

ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP

NEWSLETTER



June 2003

Issue No.7

www.atlanticpartnership.com

Editorial

Whatever your view of the war against Iraq one thing is certain – the war has divided Europe and imposed unprecedented strains on the relationship between America and Europe. For nearly 60 years the Atlantic partnership has been a force for good, not just for Europe and North America, but on the world as a whole. Is it now beyond repair or can it be restored?

This was the question which was addressed by leading Americans and Europeans at Atlantic Partnership's 'Healing the Rift' conference in London on the 19th May. The meeting was widely reported in the media.

Despite a range of differences of opinion, it was generally agreed that Europe and North America do retain a fundamental common outlook. And if they work together more progress can be made in tackling the world's problems than if they see each global flashpoint as an opportunity to seek advantage at the expense of the other.

In a new, more unstable, century, the relationship between Europe and America is not less, but more important than ever. Arguments, like the one over Iraq, should not sound the death knell of the relationship, but must be managed in such a way as to inflict the minimum of harm on the partnership. Every effort must be made to heal the wounds and learn the lessons so that future disagreements, which will undoubtedly arise, do less damage. There is too much at stake to allow the Atlantic partnership to flounder.

MICHAEL HOWARD

The Rt Hon Michael Howard QC MP is Chairman of Atlantic Partnership

Atlantic Partnership this Spring

Meyer Breakfast - London

We were grateful to Sir Christopher Meyer for speaking at an unusually large gathering during the first week of the Iraq war. The event marked his first public engagement in London after returning from six years as Ambassador to Washington. His insight on the relationship between Prime Minister Blair and President George W Bush, and the background to both their thinking on Iraq was fascinating. At the breakfast we were delighted to welcome the Chief of the General Staff, General Sir Mike Jackson, and former Chief of the Defence Staff, Lord Guthrie as well as the American and Spanish Ambassadors and the Canadian High Commissioner.

Felix Rohatyn & Alain Juppe in Paris

In Paris, the former American Ambassador to France, Felix Rohaytn spoke at a breakfast on the 15th May to a group of leading politicians, businessmen, and journalists. Our patron, former Prime Minister, Alain Juppe replied on behalf of the French and an extremely interesting debate followed on the strained relationship between France and America.

‘Healing the Rift’ Conference

An Atlantic Partnership ‘Healing the Rift’ conference was held in London on the 19th May, bringing together leading Europeans and Americans to discuss the damage to the transatlantic relationship since Iraq. Notes from the meeting are included below. The discussions were extremely constructive and far ranging, and were widely covered by media especially by BBC’s *Today Programme* and *Newsnight*.

Atlantic Partnership are holding a follow up ‘Healing the Rift’ conference in Washington on the 15th July.

Forthcoming Events

In June, Atlantic Partnership will be hosting its first breakfast in Frankfurt alongside the American Chamber of Commerce when Michael Howard will speak alongside our German Patron, Karsten Voigt and the Prime Minister of Hesse, Roland Koch.

In London we will welcome the leader of the CDU/CSU party in the Bundestag, Dr Angela Merkel to an Atlantic Partnership breakfast meeting and at the end of June the Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP.

At the beginning of September the new SACEUR, General Jones will launch our Autumn series of breakfasts in London and the Rt Hon John Major CH will speak at an Atlantic Partnership breakfast in New York in late September.

Atlantic Partnership Opinion

We dedicate most of the opinion section of this Newsletter to what was discussed at the Atlantic Partnership Conference in London. Also included are articles as follows:

- Michael Howard, Atlantic Partnership Chairman, is interviewed by Alice Thomson for the Dail Telegraph.
- Josef Joffe, panellist and editor of the German weekly **Die Zeit** looks at the effect of the Iraq war on transatlantic relationships; and,
- Lord Howell, panellist, writes on the post war outcome.
- Michael Howard, writes in Die Welt about the 'partnership in peril'.

If you wish to research more articles, Atlantic Partnership's website contains links to all the articles written by panellists, chairmen and patrons. It also contains copies of past newsletters as well as relevant articles and speeches on the subject of transatlantic relations. In the last four months we have had 52,000 hits.

ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP CONFERENCE: 19TH MAY 2003. **HEALING THE RIFT.**

This conference was held at held at the Mandarin Oriental Hotel in Knightsbridge, London. The participants included:

The Rt Hon Donald Anderson, MP (UK): Chairman of the Commons Foreign Affairs Select Committee.

HE Ambassador R.. Nicholas Burns (USA): American Ambassador to NATO.

Laurent Cohen-Tanugi (France): Political writer and Partner with Clearly, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton.

Professor Lawrence Freedman (UK): Head of the School of Social Science and Public Policy, at King's College, London.

Ambassador Richard Haass (USA): Director, Policy Planning Staff, State Department.

The Rt Hon Michael Howard QC MP (UK): The Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Field Marshal Lord Inge (UK): The former Chief of Defence Staff.

Thomas Kielinger (Germany): The London correspondent of *Die Welt*.

Professor Dr Margarita Mathiopoulos (Germany): CEO, European Advisory Group of GMBH.

The Rt Hon Lord Owen (UK): The former British Foreign Secretary.

Guillaume Parmentier (France): Director of the French Centre on the United States (CFE) at the *Institut Francais des Relations Internationales* (IFRI).

Lord Powell of Bayswater (UK): The former Foreign Affairs Private Secretary to Baroness Thatcher and John Major.

The Rt Hon Dr John Reid MP (UK): Leader of the House of Commons.

Sir Evelyn de Rothschild (UK): Chairman, N. M. Rothschild & Sons Ltd.

M. Eduardo Serra (Spain): The former Spanish Defence Minister and President of the Elcano Royal Institute.

This note summarises points made by the main speakers at the Conference. They are abbreviated notes, which we hope will convey the main gist of what was said.

2 **KEYNOTE SPEECHES**

Ambassador Richard Haas

US/European differences are not just a speed bump but real and substantial. The situation will not right itself automatically: indeed he was not overly sanguine that the rift could be healed. Iraq was not the fundamental cause of it though it exacerbated underlying problems. These stem both from old arguments over issues like burden-sharing and differences over how to handle new transnational challenges like terrorism and WMD.

There is no doubt that the US needs partners. ‘There is no challenge which we can meet better on our own than in the company of others’. Only the Europeans have the necessary capabilities and attitudes to be partners. There have been some notable successes for US/European cooperation: the war on terror, Afghanistan and so on. But Europe needs to adjust to a new era in which it is no longer the geopolitical centre of the post-Cold War, post 9/11 world. The focus has moved outside Europe. Moreover it is increasingly hard to generalise about Europe. The US will not always want to work with the whole of Europe but with different groups and coalitions.

Against this background he put forward various prescriptions:

- (i) there should be better transatlantic consultation in both directions;
- (ii) Europe should not set itself the goal of being a counter-weight to the US. It would be better to follow the British model of relations with the US;
- (iii) of course it is legitimate for Europe to disagree with the US, but not to work actively against it;
- (iv) Europe must enhance its military capabilities. Dialogue will not always be the answer to conflict situations: sometimes force would be necessary;
- (v) reconstruction of Iraq offers an opportunity for rebuilding the US/European relationship. Europe should not contest the proposed UN resolution and should also agree to a peace-keeping role for NATO in Iraq;
- (vi) there needs to be more profound transatlantic consultation on what to do about Syria, Iran, North Korea and the whole issue of proliferation; and also a dialogue on when it’s justified to use force.

Finally he accepted the criticism that the US sometimes pushes too hard to win hundred per cent acceptance of its views when it would be wiser to settle for less and invest more in wider relationships.

Dr John Reid MP

Europe and the US have long-term interests in common which outweigh current differences. American hard power and European soft power can usefully complement each other eg. in Iraq. The UK will never agree to any arrangements in Europe designed to rival the US. There is no compulsion on the UK to make a strategic choice between Europe and the US, though on individual policy issues we shall opt for one or the other as suits our interests.

