

America in Context

A publication intended to create a historical and cultural context in which to read contemporary issues in the United States.
<http://www.uspolicy.be>

> Embassy Event

Forum at the American Center - Dr. Simon Serfaty will give his perspectives on the transatlantic relationship after the U.S. presidential elections on Monday, December 6 at 6:00 p.m.

> Biography



Dr. Simon Serfaty is the first holder of the Zbigniew Brzezinski Chair in Global Security and Geostrategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, D.C. He was the director of the CSIS Europe Program for more than 10 years and remains a senior adviser to the program. Dr. Serfaty is also a senior professor of U.S. foreign policy with the Graduate Programs in International Studies at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia.

> **America in Context** is intended to contribute to a constructive discussion of major issues about US society and values. Articles and other materials, therefore, should not be construed as an endorsement of the views contained therein.

America in Context is best viewed online at: www.uspolicy.be/context/. Each issue covers a specific topic. For dynamic, updated content we refer to the various dossiers on our web site.

All articles and materials are available in full text format. To access some articles a password is required. Please use: AA2003.

Readers interested in subscribing can register via our web site at: <http://www.uspolicy.be/listen.htm>. Readers can also unsubscribe using the same form.

A Vital Partnership: Europe and the U.S. after the Presidential Elections

This issue of *America in Context* focuses on the future relations between Europe and the United States.



President George W. Bush meets with Prime Minister of the Netherlands Jan Peter Balkenende in the Oval office. Tuesday, March 16, 2004. White House Picture by Paul Morse.

Serfaty, Simon. VITAL PARTNERSHIP: HALF AFTER BUSH. *Center for Strategic and International Studies - Initiative for A Renewed Transatlantic Partnership*, November 3 2004, pp. 1-6.

“The transatlantic partnership is at risk. For the first time since the United States of America assumed, on behalf of the West, a leadership it had earned the old-fashioned way, many of its European allies do not recognize the threat identified by the United States, do not condone the methods used to defeat that threat, and do not endorse the goals that motivate the United States. For both sides of the Atlantic, this is a critical juncture—a defining moment that parallels the start of President Truman’s second term in office, in January 1949, when decisions and the events that prompted them were to shape the history of the following four decades.

The strategy put in place by Truman between 1949 and 1953 was neither an American nor a European strategy. It was a Western strategy that relied on American power to shape an institutional order in the name of

Table of Contents
What Are the Issues ? | Facts & Figures | In the Media | Behind the Scenes

which the Cold War was waged and won. While a Western strategy may today be a goal that the European allies themselves will keep beyond our reach, it is one that deserves to be sought nonetheless. Insisting that the new security normalcy unveiled on September 11, 2001, can best be fought with passing "coalitions" that are built one "mission" at a time will marginalize the Atlantic Alliance and encourage the emergence of a potentially adversarial counterweight in Europe that will not serve our interests well. (...)

For all our differences with many of our European counterparts, and for all the personal doubts and occasional anger felt on each side of the Atlantic, Europe matters to America, and America to Europe, because overlapping interests and compatible values make of each the other's partner of choice. By April 2009, for the fiftieth anniversary of the Washington Treaty that launched the North Atlantic Alliance, relations with Europe will be either much better off or much worse off—depending on the decisions made on both sides of the Atlantic over the next six to eight months. For now in November 2004, as before in November 1949, the long-term has run out of time. In a moment impregnated with a certain air of destiny, what is most needed is a will for partnership nurtured by the historically extraordinary achievements that lie behind, but reinforced by the compelling challenges that stand ahead." [more](#)

> What Are the Issues ?

Underneath we have listed the most critical issues facing the leaders of both U.S. and EU in their search to further broaden the historically strong transatlantic partnership. We have documented each statement with a quote from a leading U.S. official, in order to reflect the American point of view on these issues.

