With committee testimony that was both combative and aw-shucks-y -- and with his party in charge of the probe -- Barbour made the problem go away. And speaking of going away: Democrats had been pursuing Bolton to get him to testify. But, wouldn't you know it, he reported an important business meeting in Europe the week he was scheduled to appear, and he canceled at the last minute.

One GOP operative tried to laugh off questions about the NPF at the time by saying that it "was staffed by policy wonks. Do you really think we would trust those guys to conduct secret political work?" I don't know about the mid-level staff. But I do know policy wonks. Haley Barbour was no policy wonk, and neither was John Bolton -- who, as a young lawyer in the 1970s, worked on the Buckley v. Valeo lawsuit trying to reverse the campaign-finance reforms of the early '70s.

What did Bolton know about the Young loan? Why did he call Signet Bank and instruct a loan officer to start taking its payments out of Young's collateral? How did Young feel about all this? Did the NPF do expressly political work?

Barbour used to like to compare the NPF to the Democratic Leadership Council, but the DLC never had a political party chairman in charge, and it sure never found a sneaky way to channel a large amount of money to the Democratic National Committee just weeks before an election.

Staffers on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee trying to prepare their bosses for Bolton's hearings might want to contact former staffers of Fred Thompson's old money-probe committee. They might have some interesting tales to tell.

**"Bolton's Big Secret"**  
**Nation Magazine - March 21, 2005 - Ari Berman**

Much has been written about the appointment of unilateralist uber-hawk John Bolton as America's new UN ambassador, but there's been almost nothing regarding Bolton's role in promoting the fantasy that Saddam Hussein (news - web sites) tried to acquire enriched uranium from Niger. In fact, United Press International is the only national news agency or publication thus far to detail Bolton's behind-the-scenes dealings, in a news story by Christian Bourge and a column by Steve Clemons, who's monitored Bolton at his blog The Washington Note.

News of Bolton's involvement in the Niger scandal broke on March 1, when Congressman Henry Waxman sent a letter to Chris Shays, chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Security. As part of a larger examination of excessive government secrecy, Waxman wrote that the "State Department concealed classified information about the role of John Bolton, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control, in creation of a fact sheet that falsely claimed that Iraq (news - web sites) sought uranium from Niger." According to Waxman, after Bolton repeatedly advanced a known untruth, his staff tried to squelch an investigation and lied to Congress about their boss's role.

The State Department drew up the fact sheet in response to the Iraqi regime's weapons declaration to the UN Security Council on December 7, 2002. "The Declaration ignores efforts to procure uranium from Niger," State alleged. "Why is the Iraqi regime hiding their uranium procurement?" At the time, State Department and CIA (news - web sites) intelligence experts knew the question's premise was false. When Waxman pressed Colin Powell (news - web sites) on whether Bolton was behind the statement, State responded on September 25, 2003 that "John R. Bolton did not play a role in the creation of this document."

But a subsequent request for the fact sheet's chronology proved that on December 18, 2002--eight months before the denial--State Department spokesman Richard Boucher asked Bolton "for help developing a response to Iraq's December 7 declaration...that could be used with the press." Bolton agreed and put his staff at the Bureau of Nonproliferation in charge. Three different versions of the fact sheet, all emailed to Bolton, included the debunked Niger charge. The chronology was labeled "sensitive but unclassified" and protected from Freedom of Information Act requests. If not for Waxman's persistence, the truth of Bolton's involvement may never have been exposed.

The Bush Administration is rightfully worried about Bolton's confirmation, and the new Niger revelation may be one reason why State unsuccessfully attempted to fast-track public hearings before the Senate recess on March 21. The first hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will instead commence on April 7.

At least one Republican will need to join the Committee's eight Democrats to block Bolton's appointment. The key swing votes are Democrat Russ Feingold (D-WI) and Republican Lincoln Chafee (R-RI). Feingold may run for President in 2008 and has a disturbing history of backing some of the Administration's most controversial nominees (see Ashcroft, John). Chafee faces a tough 2006 re-election challenge in a blue state.