22

PROSPECTS FOR TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS

Eduardo Serra

International institutions are the victims of differences over Iraq: the UN Security Council has been marginalised by inability to enforce its resolutions: NATO was paralysed and unable to help Turkey: and the EU is hopelessly divided. But it is not Europe as a whole which is at loggerheads with the US only some European governments. It is fundamentally wrong for European allies to work actively against the US. Europe is less important strategically since the end of the Cold War made it into a zone of peace. Moreover it is falling behind the US not just in defence spending but in technology, economic growth and social cohesion. There is little chance of Europe increasing its defence spending. The sensible course is for Europe to cooperate with the US while acting as a moderating influence on American views and policies. To adapt Robert Kagan's analogy "Mars and Venus should fall in love".

Thomas Kielinger

Europe is long on declarations but short on delivery. It has failed to put beef on the bones of the common foreign policy. Germany and France made a strategic mistake in pursuing a grandstanding policy over Iraq. Just as power corrupts so does impotence.

Guillaume Parmentier

We fail to realise in Europe what a deeply changed country the US is, not just as a result of 9/11 but also changes in society resulting from immigration and an altered regional balance within the US itself. It's not the US we used to know. Moreover, when a country is so powerful, it is difficult for it to listen to others. The US should bear in mind that its foreign policy is strongest when it combines ability to coerce with ability to convince.

One has to be realistic: countries adopt unilateralism and multilateralism as suits them. In practice the UK's policy of closeness with the US has not given it much influence over American policy. But equally there is a conflict at the heart of French policy between the desire - stemming from the Suez experience - not to be dependent on alliances and the aim of creating a common European foreign policy. There are signs that France has learned lessons from its recent differences with the US. There is a bargain to be struck between France and Britain if both act with traditional pragmatism which could give Europe real influence with the US.

David Owen

A true Alliance is based on underlying friendship which leads you to back your ally even when you think they are wrong, and to support them in time of difficulty.

European defence poses a threat to the Alliance if pursued in the wrong way. Berlin Plus is fine but the Brussels meeting of France/Germany/Belgium/Luxembourg and the proposal to establish a joint military HQ separate from NATO was a step in the wrong direction. The proposals on foreign policy and defence now being discussed in Europe's Constitutional Convention are deeply unsatisfactory and must be opposed by the UK. Europe should stick to the Pillar Structure. The best immediate contribution to restoring Alliance unity is to work on Germany whose strategic intuition to be close to the US will reassert itself.

222 **NATO AND EUROPEAN DEFENCE**

Charles Powell (in the chair)

Suggests discussion on NATO and on European defence should examine whether NATO can remain the core institution of the transatlantic relationship; whether it should do more out of area; and the real US attitude to NATO. Can it be the institution where the US and Europe rebuild their relations? Also how much of an irritant to the US is ESDP? Is it positive so long as it is firmly linked to NATO rather than going the route mapped by France/Germany/Belgium/Luxembourg?

Ambassador Nicholas Burns

Europe is a vital partner to the US: even though the US is uniquely powerful we cannot go it alone. The US wants ESDP to succeed and Europe to take on more responsibilities, provided it is firmly rooted in NATO.

A key question in transatlantic relations is how France will act now. There are some promising signs: its willingness to agree to NATO peace-keepers in Afghanistan and possibly in Iraq. There is also good cooperation against terrorism, especially over intelligence.

Europe needs to recognise that President Bush sees NATO differently from earlier Presidents. 'Old' NATO is no longer relevant with the passing of the Soviet threat. 'New' NATO needs to pivot towards an external focus and operate out of area. ESDP within NATO could be a good basis for the future transatlantic security relations, but not if it goes the way proposed at the Gang of Four meeting in Brussels with a separate European military headquarters: that is contrary to Berlin Plus.

Margarita Mathiopoulos

Europe's performance over Iraq was its worst on security issues since 1945. The result was a loss of influence for Europe. The present German government has done what the Soviet Union never achieved which is to detach Germany from the US.

Laurent Cohen-Tanugi

Agrees that the present crisis in Atlantic relations goes beyond all previous crises. We need to build a brand of euro-atlanticism which preserves American support for

European integration. This will require a new strategic doctrine to deal with the post 9/11 world, and new transatlantic institutions going beyond NATO.