Homeland Security - War against Terrorism



U.S. Envoy on 21st Century Russian-European-American Relations - April 2, St. Petersburg: speech by Amb. Alexander Vershbow

"(...) our increasingly close cooperation with the European Union on counterterrorism resulted last year in agreements on extradition and legal assistance. Together, the United States and EU have coordinated the freezing of terrorist assets all over the world. We are also working with EU member states and the European Commission to safeguard United States ports. The March 11 train bombings in Spain demonstrated conclusively, if there had ever been any serious doubts about this, that terrorists can strike anywhere, and that we need to work collectively with our European partners and others to combat this

global challenge. I am confident that our European friends, even those who opposed the military campaign against Saddam Hussein, understand the importance of bringing stability and security to a soon-to-be sovereign Iraq. [more](#) | [read about the U.S.-EU co-operation in this field on the website of the U.S. Mission to the EU.](#)

Values



U.S. Ambassador to the EU Rockwell A. Schnabel spoke on "**Measuring the Transatlantic Divide: Inextricably Bound, or Drifting**

Apart?'" before the ISC Foundation, St. Gallen, Switzerland, on May 14.

In his speech before the ISC Foundation, Ambassador Schnabel maps the shared values that underpin the transatlantic relationship. In that light, he examines to what extent the concerns that the two continents are drifting apart is justified, and whether some of the disputes between the U.S. and Europe that we have witnessed in recent years are in fact a reflection of a growing "values gap" between the U.S. and Europe.

"It is often said that the U.S. and Europe share the same values. Our common history and common systems of democratic governance and market economies have built a bond that runs deeper than cooperation between the governments of the day.

As far as it goes, this is true. Europe and the United States share more in common than perhaps any two other regions of the world. Our core values include democracy, a commitment to the importance of the individual, of respect for basic human rights, the rule of law, tolerance, and an appreciation of diversity. Both sides of the Atlantic share a strong belief in the role of free trade and competitive markets to improve the daily lives of our citizens.

But the strength of our relationship is, and must be, about much more than shared values. It is not our values that make the transatlantic relationship so important. The relationship matters because we derive from these shared values common objectives, and because we have the capabilities to achieve them.

To continue to go forward, then, transatlantic ties need to build on our common values. We must also move ahead on common action.

And we have. For two generations, from the Kennedy Round to today's Doha Round, the U.S. and Europe have been in the forefront of efforts to dismantle barriers to free trade.

For half a century, we stood toe-to-toe against the Soviet Union's alternate system of values – and prevailed.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, we toiled side by side in Eastern Europe to support those countries' ambitions to build democracies and strong, vibrant market economies. Those efforts were critical to bringing about the historic enlargement of the EU earlier this month.

In the Balkans, American and European troops have taken the point to bring stability and put an end to brutality. Increasingly, those troops are giving way to other professionals from both sides of the Atlantic who are taking on the difficult task of building new societies in Southeast Europe.

Some day, perhaps even by the end of this decade, we will be welcoming them into our premier transatlantic institutions – NATO and the EU.

In Africa, we are working side by side to tackle humanitarian crises, battle the diseases that are ravaging the continent, and supporting those who call for democracy and freedom.

At this summer's U.S.-EU summit, I hope we will be able to agree on a new priority effort for the transatlantic relationship as we work together to support those voices in the Middle East calling for economic, political and social reform.

And increasingly, we are also turning our attention to the new threats to our core values posed by terrorism, organized crime, and the spread of weapons of mass destruction." [read the full speech by Ambassador Rockwell Schnabel, U.S. Envoy to the European Union](#)

Evolution of NATO



NATO and the Transatlantic Relation - Remarks by R. Nicholas Burns, U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO, *Forum Bundeswehr and Gessellschaft 2004 Berlin, Germany*

"(...) I believe the great majority of Europeans and Americans understand a central fact—our security is indivisible. We must stand together because we need to meet the challenges of the modern world as an alliance of shared values and goals.

Simply put, NATO will stay strong because our mutual interests demand it. European Allies continue to rely on the U.S. for the nuclear and conventional defense of the continent. Of the many issues being debated for the new European constitution, for example, one that is not in the need

for an overarching European security umbrella to maintain peace on the continent. No such initiative is needed, because NATO and the U.S. provide that now, as we will in the future. Europe also needs NATO to project power beyond the continent.