Both should have plenty of time to review Bolton's "Affair with Niger" over their spring break.

**"Wrong Man for This U.N."  
Washington Post - March 22, 2005 - By Peter Beinart**

John Bolton owes his recent nomination as ambassador to the United Nations to an analogy. It goes something like this: In 1975, when anti-Americanism was on the march, Gerald Ford chose a distinctly undiplomatic diplomat, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, to represent the United States at the United Nations. Unlike his predecessors, who had listened politely while America was defamed, Moynihan denounced the tin-pot dictatorships running wild at the United Nations. And a new movement called neoconservatism -- of which Moynihan was a leading voice -- made its entrance onto the international stage. Six years later, Ronald Reagan gave the U.N. job to another prominent neocon, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and she proved equally blunt.

Bolton -- a fierce U.N. critic -- is the supposed heir to that tradition. When Condoleezza Rice announced his nomination, she specifically invoked Moynihan and Kirkpatrick. Numerous right-leaning commentators have done the same. To some members of Congress, sending a man who has repeatedly trashed the United Nations to be America's representative there seems perverse. But for neocons with a sense of history, that's precisely the point.

Problem is, the history's misleading. Moynihan and Kirkpatrick were effective because their oppositional styles suited the time -- a time when there was little the United States could do at the United Nations other than oppose. Today the United States has an opportunity to lead. And by choosing Bolton, the Bush administration may be squandering it.

Moynihan became America's U.N. ambassador at one of the lowest moments in the history of U.S. foreign policy. In April 1975, the month he was nominated, North Vietnam overran Saigon, handing the United States its greatest military defeat of the 20th century. The United Nations was dominated by leftist Third World dictatorships with a fondness for the Soviet Union and a hostility to the United States. The previous year they had proposed a resolution essentially endorsing government expropriation of foreign property. The United States had opposed the resolution, and been outvoted 120 to 6.

In fact, Moynihan was given the U.N. job largely on the strength of an essay he published in Commentary called "The United States in Opposition," in which he noted that, "We are a minority. We are outvoted. . . . The question is what do we make of it."

Moynihan said America should go down fighting. And so, less than five months into his tenure, when the United Nations passed its infamous resolution equating Zionism with racism, Moynihan declared, "This is a lie." When Ugandan tyrant Idi Amin went before the General Assembly to demand the "extinction of Israel as a state," Moynihan called him a "racist murderer." By defending America, Moynihan kindled national pride. Time put him on its cover. National Review named him "man of the year."

When Kirkpatrick took the job in 1981, America's international standing was not much higher. The Soviets had recently invaded Afghanistan, and the Iranian hostage crisis had been an extended national humiliation. Often citing Moynihan, Kirkpatrick

denounced America's critics, responding to their lectures on imperialism with lectures on democracy. The United States was still a beleaguered minority. But as one of Kirkpatrick's aides put it, it was no longer "a willing victim."

Like Moynihan and Kirkpatrick, Bolton loves a good fight. He has denounced international treaties on small arms, biological weapons and the International Criminal Court. He has said that if the United Nations lost 10 of its 38 floors, no one would notice. And as if to underscore his incendiary reputation, he reportedly keeps a fake hand grenade in his office.

But in today's United Nations, bomb-throwing is no longer what America needs. The Third World-Soviet alliance that dominated the organization in the 1970s and 1980s has collapsed. Eastern Europe is now filled with pro-U.S. democracies, and across the Third World governments have moved toward the capitalist economic systems they once decried. According to Freedom House, the number of countries deemed "free" has more than doubled since 1974, from 41 to 89. And while the United States is still resented at the U.N., its influence there is enormous. In 1996 the United States almost single-handedly deposed U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. Today his successor, Kofi Annan, is scrambling to avoid a similar fate.