Peter Inge

There are no quick fixes to the present crisis. NATO has proved its value in the past and can do so in the future despite its enlarged membership and changing role. It has a particularly valuable role in relation to Russia which is being overlooked in the present discussion. NATO should be involved in Iraq provided the US itself also stays involved and does not just dump the peace-keeping task in NATO's lap.

Europe should do more in defence but is failing to face up to the challenge because it has not itself suffered the 9/11 calamity. The gap in military capabilities between the US and Europe is alarming and makes effective military cooperation increasingly difficult. The Rapid Reaction Force ought ideally to be within NATO, but if for political reasons it has to have a separate European identity, it must be closely integrated with NATO and not have separate headquarters.

M. Gompertz (French Embassy)

France wants a strong NATO and, if the necessary conditions are fulfilled by a new UN resolution, can envisage a role for NATO in Iraq. France also wants to strengthen the European component of NATO, but always within the framework of the Alliance. France is playing an active part in the fight against terrorism.

2V THE MIDDLE EAST

Charles Powell (in the chair)

Suggests that discussion on the Middle East should examine whether the peace process is an area where Europe and the US can rebuild their cooperation, using the Quartet as a model mechanism. It should also consider the implications for *ancient regimes* in the Gulf of spreading democracy.

Evelyn de Rothschild

The Middle East is not just an American problem: Europe must contribute. The US is right to side-line Arafat

Donald Anderson

Talk of 'punishment' in euro-atlantic relations is counter productive.

Achieving peace between Israel and the Palestinians is a positive area for healing the transatlantic rift. Europe has a special role to play in bringing along the Palestinians. Americans need to understand the political context in Europe of many millions of Muslim citizens and residents and their effect on parliamentary and public attitudes.

Lawrence Freedman

Israel-Palestine will be a critical test for Blair. The real task is to convince Sharon that he is undermining the war on terror by giving Hamas a veto over the Middle East peace process.

The situation in Syria is intriguing: it is a state of shock as a result of the Iraq war and subsequent American pressure.

Ambassador Richard Haas

It is vital to get a further UN resolution on Iraq's reconstruction soon: the welcome mat may not be out for long in Iraq itself. The US is going to have to prepare for a long stay and dig deep to root out the old regime.

Europe seems to think it's enough to hold out carrots to regimes like Syria, Iran and Libya to get them to change their ways. But it's just as necessary to point out the harsh consequences if they don't.

There needs to be a wide long-term agenda for the Middle East to help the area modernise and benefit from globalisation. It includes help with political development – though realistically not immediate transition to full elections – building civil society, encouraging an independent media and the rule of law, as well as preparing for WTO membership. It is particularly important to discourage the flow of funds from Saudi Arabia and others to radical mosques and educational institutions which promote extreme views.

V CONCLUSIONS

Charles Powell

Impossible to summarise adequately a rich discussion. European-Atlantic Partnership has brought us unprecedented security, stability and prosperity and must be preserved. The present difficulties across the Atlantic are not a 'normal' crisis but more profound. We must find a better way for Europe and the US to work together and minimise future problems. There are successes in partnership which we can build on – Kosovo, Afghanistan, Macedonia, Cyprus, NATO enlargement. The first requirement is for much better consultation in both directions before decisions are made and positions finalised, restoring the transatlantic intimacy which characterised 'old' NATO. Europe needs to respond more actively to new challenges outside Europe rather than become bogged down exclusively in institution-building. Its goal in moving towards greater unity should be partnership with the US rather than building a counter-weight or countervailing power. NATO's role as the central institution of transatlantic partnership should be restored and NATO be prepared to take on new challenges outside Europe including in Iraq. While Europe needs to strengthen its defence capabilities, it should do so firmly within the NATO framework rather than develop separate military headquarters. Europe can also exploit its soft power to make a major contribution to rehabilitation and reconstruction in Iraq and elsewhere: there is a complementarity between America's military power and Europe's soft power. Europe and the US need to work together to adapt international institutions to the new challenges of the 21st century. Finally there is scope for an early warning mechanism of impending problems, in the form of a standing commission of representatives from both sides of the Atlantic who would identify problems and head them off. This was not a complete summary but identified some broad areas of agreement.