It is also undeniably true the United States needs Europe. We have a \$2 trillion economic relationship that is by far the largest in the world. We Americans cannot confront the global transnational threats that go under, over, and through our borders and that are the greatest challenges of our time, without Europe. (...)

(...) NATO will stay together because we need each other and because we want the same future of stability and peace.

The real question, in my view, is not whether the U.S. is committed to working through multilateral institutions – President Bush made it clear at NATO's Istanbul summit in June that the U.S. advocates the most ambitious use possible of NATO to confront the broad range of security challenges facing Europe, Canada, and the United States. Rather, it is whether all of us are ready to put past differences behind us and work together to build an Alliance that is strong, effective, and engaged. This is what we did in the Cold War, in the Balkans, and it is what the U.S. is committed to doing today to confront the terrible threat of terrorism and the proliferation of WMD." [read Ambassador Burns' full speech](#) | [read all about NATO's 21st century challenges in this in June 2004 Department of State issued e-journal, entitled: "The U.S. and NATO: an alliance of purpose"](#)

Turkey's Accession to the EU



Bush Says Democracy Will Bring Justice, Freedom, Prosperity - June 29, Remarks By the President in Istanbul, Turkey

"Now Turkey has assumed even greater historical importance, because of your character as a nation. Turkey is a strong, secular democracy, a majority Muslim society, and a close ally of free nations. Your country, with 150 years of democratic and social reform, stands as a model to others, and as Europe's bridge to the wider world. Your success is vital to a future of progress and peace in Europe and in the broader Middle East -- and the Republic of Turkey can depend on the support and friendship of the United States.

For decades, my country has supported greater unity in Europe -- to secure liberty, build prosperity, and remove sources of conflict on this continent.

Now the European Union is considering the admission of Turkey, and you are moving rapidly to meet the criteria for membership. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk had a vision of Turkey as a strong nation among other European nations. That dream can be realized by this generation of Turks.

America believes that as a European power, Turkey belongs in the European Union. Your membership would also be a crucial advance in relations between the Muslim world and the West, because you are part of both. Including Turkey in the EU would prove that Europe is not the exclusive club of a single religion, and it would expose the "clash of civilizations" as a passing myth of history. Fifteen years ago, an artificial line that divided Europe -- drawn at Yalta -- was erased. Now this continent has the opportunity to erase another artificial division -- by fully including Turkey in the future of Europe." [more](#) | [read more on this issue on the website of the U.S. Mission to the EU](#)

The War in Iraq



NATO and the Transatlantic Relation - Remarks by R. Nicholas Burns, U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO, *Forum Bundeswehr and Gessellschaft 2004 Berlin, Germany*

"Let me offer three reasons why Transatlantic cooperation may be stronger and more resilient than the critics will allow:

First, the Transatlantic debate over the Iraq war, while noisy and animated these last two years, is not a unique event in the post-World War II history of the our Alliance. Remember Suez, the Skybolt Affair, Vietnam, the deployment of Pershing missiles in the '80s, and our big disagreements over Bosnia a decade ago, all were touted as evidence in years past that NATO was on the verge of a break up. It didn't happen then and it will not now. Since NATO's inception, the transatlantic relationship has been characterized by ups and downs. We are, after all, not the Warsaw Pact requiring a rigid orthodoxy of thought, but an alliance of democracies with the right to independent and critical thought. At each of these crisis points, NATO unity has bent but not broken, and we have emerged stronger for the challenges ahead. I predict the same renewed unity in 2005, as we all agree to put the Iraq debate to rest and focus instead on supporting the first democratic elections in that country's memory." [read Ambassador Burns' full speech](#) | [more on the Iraq crisis and U.S.-EU co-operation on the website of the U.S. Mission to the EU](#)