America's challenge at the United Nations is to forge a new ideological majority and harness it for cooperative efforts against terrorism, nuclear proliferation, poverty and AIDS. Bolton -- who specializes in alienating America's democratic allies -- is uniquely ill-suited to that task. By choosing him, the Bushies are signaling one of two things: Either they think America is still isolated in the world or, worse, they want it to be.

The writer is editor of the New Republic and a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution. He writes a monthly column for The Post.

**"Kudos to Bolton for telling it like it is"**  
**Chicago Sun Times - March 20, 2005 - by Mark Steyn Sun-times Columnist**

Even if Paul Wolfowitz and John Bolton weren't two of the more far-sighted thinkers in the Bush administration, appointing them respectively to the World Bank and the U.N. would be worth it just for the pleasure of watching the Europeans, the Democrats and the media go bananas over it.

The assumption seems to be that, with things going Bush's way in Iraq, Lebanon, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, Bush needs to reach out by stiffing the counselors who called it right and appointing more emollient types who got everything wrong. Each to his own. But as I see it, the question isn't why Wolfowitz and Bolton should hold these jobs, but why Kofi Annan, Jacques Chirac, John Kerry and assorted others still hold their jobs.

Still, if you're going to play the oldest established permanent floating transnational crap game for laughs, might as well pick an act with plenty of material.

What I love about Bolton, America's new ambassador to the U.N., is the sheer volume of "damaging" material. Usually, the Democrats and media have to riffle through decades of dreary platitudes to come up with one potentially exploitable infelicitous soundbite. But with Bolton the damaging quotes are hanging off the trees and dropping straight into your bucket. Five minutes' casual mooching through the back catalog and your cup runneth over:

The U.N.? "There is no such thing as the United Nations."

Reform of the Security Council? "If I were redoing the Security Council, I'd have one permanent member: the United States."

International law? "It is a big mistake for us to grant any validity to international law."

Offering incentives to rogue states? "I don't do carrots."

But he does do schtick. I happen to agree with all the above statements, but I can see why the international community might be minded to throw its hands up and shriek, "Quel horreur!" It's not just the rest of the world. Most of the American media are equally stunned.

The New York Times wondered what Bush's next appointment would be:

"Donald Rumsfeld to negotiate a new set of Geneva conventions? Martha Stewart to run the Securities and Exchange Commission?"

OK, I get the hang of this game. Sending Bolton to be U.N. ambassador is like . . . putting Sudan and Zimbabwe on the Human Rights Commission. Or letting Saddam's Iraq chair the U.N. Conference on Disarmament. Or sending a bunch of child-sex fiends to man U.N. operations in the Congo. And the Central African Republic. And Sierra Leone, and Burundi, Liberia, Haiti, Kosovo, and pretty much everywhere else.

All of which happened without the U.N. fetishists running around shrieking hysterically. Why should America be the only country not to enjoy an uproarious joke at the U.N.'s expense?

That's why the Bolton flap is very revealing about conventional wisdom on transnationalism. Diplomats are supposed to be "diplomatic." I mentioned a month or so back the late Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson's bon mot: Diplomacy is the art of letting the other fellow have your way. In other words, you were polite, discreet, circumspect, etc., as a means to an end. Not anymore. None of Bolton's detractors is worried that his bluntness will jeopardize the administration's policy goals. Quite the contrary. They're concerned that the administration has policy goals -- that it isn't yet willing to subordinate its national interest to the polite transnational pieties.

In that sense, our understanding of "diplomacy" has become corrupted: It's no longer the language through which nation states treat with one another so much as the code-speak consensus of a global elite.

For much of the civilized world the transnational pablum has become an end in itself, and one largely unmoored from anything so tiresome as reality. It doesn't matter whether there is any global warming or, if there is, whether Kyoto will do anything about it or, if you ratify Kyoto, whether you bother to comply with it: All that matters is that you sign on to the transnational articles of faith. The same thinking applies to the International Criminal Court, Darfur, the Oil-for-Fraud program, and anything else involving the U.N.