Howard still has appetite for fight

(Filed: 09/04/2003)

Extracts from the Interview with Alice Thomson – The Daily Telegraph

[Michael Howard] He may have been born in Wales, but he loves America so much that he lists the New York Mets as a hobby in his Who's Who entry. His "Atlantic Partnership" has quickly become one of the most influential international think-tanks, with a formidable cast of characters. Its patrons include Dr Henry Kissinger, the Democrat Senator Joe Biden, John Major and the former French Prime Minister, Alain Juppe.

Every month, Mr Howard holds a breakfast. He has been quietly bringing together generals, Labour cabinet ministers, Republican and Democrat advisers, dozens of ambassadors and former foreign secretaries. Jack Straw, Geoff Hoon, Richard Perle and the former Chief of Defence, Charles Guthrie have all shared bacon and eggs at the Mandarin Oriental Hotel in Knightsbridge.

General Sir Michael Jackson, chief of the General Staff, even attended the events in the middle of the war. Tony Blair has sent a letter of support.

As chairman, Mr Howard flies to New York, Berlin and Paris trying to keep the cast together. The Germans prefer cheese and salami breakfasts, the French prefer a civilised dinner. Next month, he is holding a post-war conference in both America and Britain called: Healing The Rift.

Does Mr Howard think that the Prime Minister has done his best to keep Britain, Europe and America together? "I, personally, think that he's made too many concessions to Europe already, and I'm nervous he will make more."

THE WAR AGAINST SADDAM HAS ALREADY CLAIMED THREE PROMINENT VICTIMS Time Magazine, 03 Mar 03, by Josef Joffe *

* Josef Joffe is editor of the German weekly newspaper Die Zeit

Let's doff our hats to the most powerful man in the West: Saddam Hussein. Any war against him is still at least a few weeks off, yet it has already claimed three prominent victims: Europe, NATO and the U.S.-German relationship.

When French President Jacques Chirac and German Chancellor Gerhard Schroder, hoping to refurbish their creaking "axis," pledged to join forces against the American-led war effort, the other Europeans were not amused. Their counterthrust came in the form of two open letters, splashed across the front pages of Europe's newspapers, in which 18 countries agreed to stand together against Saddam--and at the side of the United States. It didn't help when Chirac, cane in hand, blasted the East Europeans among them for "misbehaving." For now, say goodbye to Europe's speaking "with one voice." And score that round 18 to 2 for the U.S. Franco-German revenge came swiftly. When the U.S. asked NATO to start planning for the defense of Turkey in case of an Iraqi attack, Berlin and Paris retaliated with a veto. Ever since, the alliance has been trying to repair the damage. Yet whatever the murky compromise may be, the message was deadly. The alliance is now ad hoc and a la carte. Out goes the "All for one, and one for all" rule at the very heart of NATO. The new motto is "Some for one, some of the time." History's longest-lived alliance deserves a grander death than to be done in by pique and spite.

What a sad twist U.S. and German relations have taken! Twinned by enduring mutual interest, the Federal Republic and the U.S. used to be the two cornerstones of the Atlantic alliance. Alas, no more. For reasons perhaps not fully fathomed by Schroder himself, the Chancellor moved from injury last summer, when he began to rail against U.S. "adventurism" and against war as an option, to insurrection this winter, when he threatened to vote against the U.S. in the U.N. Security Council. What began as a desperate ploy to save his sinking

electoral campaign (it worked) has now escalated into barely masked antagonism toward the U.S. Schroder seems like a man on a mission: to stop the war together with the French, Russians and Chinese.

He could have taken a cheaper way out by telling President Bush, "Look, we don't have the military manpower and the public support. You leave us alone, and we'll give you benevolent neutrality plus the use of our airspace and your bases in Germany." That would have earned him sour smiles in Washington, but not clenched teeth. Why this refusal to heed the insights of Diplomacy 101?