Non-Proliferation - Iran's Nuclear Threat



U.S. Envoy on 21st Century Russian-European-American Relations - April 2, St. Petersburg: speech by Amb. Alexander Vershbow

"First, there is no challenge more urgent than stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). At last summer's U.S.-EU summit in Washington, the United States and the European Union announced new ways of cooperating on this vital issue, including tightening export controls, strengthening the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its inspection regime, and improving national controls over dangerous pathogens and chemical weapons. This renewed commitment has already seen some progress in dealing with countries such as Libya and Iran, although I would note, particularly in reference to the latter, that any progress remains precarious at best." [more](#) | [follow all the latest developments concerning U.S.-EU initiatives to contain the Iran nuclear threat on the website of the U.S. Mission to the EU](#) | [more on non-proliferation on the same site](#)

The Middle East



U.S., U.K. Call for Renewed Efforts to Resolve Arab-Israeli Conflict - November 12, 2004. Joint Statement between the United States of America and

the United Kingdom concerning the Middle East Peace process

The United States and the United Kingdom share a vision of freedom, peace, and democracy for the Broader Middle East. That vision must include a just and peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, based on two democratic states -- Israel and Palestine -- living side by side in peace and security. Now is the time to seize the opportunity of new circumstances in the region to redouble our efforts to achieve this goal. This will require a series of steps which we look forward to taking with our international partners and the parties.

First, we re-commit to the overarching two-state vision set out by President Bush in his statement of June 24, 2002 and repeated in the Roadmap.

Second, we will support the Palestinians as they choose a new President within the next sixty days and as they embark upon an electoral process that will lead to lasting democratic institutions.

Third, following that, the President and the Prime Minister have agreed to mobilize international support behind a plan to ensure that the Palestinians have the political, economic, and security infrastructure they need to create a viable state. There will be no lasting solution without a Palestinian state that is democratic and free, including free press, free speech, an open political process, and religious tolerance. Such a state will need a credible and unified security structure capable of providing security for the Palestinians and fighting terrorism. There must also be effective economic development and transparent financial structures which provide for the economic and social needs of the Palestinian people. The plan will be developed intensively over the coming period of time in concert with all the relevant partners.

Fourth, we endorse and support the disengagement plan of Prime Minister Sharon from Gaza and stipulated parts of the West Bank as part of this overall plan.

Fifth, these steps lay the basis for more rapid progress on the Roadmap as a reliable guide leading to final status negotiations. [read all about the common U.S.-EU initiatives to achieve lasting peace in the Middle East on the website of the U.S. Mission to the EU](#)

Transatlantic Trade



Trade Negotiations "Back on Track" after Cancun Detour, USTR says - August 1, 2004, Statement of Robert B. Zoellick, United States Trade Representative at the Conclusion of WTO, General Council Meeting, Geneva, Switzerland.

World Trade Organization (WTO) talks advanced July 31 with agreements that will lead to more open markets for agriculture, goods and services, according to U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick.

World Trade Organization (WTO) talks advanced July 31 with agreements that will lead to more open markets for agriculture, goods and services, according to U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick.

After lengthy and extended sessions in Geneva, the talks ended with "a crucial step for global trade," Zoellick said, in the form of agreements that will provide greater structure and direction to the ongoing talks.

"We have agreed to make historic reforms in global agriculture trade. We have laid out a course to open markets for manufactured goods," said Zoellick in a statement released from Geneva. "We've agreed to intensify negotiations to open services markets, which now account for more than half of the economies of most countries, developed and developing."

One of the highlights of the agreement reached by the 147-member WTO is a pledge to abolish all forms of agriculture subsidies by a future date, still to be negotiated. This has been a longstanding sticking point in global trade talks, as developing world farmers have complained that the competitiveness of their products is impaired in the global marketplace by subsidies offered to developed world growers by their governments.

Another highlight noted by Zoellick are provisions to reform customs procedures as goods move across international borders in order to reduce customs costs and streamline the process. [more](#) | [follow all latest developments in our dossier on trade and the WTO](#)

> Facts and Figures

Did you know that...