That's what Bolton had in mind with his observations about international law: "It is a big mistake for us to grant any validity to international law even when it may seem in our short-term interest to do so -- because, over the long term, the goal of those who think that international law really means anything are those who want to constrict the United States." Just so. When George Bush Sr. went through the U.N. to assemble his Stanley Gibbons coalition for the first Gulf War, it may have been a "diplomatic triumph" but it was also the biggest single contributing factor to the received wisdom in the decade and a half since that only the U.N. has the international legitimacy to sanction war. That in turn amplifies the U.N.'s claim to sole global legitimacy in a thousand other areas, big and small: the environment, guns, smoking, taxation.

Yet the assumption behind much of the criticism of Bolton from the likes of Kerry is that, regardless of his government's foreign policy, a U.N. ambassador has to be at some level a U.N. booster. Twenty years ago, Secretary of State George Schulz used to welcome the Reagan administration's ambassadorial appointments to his office and invite each chap to identify his country on the map. The guy who'd just landed the embassy in Chad would invariably point to Chad. "No," Schulz would say, "this is your country" -- and point to the United States. Nobody would expect a U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union to be a big booster for the Soviets. And, given that in a unipolar world the most plausible challenger to the United States is transnationalism, these days the Schulz test is even more pertinent for the U.N. ambassador: his country is the United States, not the ersatz jurisdiction of Annan's embryo world government.

Reporting on the Bolton appointment in the Financial Times, James Harding wrote, "Mr. Bush is eager to re-engage with allies, but is unapologetic about the Iraq war, the policy of preemption and the transformational agenda." "Unapologetic"? What exactly should he be apologizing for? The toppling of Saddam?

The Iraq election? The first green shoots of liberty in the desert of Middle Eastern "stability"? When you unpick the assumptions behind Harding's sentence, Bush's principal offense is that he remains "unapologetic" about doing all this without the blessing of the formal transnational decision-making process.

Good for him. In recent years, I can find only one example of a senior U.N. figure having the guts to call a member state a "totalitarian regime." It was former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali last autumn, and he was talking about America. Bolton's sin isn't that he's "undiplomatic," but that he's correct.

**"Cheney Defends Bush Appointments"**  
**Washington Post - March 23, 2005 - By Jim VandeHei, Washington Post Staff  
Writer**

Vice President Says Loyalists in Diplomatic Posts Will Strengthen U.S. Position

Vice President Cheney said yesterday that the elevation of White House loyalists and supporters of the Iraq war to key diplomatic posts puts the United States in a stronger position to force changes at the United Nations and improve the U.S. image abroad.

In an interview aboard Air Force Two, Cheney said the nomination of John R. Bolton to serve as ambassador to the United Nations in particular shows President Bush's commitment to ending corruption and changing the culture at the world body.

"There is clearly a lot that needs to be done at the United Nations," he said pointing to the oil-for-food scandal and recent charges of sexual assault by a U.N. official. "There is ample evidence here at home a great many Americans are not happy with the performance of the United Nations," Cheney said.

"We are the host country, we're the biggest contributor to its budget, and success long-term, I think, depends on the continued support of the U.S. and the American people," he continued. Cheney said the fact that Bolton has been a critic of the United Nations will give him "a great deal more credibility" tackling the challenges there.

In the interview conducted en route from Reno, Nev., the vice president bluntly acknowledged the administration's shortcomings in overcoming international hostility to American foreign policy and communicating a positive image of the United States abroad, especially to the Arab and Muslim worlds.

"If we are going to be successful long-term in the war on terror and in the broader objective of promoting freedom and democracy in that part of the world, we have to get the public diplomacy piece of it right," Cheney said. "Up until now, that has been a very weak part of our arsenal."

Cheney has been a driving force in the administration's foreign policy and privately advocated for Bolton to get the U.N. job and for longtime ally Paul D. Wolfowitz to head the World Bank. The vice president said top-level changes at the State Department should help set a better course.