Perhaps the answer, echoed by millions of antiwar demonstrators across Europe, is as old as international politics itself. Perhaps Schroder, Chirac et al. have become too uncomfortable with Gulliver Unbound, with a giant whose strength is no longer stalemated by the Soviet Union. They may see America's power play, let alone its triumph, in the Middle East as a greater evil than Saddam and his weapons of Armageddon. If so, the name of the game is to put the ropes back on Gulliver--to constrain and contain him. Or: "Let's all gang up on Mr. Big."

The tone and language of American diplomacy have not helped. Compare Donald Rumsfeld with James Baker, Bush the Elder's Secretary of State. Twelve years back, after Saddam's Kuwait grab, Baker crisscrossed the world in a painstaking (and successful) effort to harness a global coalition against the despot. Yet Rumsfeld, who dismissed France and Germany as "old Europe," seems to operate under the motto "I would rather lose a good friend than a good phrase." Power does not substitute for persuasion, and obliviousness shading off into hauteur does not exactly increase the supply of the willing and able.

But what if the end of alliance is the deeper truth? Then the new game will be the old game of nations. No more privileged relationships, just ever-changing combinations as in the 18th and 19th centuries. History whispers that this was bound to happen once the balance of power tilted as drastically as it did when the Soviet Union collapsed, leaving the last remaining superpower to rule the roost. But for America's unprecedented might to endure, it will have to be softened by trust and acceptance. Will Bush & Co. muster so much wisdom?

Tomorrow's historians will know the answer. In the meantime, Saddam Hussein has scored three long-distance victories just by sitting tight. As the intra-Western war continues, his prediction may yet come true. "No doubt, time is working for us," Saddam told the Egyptian weekly al-Usbou in November. "We have to buy some more time, and the American-British coalition will disintegrate."

22nd March 2003

Article for the IHT – carried 3rd April 2003

By David Howell

(Former Secretary of State and Chairman of the Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, now Opposition Foreign Affairs spokesman in the Lords)

Ten Reasons for Thinking Positive about the War Outcome .

Now that the Iraq campaign is well under way expert analysts and policy makers have been tirelessly warning about the fearsome potential dangers to come.

This is right – we should be prepared for the worst. It is certainly possible that, however swift and successful the military operations, there will be million of mouths to feed, Iraq could slide into an internal blood bath or fall apart, the Kurds could slaughter their former oppressors in Kirkuk, the Turks could then smash down on the Kurds, fanaticism could further destabilize the Arab world , terrorism could be greatly encouraged and much else besides.

On a wider stage, goes this catalogue of gloom to come , oil supplies face disruption ,the Western Alliance could become more divided than ever, the EU split down the middle, the UN neutered, and anti-Americanism reach new heights of frenzy.

Some or all of this might happen. Of course there is no room for complacency as the Saddam regime finally crumbles.

Yet it is possible to overdo all the pessimism. There is a question of what could go right as well as what could go wrong. If only to balance the picture it seems worthwhile setting out the plus side of what could emerge from the present imbroglio, both in the region and on the world stage. So here are ten potential positive outcomes to set alongside all the negatives:

1. The major powers could grasp, even as they disagree and trade insults over the attack on Iraq, that with a whole string of tasks stretching years ahead to curb global terrorism and prevent unending nuclear proliferation, they have just got to find better ways of working together. The United States could come to see that, whatever the hype about overwhelming power, in practice Americans cannot go it alone in cleaning up an interdependent world and shouldn't try. The Russians may come to see that they need friends to keep their sprawling giant nation together. The new Government in Beijing may realize that they are going to need a combined effort, with Moscow, Washington and Tokyo if they are to deal successfully with the North Korean hornets' nest on their doorstep. Out of spectacular diplomatic failure a new and more realistic diplomacy could take shape.
2. European unity, which was running into the sand anyway before the Iraq crisis, could actually emerge in better balanced shape from the present split, once the wounds heal over. Obviously there can be no Europe without France, but it may now at last be equally obvious that a democratic Europe cannot be carried forward solely on French bureaucratic lines, or on the Franco-German agenda alone. The rest of the European Union, particularly the new entrants, must be allowed their full say.
3. NATO, which was already shaky, may now be given the real impetus to modernization and reform needed to bring it into the 21st century world of combined global and homeland threats to the lives of every citizen in the Atlantic community.
4. The UN, which has been putting off reform of its frozen 1945 pattern for years, may finally face up to the fact that its whole structure has got to change if it is going to continue carrying authority and respect as a world forum (not a world government).
5. Far from oil supplies being cut, a lot more oil may come on stream. In the longer term, oil market dependence will be reduced on Saudi-Arabia – which anyway hates being the 'swing producer'. More immediately, a sharply lower, but not a collapsed, world oil price would be a useful boost to counter incipient world recession.
6. Huge additional expenditure on Iraqi rehabilitation, as well as on defence requirements, will also work as a valuable counter-recessionary stabilizer.
7. The crisis has already given a fillip to the search for an Israel-Palestine solution and may yet provide the Quartet with just the impetus that their famous road-map to peace and an independent Palestinian state it now requires.
8. Arab passions on the street may indeed be inflamed further, but it is also possible that a benign and prosperous Iraq, instead of pumping poison into the whole surrounding region, as well as financing the most virulent forms of anti-Zionism, could do the complete reverse. As an Arab nation of potentially