... the US and the EU are global partners which together account for about 40% of world GDP and over 33% of global trade.

... transatlantic commercial ties are the largest in the world, with total commerce in 2000 amounting to roughly \$2.5 trillion.

... European companies are the number one international investors in 44 of the 50 US states. Europe is the #1 or #2 export market for 46 states. [more](#)

2003 was a record year for transatlantic trade flows. Total transatlantic trade in goods grew by 7% to \$391 billion in 2003.

U.S. exports, supported by the weaker U.S. dollar, recovered from the two-year downturn in trade with Europe and grew by 4.8% to \$150.6 billion in 2003.

U.S. imports from Europe jumped 8.5% to a record \$245 billion in 2003 despite a 20% appreciation of the euro against the dollar. America's trade deficit with the EU widened by 15% to a record \$94.3 billion in 2003. Surging imports from Europe produced record U.S. trade deficits with Germany, Italy, Ireland, France and the Netherlands. Surging U.S. demand for European products in 2003 offset the dampening trade impact of weak European economic growth and a surging euro.

Roughly 57% of total U.S. imports from Europe is considered related party trade, which means more than half of U.S. imports from Europe are affected less by exchange rates than by U.S. demand. 67% of U.S. imports from Germany, 59% of U.S. imports from the Netherlands and 54% of U.S. imports from the United Kingdom are considered related party trade.

The U.S. current account deficit with Europe in 2003 reached an estimated \$94 billion, up 9% from 2002.

Source: Partners in Prosperity: The Changing Geography of the Transatlantic Economy - executive summary by Dan Hamilton and Joseph Quinlan, *Center for Transatlantic Relations*, April 2004, pp. xi-xvii. [more](#)

Imports, Exports and Trade Balance with European Union (25). U.S. Census Bureau, *Foreign Trade Statistics*. [U.S.-EU Trade Balance](#).

U.S. cooperation with the EU is based on the [Transatlantic Declaration of 1990](#) and the [New Transatlantic Agenda](#) (NTA), adopted in 1995. This cooperation, which has been gradually deepened and broadened, takes place on several levels and includes summit meetings at the level of heads of state and government between the U.S., the European Commission and the country holding the [EU Presidency](#).

Transatlantic cooperation builds on the strong community of interests between the US and EU member states. In addition, the flow of transatlantic trade and investments is the largest in the world and amounts to a value of up to a billion U.S. dollars every day. The EU and the U.S. together account for about 37% of the value of global trade in goods and about 45% of world trade in services. **Source:** [website of the U.S. mission to the EU - Transatlantic Relations](#)

Underneath we have listed a non-exhaustive list of documents describing the fields of co-operation between the United States of America and the European Union:

[Trans-Atlantic Business Dialogue continues efforts to promote EU-US economic ties](#)

[GALILEO and GPS will navigate side by side: EU and US sign final agreement](#)

[EU-US Declaration on HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis](#)

[EU-US Declaration of support for the people of Iraq](#)

[EU-US Declaration supporting peace, progress and reform in the broader Middle East and in the Mediterranean](#)

[EU-US Declaration on Sudan](#)

[EU-US Declaration on combating terrorism](#)

[EU-US Declaration on the Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction](#)

Source: [Website of the European Commission - EU relations with the United States of America](#) | [the website of the Delegation of the European Commission to the United States](#)

> In the Media

In addition to the official U.S. standpoint on several issues challenging the transatlantic alliance over the coming years, we have selected articles mostly from leading U.S. magazines and think tanks, highlighting the same issues. Our scope is to provide varied third party insights into these policy matters.

Homeland Security - War against Terrorism

Lebl, Leslie. THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE UNITED STATES: COMBATING TERRORISM. ACES Cases - 2004.2, August 31, 2004, pp. 1-34.