"What the president has done . . . is make some personnel changes that he felt would strengthen our capacity as an administration to achieve our objectives," Cheney said.

The vice president said the decision to put three of the most influential women from Bush's first-term White House -- Condoleezza Rice, Karen P. Hughes and Dina Powell -- at the State Department signifies a new approach for Foggy Bottom. Privately, White House aides said the department is now a power center and one of the few agencies

with a significant second-term role, especially dealing with Bush's inaugural pledge to spread democracy.

"Having Karen Hughes over there with Dina Powell and Condi gives us the best possible combination of people [to] actively and aggressively address those issues," Cheney said.

Conservative Fred Barnes, in an article on yesterday's Wall Street Journal editorial page, said the moves are part of "Mr. Bush's shake-up-the-world view." Bolton, Hughes and Powell still must be confirmed by the Senate, and Wolfowitz needs the approval of the World Bank; all are expected to overcome any opposition.

The rise of close White House allies is not over and may include Cheney's chief of staff, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, replacing Wolfowitz as deputy defense secretary, according to White House officials. When asked about the possible change, all Cheney would say is: "I need Scooter."

Cheney, who sometimes clashed with then-Secretary of State Colin L. Powell over the Iraq war, said he would not discuss whether the new team is working better than the first-term one because he did not want to offend anyone.

Critics charge the White House is purging its voices of dissent and sending the wrong signal to the world with Bolton and Wolfowitz, two controversial architects of the Bush foreign policy.

"I can't think of anybody more qualified than Paul Wolfowitz to run the World Bank," Cheney said.

During the interview, Cheney continued to take a hard line with Syria and Iran but did not express serious concerns about China's policies. He said he had not been briefed on Rice's trip to Asia this week, during which China's role in pressing North Korea to return to negotiations over its nuclear program was left unsettled.

Citing diplomatic sensitivity, Cheney said he did not want to discuss China's more bellicose tone toward Taiwan. Some senior White House officials expressed concern over the growing instability in rural China, where poverty is ubiquitous and is leading to demonstrations, as well as China's dealings with North Korea and Taiwan.

"Generally, the relationship is in pretty good shape," Cheney said. "That does not mean we agree on everything."

As international pressure intensifies on Syria to withdraw from Lebanon before the spring elections, Cheney said: "It's not clear yet they will do what they need to do." If not, he said the United Nations will be "obliged" to consider other actions, though he would not discuss if or how forcefully the United States would push for punitive sanctions. "Syria is pretty isolated at this point," he said.

Cheney, who is described by administration officials as a leading proponent of a hard-line policy toward Tehran, said he is uncertain whether Iran has nuclear weapons.

"We have made the judgment that they are seeking to acquire" such weapons, the vice president said.

He did not set a timetable for Iran to reach an international agreement on its nuclear program, and said the United States will continue to work through European allies for now. "It is important to make clear to the Iranians that they need . . . to give up any aspirations they might have had to acquire nuclear weapons."

Iran denies it is using that program to develop nuclear weapons and says it needs nuclear energy.

**"Tough Love or Tough Luck?"**  
**Washington Post - March 8, 2005 - Susan E. Rice OpEd**

President Bush has shocked even his most cynical critics by nominating the combative neoconservative John Bolton to one of our most complex and sensitive diplomatic posts: U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. Bolton served the past four years as undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, though then-Secretary of State Colin Powell initially resisted his appointment.

Powell's successor, Condoleezza Rice, who passed over Bolton for deputy secretary despite strong support for him from Vice President Cheney, put on a brave face yesterday in announcing his appointment to the United Nations. She stressed the administration's commitment to U.N. reform and praised Bolton as a friend of the United Nations who helped repeal the noxious General Assembly resolution equating Zionism with racism. But as Rice must know, keeping Bolton off her team at State may prove a Pyrrhic victory, if he takes his notoriously abrasive style to New York.