enormous wealth and the highest culture it could radiate prosperity and peace throughout the Arab world.

9. A democratic Iraq, along with an increasingly lively democratic Turkey to the north, could both show respect and understanding for Kurdish rights in place of the present tensions, fears and stand-offs.
10. The urgent need for a rapid restoration of the crumbling nuclear non-proliferation regime could be addressed by all the existing nuclear powers, in the knowledge that further collapse threatens them all – equally.

Let's add one benefit on a lighter note. Perhaps the embarrassing failures of persuasion and diplomacy surrounding the lost Second UN Resolution might at last lead the current American administration to make its rhetoric more global-friendly.

The 'Victory will be ours' commencement-day oratory from The White House may play well at home. But to a world-wide audience its sounds unconvincing, dated and hollow. The excellent case for lifting the genocidal Saddam right out of the global terrorist equation has just not been getting the promotion it deserves. Maybe the U.S President could bring a British speech-writer on to his team to freshen up the phrases and expunge the clichés. There should be no lack of volunteers.

Ends

Article in Die Welt, 2nd June 03

Partnerschaft in Gefahr Gastkommentar

von Michael Howard

Der Irak-Krieg hat für beispiellose Spannungen in der Beziehung zwischen Amerika und Europa gesorgt. Seit beinahe 60 Jahren war die atlantische Partnerschaft eine Kraft zum Guten, und zwar nicht nur für Europa und Nordamerika, sondern auch für den Rest der Welt. Sind diese Beziehungen wieder zu kitten?

Die Beziehungen haben sich in Besorgnis erregender Geschwindigkeit aufgelöst. In der Zeit nach dem 11. September 2001 las man in französischen Zeitungen Schlagzeilen wie: "Wir sind alle Amerikaner." Es schien anfänglich so, als hätten wir uns unserer grundsätzlich gemeinsamen Perspektive und unserer viel gerühmten gemeinsamen Werte wieder vergewissert.

Binnen einen Jahres sah alles ganz anders aus. Deutschlands Kanzler gewann die Wiederwahl mit einem scheinbar anti-amerikanischen Wahlprogramm. Wenn auch einige dieser Gefühle falsch dargestellt wurden, so war doch klar, dass Deutschland Kampfhandlungen im Irak nicht unterstützen werde. Viele Deutsche sind nicht nur im Hinblick auf den Irak, sondern hinsichtlich des Kriegs im Allgemeinen in sich zerrissen. Viele glauben, Deutschlands Haltung spiegele eher pazifistische als anti-amerikanische Gefühle wider. Das kann sein. Deutschland hat sich in den letzten Jahrzehnten geändert. Es entsandte Friedenstruppen nach Somalia, Bosnien, Osttimor, in das Kosovo, in den Kaukasus, nach Mazedonien und als Reaktion auf den 11. September auch nach Afghanistan. Aber keine dieser Truppen hat Krieg geführt.