"During the years since September 2001, the United States and the European Union have signed agreements previously thought unachievable, and have worked together much more closely than ever before. In fact, the breadth of the cooperation in itself contributes to the difficulty of any review and analysis. Since September 11, there have been numerous transatlantic initiatives: to develop law enforcement cooperation; to extend the freezing of terrorist assets; to develop more secure procedures for container shipping, air passenger travel and issuance of travel documents; to improve export control systems and other non-proliferation measures; and to coordinate foreign policy, especially toward the Greater Middle East. The bilateral cooperation thus included both foreign and domestic policy officials from numerous agencies on both sides of the Atlantic. However, the number of agreements signed and meetings attended does not in itself define the quality or success of the cooperation. The substance of the agreements is important, as is the degree to which they have been implemented. Further, at the outset it was not clear whether any new U.S.-EU cooperation would come at the expense of bilateral cooperation between the United States and EU member states at the national level, or whether it would indeed provide its own "value added."
[more](#)

Values

Anderson, Brian C. SECULAR EUROPE, RELIGIOUS AMERICA. Public Interest, Spring 2004, pp. 143-158.

America and Europe, or at least the nations of "old" western Europe, have been increasingly at odds since the end of the Cold War. (...) One should not overstate the importance of these tensions within the democratic world. Nobody is predicting that Belgium and the United States will be firing missiles at each other any time soon, or ever. But as Robert Kagan has observed, it sometimes seems nowadays as if Americans and Europeans live on different planets. There are a variety of explanations for the widening rift, among them the end of the Cold War, which has deprived the Western democracies of a powerful common enemy against which to unify; contrasting views of the roles of national sovereignty

and of international institutions; use of the death penalty in the United States; and anger over the Bush administration's decision to use military force to prosecute the global struggle against Islamist terror. One of the most significant sources of tension and lack of mutual understanding between America and Europe, however, is religion-or better, America's religiosity and Europe's lack of it, argues the author of this article. [more](#)

Evolution of NATO

Cimbalo, Jeffrey L. SAVING NATO FROM EUROPE. Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec 2004, pp. 111-121.

Long the bulwark of the transatlantic security relationship, NATO now faces a threat from within Europe itself. The proposed EU constitution makes clear that the new Europe seeks to balance rather than complement U.S. power-making European political integration the greatest challenge to U.S. influence in Europe since World War II. Washington must begin to adapt accordingly. [more](#)

Turkey's Accession to the EU

Abramowitz, Morton I., Bandler, Donald K., Burt, Richard R., Burwell, Frances G., Drozdiak, William, Melby, Eric. TURKEY ON THE THRESHOLD: EUROPE'S DECISION AND U.S. INTERESTS. The Atlantic Council of the United States - Policy Paper, August 2004, pp. 1-36.

In December 2004, the European Union will decide whether or not to begin accession negotiations with Turkey. Whatever the outcome, the implications for U.S.-Turkish relations and U.S.-EU relations — indeed, for transatlantic relations generally — will be significant. The challenges for U.S. policy both before and after the EU decision are correspondingly important. To explore the likely course of Turkish-EU-U.S. relations, and how best U.S. foreign policy might play a constructive role, the Atlantic Council sent a delegation of U.S. leaders and experts to Europe in March 2004. The delegation met with key government and private sector policy makers in Brussels, Berlin, Ankara, Istanbul and Athens for discussions about prospects for the December 2004 decision and its aftermath. This policy paper contains the group's conclusions and recommendations for keeping both transatlantic and U.S.-Turkish relations on a constructive course. [more](#)

The War in Iraq

Asmus, R., Bertram, C., Bildt, C., Brimmer, E., Dassu, M., de Wijk, R., Dobbins, J., Drozdiak, W., Gnesotto, N., Gordon, P.H., Grant, C., Gustenau, G., Hassner, P., Hulsman, J., Lejins, A., McArdle Kelleher, C., Moravcsik, A., Onyszkiewicz, J., Sedivy, J., Serra, N. and Vasconcelos, A. - Edited by G. Lindstrom and B. Schmitt. ONE YEAR ON: LESSONS FROM IRAQ. Chaillot Paper 68, International Security Studies, March 2004, pp. 1-203.