The job of U.N. ambassador is always important and delicate, but arguably never more so than now. The United Nations is facing unprecedented, justified criticism for its role in the oil-for-food scandal and its failure to prevent peacekeepers from sexually exploiting civilians in Congo. Several Republican members of Congress are gunning for Secretary General Kofi Annan's head. In response, Annan is shaking up his management team and reminding the United States how badly it needs the United Nations.

Indeed, the United States is relying on the United Nations to carry out a massive tsunami recovery effort and 17 peacekeeping missions, to support the democratization processes in Afghanistan and Iraq, and to pressure Iran to halt its nuclear program. At the 60th anniversary of its founding, the United Nations has rarely been more relevant or in greater need of reform.

President Bush seems to understand this. In December he pledged three international goals for his second term. "The first great commitment," he said "is to defend our security and spread freedom by building effective multinational and multilateral institutions and supporting effective multilateral action."

Is John Bolton the right man to lead this effort? Having served as assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs from 1989 to 1993, Bolton may be deemed qualified, but his record on multilateral issues is alarming. He told the Wall Street Journal that "the happiest moment of his government service" was when the Bush administration renounced the treaty on the International Criminal Court. Bolton led the administration's withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, scuttled an important biological weapons protocol and weakened an international agreement to limit small-arms trafficking. On these issues, Bolton's positions at least reflected administration policy.

But Bolton holds many strong views that diverge sharply from current U.S. policy. He described the United Nations as "a great, rusting hulk of a bureaucratic superstructure . . . dealing with issues from the ridiculous to the sublime . . ." More important, he maintains that the United States has no legal obligation to pay its U.N. dues.

Once a paid consultant to the Taiwanese government, Bolton favors Taiwan's independence and its full U.N. membership -- a dangerous position in light of cross-straits tensions and our efforts to obtain Chinese pressure on North Korea. Will Bolton set aside his support for a Taiwanese U.N. seat while manning the U.S. seat on the Security Council?

Bolton flatly opposes the use of U.N. peacekeepers in civil conflicts, because he does not deem these "threats to international peace and security." By his logic, the United Nations has no business doing peacekeeping in many places where the Bush administration has supported its deployment of forces.

Bolton has testified against U.N. involvement in Congo, an inter-state conflict that has cost 3 million lives. He blasted the United Nations' concept of operations for its Ethiopia-Eritrea operation and rejected the U.N. civil administration missions in Kosovo and East Timor. Will Bolton undergo such a conversion on the road to First Avenue that he can effectively support U.N. peace operations?

Finally, Bolton criticized any " 'right of humanitarian intervention' to justify military operations to prevent ethnic cleansing or potential genocide." One must wonder how forcefully he will work to halt what the administration deems genocide in Darfur.

Rice asserts that Bolton will be an outspoken, effective U.N. ambassador in the vein of Jeane Kirkpatrick and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. If his appointment serves to bring the United Nations' most rabid critics in Congress to heel, it may have some merit. Bolton could yet surprise his skeptics by giving "tough love" a whole new definition. To do so, he will have to be for the United Nations what Richard Nixon was for China: a hard-liner who effectively forged groundbreaking change. Those of us who believe the United States needs an effective, reformed United Nations can only hope he succeeds.

The writer is a senior fellow in foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution. She was assistant secretary of state from 1997 to 2001.

**"Bush's Bomb Thrower"**  
**Time Magazine - March 21, 2005 - James Carney, With reporting by Matthew Cooper; Elaine Shannon/Washington**

John Bolton loathes the U.N., which some say makes him perfect to be our ambassador there

Ever since Bernard Kerik, George W. Bush's choice to head the Department of Homeland Security, withdrew his name from consideration last December, the President had been playing it safe with his second-term nominations. And so it came as a surprise to almost everyone, in Washington and in foreign capitals, when the President last week announced John Bolton as his pick for the next U.S. ambassador to the U.N. A senior State Department official whose 24-year career in and out of government has been defined by a self-professed distaste for treaties, contempt for diplomatic niceties and hostility toward the U.N., Bolton was described by a liberal think tank as "possibly the least appropriate person in U.S. public life" for the job. Said a Republican Senator: "Is the President spoiling for a fight?"