Es gibt Uneinigheiten hinsichtlich der Verteidigungspolitik. Sie sorgen für eine wachsende Gereiztheit in den USA über die so genannte europäische Verteidigungsinitiative. Die USA beobachten schrumpfende europäische Verteidigungshaushalte in Verbindung mit einer neuen und unnötigen Befehlsstruktur, die die der Nato lediglich verdoppelt. Auch die kulturellen Differenzen werden immer deutlicher. Viele Europäer halten die Anwendung der Todesstrafe in den USA für rückwärts gerichtet und widerlich. Viele Amerikaner führen Europas Mangel an totalem Engagement beim Antiterrorismus auf latenten Antisemitismus zurück.

Da Europa militärisch bedeutungslos ist, überrascht es nicht, dass Europäer stärker auf Diplomatie als auf militärische Gewalt setzen, um Streitigkeiten zu lösen. Andererseits sollte niemand überrascht sein, dass die Amerikaner sich daran stoßen, wenn man ihre Möglichkeit beschneiden will, aus ihrer militärischen Hegemonie Vorteile zu ziehen.

In Wahrheit haben die transatlantischen Gegensätze schon seit langem bestanden. Während des Kalten Krieges wurden sie vor allem durch die sowjetische Bedrohung und das Eingeständnis der Europäer unterdrückt, auf die USA angewiesen zu sein, um der Bedrohung zu begegnen. Tatsächlich ist es verwunderlich, dass die Partnerschaft nicht schon früher nach dem Ende des Kalten Krieges mehr Spannungen aufwies. Diese Spannungen werden nicht dadurch überwunden, dass man sie leugnet. Auch wenn die USA und Europa noch Fragen zu lösen haben, besteht die eigentliche Gefahr darin, dass dann, wenn man jedes mögliche Ereignis als Ankündigung einer neuen Spaltung darstellt, sich diese daraus dann auch ergibt. Es steht zu viel auf dem Spiel, um das weiterhin zuzulassen.

Europa und Nordamerika haben im Grundsatz weiterhin eine gemeinsame Perspektive. Wenn beide zusammenarbeiten, lassen sich mehr Fortschritte in der Handhabung der Weltprobleme erzielen, als wenn sie jede Gelegenheit nutzen, um daraus Vorteile für sich zu ziehen. Wenn sich dagegen die atlantische Partnerschaft in Feindseligkeit auflöst, wird die Welt noch gefährlicher werden.



Patrons

The Hon Dr Henry Kissinger – United States of America

Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr. – United States of America
Senator, Democrat

Minority Leader of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

The Rt Hon John Major CH – United Kingdom

Prime Minister (1990-1997)

The Rt Hon Lord Gilbert – United Kingdom

Former Defence Minister under the present Labour government

Alain Juppe - France

Prime Minister (1995-7)

Depute, French Assemble

Friedrich Merz – Germany

Deputy leader of the CDU/CSU Parliamentary Group in the German Bundestag

Karsten Voigt - Germany

US German Coordinator in the present German Government

Senator Antonio Martino – Italy

Defence Minister in the present Italian government

Eduardo Serra - Spain

Chairman, UBS Warburg Spain

Former Defence Minister

Chairman and Vice Chairmen

The Rt Hon Michael Howard QC MP- Chairman

Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer

Former Home Secretary

Lord Powell of Bayswater – Vice Chairman UK

Former adviser on foreign affairs and defence to two UK Prime Ministers - Lady Thatcher and John Major.

The Hon Henry Hyde – Vice Chairman USA

US Congressman

Chairman of the House International Relations Committee

Pierre Lellouche – Vice Chairman France

Depute, French Assemble

Trustees

The Rt Hon Michael Howard MP
Lord Powell of Bayswater
Lord Chadlington of Dean
Jonathan Marland (treasurer)
Mrs Meg Allen

USA Trustees

Richard Burt – former US Ambassador to Germany
General Scowcroft – former national security advisor

Directors

Catherine Fall - Director worldwide
Douglas Seay - Director USA
Owen Pengelly – Associate Director USA

How to Contact Atlantic Partnership

If you wish to know more about the work of Atlantic Partnership please feel free to contact our Director, Catherine Fall on telephone: 020 77381423 or by email cfall@workcambridge.fsnet.co.uk Or you can visit our website on:

www.atlanticpartnership.com