This Chaillot Paper takes stock of the consequences of the Iraqi war one year after the initiation of the military campaign in March 2003. Rather than provide a definitive or conclusive verdict on the implications of the war, its objective is to offer a number of viewpoints concerning developments in its aftermath. Given the divergences that the war created, not only between the United States and Europe but also within the EU, the editors invited a wide spectrum of authors to participate in this project in order to get as representative a picture as possible. To do so, twenty-one authors from Europe and the United States were asked to respond to five questions covering different aspects of international relations. Respondents were asked to give their views on the consequences of the war in Iraq on: the fight on terrorism; the Greater Middle East; the European Union's role as a global actor; transatlantic relations; the international system. [more](#)

Iran's Nuclear Threat

Einhorn, Robert J. A TRANSATLANTIC STRATEGY ON IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM. The Washington Quarterly, Autumn 2004, pp. 21-32.

The Iran nuclear issue poses two critical tests for the United States and Europe. The first is whether, after the deep divisions over Iraq, Americans and Europeans can work together effectively on an issue of major importance to each other as well as the world at large. The second is whether dissuading a resourceful, determined country from acquiring nuclear weapons is possible through means short of military force. The two tests are, of course, closely related. The bitter dispute that arose across the Atlantic over Iraq revolved to a large extent around how best to ensure the disarmament of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), whether by eliminating Saddam Hussein's regime through force or by relying on vigorous international inspections. So far at least, differences on Iran are not nearly as pronounced as they were on Iraq. No one seems to be giving serious consideration to the military option, and all have relied heavily on multilateral institutions, particularly the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Still, differences have emerged, and unless the United States and Europe close the gaps and forge a common strategy, prospects for satisfactorily resolving the Iran issue will be dim. [more](#)

The Middle East

Drozdiak, William; Kemp, Geoffrey; Leverett, Flynt L.; Makins, Christopher J. and Stokes, Bruce. PARTNERS IN FRUSTRATION: EUROPE, THE UNITED STATES AND THE BROADER MIDDLE EAST. The Atlantic Council of the United States - Program on Transatlantic Relations - Policy Paper, September 2004, pp. 1-48.

Since the end of the Cold War, events in the broader Middle East have increasingly

become the principal determinants of the state of the transatlantic relationship. But even though the strategic center of gravity for the transatlantic allies has shifted to the Middle East region, the challenges the allies face there have not yet galvanized the kind of strategic dialogue and common response that the threat from Soviet communism forged in earlier decades. And during 2002 and 2003, the U.S.-led campaign in Iraq caused the most serious transatlantic rift for many years, if not in the entire post-World War II period. [more](#)

Everts, Steven. THE ULTIMATE TEST CASE: CAN EUROPE AND AMERICA FORGE A JOINT STRATEGY FOR THE WIDER MIDDLE EAST? *International Affairs*, July 2004, pp. 665-686.

The argument of this article is that, notwithstanding existing challenges, a robust yet innovative strategy for the wider Middle East is both possible and necessary. To achieve that outcome, the US and the EU will need to take risks, make concessions, rethink existing approaches, confront domestic constituencies and commit significant resources. Even then success is uncertain. Lasting achievements in foreign policy are often elusive, and especially so in the Middle East. But the risks and the opportunities thrown up by the wider Middle East cry out for a US-European strategy which is comprehensive and jointly agreed but also flexible enough to allow for autonomy and complementarities. [more](#)

Perthes, Völker. AMERICA'S "GREATER MIDDLE EAST" AND EUROPE: KEY ISSUES FOR DIALOGUE. *Middle East Policy*, Fall 2004, pp. 85-98.

Perthes argues that a high capacity for coordination and even for fruitful cooperation exists. Key US and European players differ over a number of primary political assumptions about the region. This concerns, among other things, the relevance of the Arab-Israeli conflict and peace process for change in the wider region, domestic political developments in Iran and the value of comprehensively multilateral engagements with the state of the region. [more](#)

Transatlantic Trade

Kogan, Lawrence A. EXPORTING EUROPE'S PROTECTIONISM. *The National Interest*, Fall 2004, pp. 91-99.

