New York, 2 October 2001 - Secretary-General on ABC'S "GOOD MORNING AMERICA", with anchor Diane Sawyer, (unofficial transcript)

For further use please contact ABC concerning copyright restrictions

Sawyer: Here now, the Secretary-General, Kofi Annan. Is the world at war against terrorism and is it a war we're going to win?

SG: This United Nations has reacted swiftly in a manner that I haven't seen before.

Sawyer: Surprise to you?

SG: It surprised me because they realize that we are in this together; that if this can happen in New York and in Washington and in Pennsylvania, it could be anywhere. If New York today, where would it be tomorrow and I think it shook them. It shook them and the solidarity has been quite remarkable.

[Video clip with Mayor Giuliani: The United Nations must hold accountable any country that supports or condones terrorism; otherwise, you will fail in your primary mission as peacekeeper.]

Sawyer: When the mayor says that the United Nations must hold the terrorists accountable or fail in its primary mission as peacekeepers, do you agree?

SG: I agree.

Sawyer: Do you consider that under these resolutions, the United States has the right now to proceed with military attacks without any further action or even consultation with the United Nations?

SG: Well, the Security Council resolutions have described the attack as a threat to international peace and security and has also reaffirmed the right of individual and collective civil defence.

Sawyer: Have you seen sufficient evidence for you that Osama bin Laden and his group, Al Qaeda, the greater Al Qaeda, are behind this?

SG: I have not seen anything more than I have read in the press.

Sawyer: If the U.S. should determine that Iraq had its fingerprints on this and should attack Iraq, would the coalition hold?

SG: Well, so far, I have not seen any indication that Iraq has been involved in this, but I think attack on Iraq in this current climate, I think can create major difficulties in the Middle East.

Sawyer: And if the United States should determine that in order to bring the terrorists to justice it's necessary to end the Taliban government in Afghanistan, would the United Nations then -- do these resolutions cover that and include that?

SG: No. The resolutions do not cover that, but there is an earlier U.N. resolution which demanded the Taliban to deliver bin Laden and that was a basis for imposing sanctions on the Taliban. But I will not interpret the resolutions as they have now been passed to include removing the Taliban from office. What is clear from what all that I have heard and the reports I have received is that the Afghan people may themselves wish to have a change given what is happening with the starvation and the drought and there's a limit to what people can take.

Sawyer: You were talking about over a six month period at least \$584 million of emergency relief because of the refugees now flooding toward the border.

SG: That's correct.

Sawyer: Will this avert disaster?

New York, 2 October 2001 - Excerpt from interview with Al Jazeera's Ghida Fakhri,

Q: Going back to the specific Resolution [1373], the fact that it is so broad and gives countries such a wide scope of measures that they can take against so-called terrorists, does that mean that certain civil liberties could be undermined in the process? And that certain countries could use it to crack down on their own opponents?

SG: I hope that will not happen, but it is a concern. It is a concern that we should all be aware of. In times like this there is usually that tension between liberty and freedom and security and safety. How much liberty does one give up for safety and security? And if you give up liberty for safety and security do you in the end have either? And so, I think one has to be very careful. My own preference is that, whilst things may have to be done differently because of what has happened, if one has to err, I would prefer that one errs on the side of freedom and liberties.