The answer, say top Bush aides, is yes. But the fight the President seeks is not the one he will face, and almost certainly win, over Bolton's nomination. Bush chose Bolton, they say, because he's sure that the smart and abrasive onetime protege of U.N. basher and former North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms is just the person to convince U.N. bashers in Congress that it will serve U.S. interests to give the scandal-plagued international body the American support and money it needs. "This guy has the credibility to go to the skeptics and say, 'It's in our vital interests to have the U.N. because we can't do all these things alone,'" insists a senior Bush aide.

But if Bush believes the U.N. is important, picking Bolton is a novel way to show it. In 1994, Bolton declared that if the 39-floor U.N. headquarters in New York City "lost 10 stories, it wouldn't make a bit of difference." In 2000 he told National Public Radio that if he were remaking the U.N. Security Council, he would give it not five permanent members but just one--the U.S.--"because that's the real reflection of the distribution of power in the world." Bolton has insisted that international law has no validity because "those who think [it] really means anything are those who want to constrict the United States." He called the U.S. withdrawal from the International Criminal Court "the happiest moment of my government service."

Bush aides argue that no matter what Bolton has said and done in the past, as U.N. ambassador he will carry out policy, not make it. But in his government jobs, Bolton has never been one to quietly follow orders. Critics say he consistently used his perch as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security to undermine former Secretary of State Colin Powell in his policy battles with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Vice President Dick Cheney. And most famously, just as delicate six-party talks, including North Korea, were about to begin discussing Pyongyang's nuclear-weapons program in 2003, Bolton delivered a speech excoriating Kim Jong Il as the "tyrannical dictator" of a country in which "life is a hellish nightmare." Pyongyang responded by calling Bolton "human scum."

With his bushy mustache and tweedy attire, Bolton, the son of a fire fighter and a homemaker, looks more like an eccentric professor than a pinstriped diplomat. He and his wife, a financial planner, live quietly in Washington, having packed off their only child, a daughter, to Yale. Friends and colleagues describe him as a cerebral and socially awkward workaholic who once brought a bottle of wine as a present to a 3-year-old's birthday party. "It's hard to imagine him living at the Waldorf," says a friend, referring to the glamorous apartment used by America's ambassador to the U.N.

A Baltimore native and Yale-educated lawyer, Bolton, 56, has been a staunch conservative since he campaigned for Barry Goldwater as a teenager in 1964. Bolton held jobs in both the Reagan and first Bush administrations, and treasures a gift he received from colleagues in the early 1980s--a bronze-plated hand grenade celebrating his reputation as a bomb thrower. After spending the Clinton years throwing bombs from a conservative think tank, Bolton played a key role as a lawyer representing Bush during the Florida recount in 2000, a sign of loyalty that guaranteed him a plum job in the new Administration. Bolton, Cheney once said, deserves "any job he wants."

U.N. ambassador is not the job Bolton wanted most. After the 2004 election, White House and State Department sources say, he lobbied to become Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's deputy. But Rice, say sources close to the Secretary, didn't want Bolton freelancing under her the way he had under Powell. In selling Bolton's appointment to Senators, Rice is arguing that sending a noted critic to be ambassador to the U.N. would be like "Nixon going to China." Though most Democrats oppose Bolton's confirmation, some think Rice could be right. "Bolton could be both an Excedrin headache for the Secretary of State and someone who will be able to create negotiating space for her," says Lee Feinstein, a veteran of the Clinton State and Defense departments. "The question is whether the pain will be worth the gain."

Published by:

***Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation***

*322 4<sup>th</sup> Street, NE*

*Washington, DC 20002*

*(202) 543-4100*

<http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/>

April 2005