"The basic rules of international trade are simple. The United States and the European Union, the two major trading blocs, have each sought to curb serious health and environmental risks before they cause substantial harm. Both have promoted industrial policies to enhance the competitiveness of their industries and the global economy along with them. The institutional framework of the GATT and the WTO that evolved alongside

the United Nations Charter has kept these competing aims in reasonable balance. It has also reflected the main global priorities of later eras: preserving peace and stability through international commerce and the rule of law. [...] Embedded within this balanced framework is a pragmatic acknowledgement among WTO members that a certain amount of risk is unavoidable in everyday life and that international trade and global stability are good things in themselves. During the past decade, however, the European Union, with assistance from "international civil society" (a euphemism for non-governmental pressure groups), has sought to alter this equilibrium by enacting regional regulations and promoting process-based industry standards that both depart from this practice and have an extraterritorial impact. These proposals reflect what the EU sees as a more pressing global priority than freer trade—namely, achieving sustainable development." [more](#)

> Behind the Scenes



TRANSATLANTIC TRENDS 2004

is a comprehensive survey of American and European public opinion. Polling was conducted in the United States, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and, for the first time, Slovakia, Spain, and Turkey. The survey is a project of the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Compagnia di San Paolo, with additional support from the Luso-American Foundation, Fundacion BBVA, and the Institute for Public Affairs (IVO).

After the intense debates and disagreements of the past three years, the transatlantic community is divided. While Americans and Europeans have similar threat perceptions, they differ markedly on how best to deal with these threats and under what aegis. One result of this division is that many Europeans, while wanting to cooperate with the United States, also want to play a more independent role in the world. By contrast, Americans seek a closer partnership with a strong European Union even if it would not always agree with U.S. perceptions or prescriptions. However, as in past years, Europeans are ambivalent about what kind of global role they should play and at what cost. [more](#)

NATO and the European Union. Kristin Archick, and Paul Gallis, Specialist in European Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division. Congressional Research Service. April 6, 2004.

Since the end of the Cold War, both NATO and the European Union (EU) have evolved along with Europe's changed

strategic landscape. While NATO's collective defense guarantee remains at the core of the alliance, members have also sought to redefine its mission as new security challenges have emerged on Europe's periphery and beyond. At the same time, EU members have taken steps toward political integration with decisions to develop a common foreign policy and a defense arm to improve EU member states' abilities to manage security crises, such as those that engulfed the Balkans in the 1990s.

The evolution of NATO and the EU, however, has generated some friction between the United States and several of its allies over the security responsibilities of the two organizations. U.S.-European differences center around threat assessment, defense institutions, and military capabilities. Successive U.S. administrations and the U.S. Congress have called for enhanced European defense capabilities to enable the allies to better share the security burden, and to ensure that NATO's post-Cold War mission embraces combating terrorism and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. U.S. policymakers, backed by Congress, support EU efforts to develop a European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) provided that it remains tied to NATO and does not threaten the transatlantic relationship.

Most EU member states support close NATO-EU links, but also view ESDP as a means to give themselves more options for dealing with future crises, especially in cases in which the United States may be reluctant to become involved. A minority of EU countries, spearheaded by France, continue to favor a more autonomous EU defense identity. This desire has been fueled further recently by disputes with the United States over how or whether to engage international institutions, such as the United Nations, on security matters and over the weight given to political versus military instruments in resolving international crises.

This report addresses several questions central to the debate over European security and the future of the broader transatlantic relationship. These include: What are the specific security missions of NATO and the European Union, and what is the appropriate relationship between the two organizations? What types of military forces are necessary for NATO's role in collective defense, and for the EU's role in crisis management? Are NATO and EU decision-making structures and procedures appropriate and compatible to ensure that there is an adequate and timely response to emerging threats? What is the proper balance between political and military tools for defending Europe and the United States from terrorism and weapons proliferation? [more](#)